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Part 1

Regent’s Park Conservation Area Appraisal

1 Introduction

This report forms a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for the Regent’s Park Conservation Area in the London Borough of Camden.

Conservation Area designation carries the responsibility to preserve or enhance the area.

Part 1 Conservation Appraisal is an acknowledgement that the Regent’s Park Conservation Area has a special character and seeks to define that character. It gives consideration to the key issues and pressures that are affecting the area.

Part 2 Management Strategy sets out positive actions for the particular care required to preserve and enhance the special character, to anticipate change, and the need for future review.

This section also gives guidance for sources of further information and maps.

This document is part of on-going review of existing Conservation Area Statements undertaken by the Council. The purpose of the review is the safeguarding of Conservation Areas, and when the appraisal and management strategy are adopted they will become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and an agenda for future action and review.

It is important to note that whilst the appraisal seeks to provide a summary of the special interest and character and appearance of the conservation area, it would be impossible to identify all of the detailed characteristics and appearance of every street and area or highlight every facet that contributes to the area’s special interest. Accordingly, future development proposals must be considered in the context of this character appraisal and a thorough assessment at the time of the specific character and appearance of that part of the conservation area.

The document has been prepared by John Thompson & Partners in consultation with the Camden conservation and landscape officers, the Regent’s Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee and follows English Heritage guidelines set out in Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals, 2005 and Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas, 2006.
2 Definition of Special Character

The Regent’s Park Conservation Area covers the eastern segment of John Nash’s early 19th century Regent’s Park development. It is a small part of a greater scheme that extends to the west into the City of Westminster, and comprises a unique planned composition of landscape and buildings, at once classical and picturesque.

The significance of the Regent’s Park area is of national and international importance. The comprehensive masterplanning of the park, terraces, villas and the (largely redeveloped, but still appreciable in plan form) working market and service area served by canal to the east was on an unprecedented scale of urban design in London. The integration of all elements of a living area, from aristocrat to worker, from decorative to utilitarian, in a single coherent scheme were exhibited here.

On approaching the conservation area from the Park the terraces emerge over the trees; here is the city in the country. On approaching from the south Regent’s Park is the culmination of Regent’s Street, Portland Place and the wineglass shape of Park Square; here is the country in the city.

Park Village East and Park Village West are picturesque precedents for the small suburban villa, closely set in a variety of styles that were to become so popular with the Victorians.

The service area, whilst largely redeveloped in the 20th century, is preserved in the layout of later development, and the physical remains of the canal and basin to the east of Albany Street.

Control over development has been in place from the start when the concept of Regent’s Park development was established after a design competition; after which John Nash sold building leases for approved designs. Today, the majority of the buildings are listed and the area is a conservation area within either London Borough of Camden or the City of Westminster. Added protection is afforded by the management of the estate by the Crown, the Royal Parks Agency, and the Crown Estates Paving Commission through the control that they exercise on the upkeep of the buildings, the park, shared private gardens, roads and paving.

A map showing the boundary between Westminster and Camden is included within the Appendices.
3 Planning policy context
National – London Borough of Camden – local

3.1 National policy

Camden has a duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (section 69 and 72) to designate as conservation areas any “areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or historic interest of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance” and pay special attention to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of those areas.

Designation provides the basis for policies designed to preserve or enhance the special interest of such an area. Designation also, importantly, introduces greater control over the removal of trees and more stringent requirements when judging the acceptability of the demolition of unlisted buildings that contribute to the character of the area.


English Heritage has produced Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals 2005 and Management of Conservation Areas 2006 which have been used as a framework for the documents. These documents set out the rationale and criteria for designation and the way in which information should be presented in order to best support the preservation and management of designated areas.

The Greater London Authority

The London View Management Framework SPG was adopted in July 2010. This identifies a number of protected views and vistas with cross borough implications. For example, the designated Panorama from Primrose Hill towards St Paul’s Cathedral and the Palace of Westminster are dominated by Regent’s Park and surrounding buildings at the foreground.

- The view from Primrose Hill to St Paul’s and the wider setting consultation area lies over the northern part of the area.
- The view from Primrose Hill to the Palace of Westminster and the wider setting consultation area lies over the south western edge of the area.
- The background consultation area from Blackheath Point to the Palace of Westminster affects the southern end
• The wider setting consultation area from Parliament Hill to the Palace of Westminster skims the eastern edge.

Further guidance on strategic views, including those in neighbouring boroughs is available on the Greater London Authority website:

http://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/planning/vision/supplementary-planning-guidance/view-management

London Borough of Camden policy

The Council’s policies and guidance for conservation areas are currently contained in the Local Development Framework (LDF), adopted in 2010 and Camden Planning Guidance (April 2011) and reflect the requirements of national policy.

The government has introduced a new planning system in which the focus is on flexibility, sustainability, strengthened community and stakeholder involvement. Under the new system Camden is required to produce the Local Development Framework (LDF). This has replaced the Unitary Development Plan (UDP), and includes a high level of monitoring and community involvement.

The LDF incorporates the London Borough of Camden Planning policies:

• Development Plan Documents (DPDs): the key document of this type is the core strategy which includes a development plan for the whole area and will outline a broad strategy for conservation

• Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs): provide further detail and guidance on policies and proposals included in the DPD, and can supplement higher level policy in controlling erosion of the special interest that warrants designation

• Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy are to be adopted and will support the above documents.

3.2 Local policy

Regent’s Park Conservation Area is Camden Conservation Area Number 4.

The Regent’s Park area was designated as a conservation area on 1 July 1969. The west of the Park was designated by Westminster Council, and the east side by the London Borough of Camden.
The area was extended to the north from the York and Albany Public House up to the Delancey Street junction on 1 October 1971.

Two further areas were designated on 1 November 1985, to the east of Albany Street, around Redhill Street, St George’s Cathedral and Christchurch School; the other around Longford Street including the church and presbytery of St Mary Magdalene.

A further extension was made on 11 July 2011 to include the Regents Park Barracks on Albany Street and the Cumberland Estate to its south.

This Appraisal updates and supersedes the existing draft Regent's Park Conservation Area Statement. Public consultation was carried out on this document in December 2000 however the Statement was not formally adopted.

Designations in the Local Development Framework

Open Space

Public Open Space

- The Regent’s Park
- St Katherine’s Precinct

Private Open Spaces

- Gloucester Gate
- Chester Terrace Private Open Space
- Cumberland Terrace Private Open Space
- Augustus and Redhill allotments

Metropolitan Open Land

- Regent’s Park

Neighbourhood Centres

- Albany Street, opposite Robert Street,

West Euston neighbourhood renewal area.
• The southern half of the area falls within the West Euston neighbourhood renewal area.

Central London Area Clear Zone Region

• The southern end of the area is within the Central London Area Clear Zone Region

The site at Goldsmith’s House and adjoining land, Augustus Street are allocated as Site 10 in the LDF Site Allocations Additional Sites (2011) consultation document which, at time of writing, is expected to be adopted in Autumn 2011. This proposes to make more efficient use of the site for potential residential development including affordable housing or hostel use, with re-provision and expansion of the community hall and publicly accessible open space. Future development here will be expected to be arranged so as to demonstrate evidence of the former canal basin.

The management of Regent’s Park by the Crown

The Crown Estate manages Regent’s Park on behalf of HM Treasury. The Crown owns the freehold of all the buildings in and around Regent’s Park with the exception of London Zoo and the houses in Prince Albert Road, and the York and Albany.

As freeholder, the Crown Estate requires a Licence to Alter for works inside and out of the buildings.

The Crown Estate has prepared Management Guidelines and Standard Specifications for repair and conservation and they monitor works. The Regent's Park estate is managed by Cluttons, a firm of chartered surveyors, on behalf of The Crown Estate in consultation with the Crown Estate's conservation architects, Purcell Miller Tritton

The Crown Estate Paving Commission (CEPC) was established in 1813 and is a separate body from the Crown Estate. It maintains the terrace gardens (Ornamental Enclosures), the railings around them and the terrace access roads and pavements. The CEPC is responsible for the provision and maintenance of street lighting and street furniture in Regent's Park. It also maintains the roadways in York Gate, Chester Gate, Park Square East and West and pavements all around the outside of the Outer Circle. Its other functions include the regulation of parking in the private roadways, the collection of domestic refuse, patrolling the estate and the opening and shutting of park gates. The CEPC has the power to regulate and prevent the placement of signage (including estate agents boards, notice boards, advertisements and decorated hoardings) and has the power to require that the stucco work of properties is carried out in accordance with current practice and colour.
The Royal Parks Agency manages the public park. The Royal Parks, a government executive agency is answerable to the secretary of state of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport who manages the parks under powers set out in section 22 of The Crown Lands 1851 Act, which transferred management of the parks from the monarch to the government.

The Royal Parks is responsible for preserving and enhancing the landscape, providing a range of sporting and leisure activities and arranging an entertainment programme. Responsibilities include the maintenance of the Outer Circle and connecting roads at Hanover Gate and North Gate (Macclesfield Bridge). It works with the CEPC to manage traffic within the park. Law and order are maintained through the operational command unit of the Metropolitan Police.
4 Assessing special interest

4.1 Location and setting – city - borough - local

City
Regent’s Park Conservation Area is located about 1km north of Oxford Circus and lies directly north of the Marylebone Road and the West End.

Borough
Regent’s Park is on the western boundary of the Borough of Camden, in the old Borough of St Pancras. The western side of Regent’s Park belonged to the old parish of St Marylebone, and is now in The City of Westminster. This is also covered by Conservation Area designation. Further information and guidance on the Westminster Regent’s Park Conservation Area can be found on the Council’s website: www.westminster.gov.uk.

In relation to other conservation areas, it is west of Camden Town and south of Primrose Hill conservation areas.

Local
The area is bounded by The Regents Canal in the north, the Marylebone Road to the south, a straight line along the Broadwalk to the west within the park. To the east it follows a line from Parkway, along Park Village East, Albany Street, Augustus Street and includes St George’s Cathedral on Redhill Street and St Mary Magdalene’s Church on Longford Street.
4.2 **Character and Plan form**

The conservation area is oriented north-south and is made up of successive linear tracts of development which change in character as one moves from the Park edge to the eastern edge of the Conservation Area.

Development closest to the Park – and facing onto it - is of the highest architectural hierarchy. Tall stuccoed facades face the park, creating a grand linear composition and giving enclosure to the open space.

To their rear are low, stock brick mews developments reflecting the linear plan.

To their rear, and facing Albany Street, are buildings of a variety of ages and appearances, but generally of terraced house form, and united by their similar response to the linear nature of the street. Redhill and Longford Streets contain churches, housing and a public house, and sit between (in terms of architectural hierarchy and physical layout) the park and grand terraces to the west and the service area to the east.

At the northern end of Albany Street are the Park Villages East and West, which have a less formal plan, and comprise picturesque villas set in an Arcadian landscape. They were once divided by the canal and today are set apart from each other by their gardens in a wooded dell.

To their north the route of the infilled canal assumes a linear form following the gentle curve of the Park edge, and remains an open space, currently grassed or hard surfaced and in use as a car park.

South of Park Villages East and West are the Barracks and Cumberland Market Estate. The linear form of the canal and its basin survives in the layout of later 20th century development, including allotments within the basin. The operational Barracks survive on Albany Street behind a high brick wall.

Within this overall framework of distinct types, twentieth century interventions fit into the earlier patterns. These are mostly housing developments with the notable exception of The Royal College of Physicians which is an iconic building of its time.
4.3 Landscape and topography

The Topography Map shows the Regent’s Park Conservation Area on an almost level site indicated on the 35 metre contour, with a gentle falling away down Parkway towards Camden Town, and to the south east.

The ground levels have been altered artificially: the canal (and the railway just outside the eastern boundary) cut into the landscape; the levels around the terraces to the park are raised to reinforce the architectural hierarchy and to enhance views and grandeur and maximise the underlying utility of the service areas and basements. The cross section of levels though the area demonstrates the manipulation of the landscape to reinforce the intended architectural and social hierarchy.

The landscape of the park in the proximity of the terraces is a wide open parkland setting. The private ornamental gardens on the perimeter contain more exotic and colourful trees and shrubs and are raised to the level of the terrace to which they relate. This creates a layered effect when viewed from the park, and an added sense of privacy when viewed from the terraces.

The private gardens in Park Villages East and West provide picturesque settings. Park Village East extends into the valley formed by the infill of the canal, creating a ‘dell’ at its northern end which is visible from Gloucester Gate Bridge.

The depression left by the infilling of the canal is further appreciable to the north of Gloucester Gate bridge, where, at its north end the basin by its junction with the Regents Canal remains in its original use; and to the south where the site of the infilled Cumberland Basin has been retained as an open space in use as horticultural allotments.
4.4 Historic development and archaeology

A brief summary of the history follows which aims to pinpoint defining moments which shape the area. Much has been written elsewhere and further references are given in the bibliography. A full history is given in the Appendix by Richard Simpson FSA.

Key dates

1066 From the time of William the Conqueror ownership of all land became ‘in right of the King’; the ownership by the Crown of the Regent’s Park area dates from this time. The land was used to raise income for the King and thus the State.

In the medieval period the land was leased to the nunnery of Barking. At the reformation Henry VIII enclosed the area as a hunting park.

1756-7 The ‘New Road’ was built on the outer edge of the metropolis to relieve east-west traffic in the centre of London particularly along Oxford Street; this is now the Marylebone Road.

1776 Portland Place which runs north-south, was started by the Adam Brothers. Originally the development was to have been an exclusive enclave, not a through route.

1793 Surveyor general of His Majesty’s Land Revenues John Fordyce planned a grid of streets south of the New Road.

1809 The Duke of Portland, published a plan showing a landscaped park with villas and terraces north of the New Road, located on farmland known as Marylebone Park that the Duke leased from the Crown.

1811 The lease came to an end and a competition was held to select an architect. John Nash, the Prince Regent’s favourite architect was the winner.

Nash incorporated Portland Place into his via triumphalis to Regent’s Park.

The ‘new canal company’ was founded on 31st May 1811 at a meeting held at a Percy Street coffeehouse, to form a canal linking Paddington Basin to the Limehouse Cut. The route was influenced by John Nash who saw the benefit of it running through his new park and the Prince Regent agreed it should be called “The Regent’s Canal”. The Canal Bill received royal assent in July 1812 and work began on the eight-mile stretch of canal in October 1812.

A branch was incorporated into the design (the Collateral Cut) that would run south through Park Villages East and West ending in a basin (known variously as Regents Park or Cumberland Basin) surrounded by wharfs supplying the markets in the adjacent squares to the east of Albany Street.

Originally more development was envisaged in the Park than was implemented; a second grand circus was planned on the inner circle and
around fifty exquisite villas scattered amongst the trees. Lack of funds and a concern that too much building would spoil the landscape curtailed the development which would have amounted to a garden suburb.

1816 The Barracks were built on Albany Street.

1817 Park Crescent completed (1812-17).

1818 Nash’s Ophthalmic Hospital on southern arm of Redhill Street built for Sir William Adams, George IVth’s oculist, to provide services for soldiers whose eyesight had been affected by military action in Egypt. (Closed 1822, subsequently used as a Gin Distillery by Sir Felix Booth, demolished 1968).

1820-7 The Regent’s Park Terraces were built from south to north.

1824 Park Village East and West were begun

1827 Nash’s own York and Albany Public House completed

1830 Three markets east of Albany Street opened, including the relocation of the Haymarket. These were located on and supplied by the branch of the Regent’s Canal.

1833-7 St George’s Cathedral on Albany Street (formerly Christ Church) by James Pennethorne

1854 Cream lead oil paint for the render was formally adopted. (The original intention was for stone, but terraces were built with colour washed render.)

1877 Gloucester Gate iron girder bridge was designed by W. Booth Scott, engineer to St Pancras Vestry

1906 The widening of the railway cutting to Euston resulted in the demolition of the eastern side of Park Village East and a new bridge to Mornington Terrace (outside conservation area boundary)

1920s-30s Neo-Georgian social housing development for local workers and war veterans ‘The Cumberland Market Estate’ constructed to the west, south and south east sides of Cumberland Basin by the Crown Estate

1940s During the Second World War the Regent’s canal branch was infilled, reputedly as it was too readily visible as a landmark during air raids. Two thirds of the houses became uninhabitable.

1947 The Gorrell Report, ‘nothing less than the restoration of the buildings to their former state can be contemplated’.

1950s Much bomb damage to the eastern area resulted in rebuilding and the development of the Regent’s Park Estate by the Borough of St Pancras.
1964 Royal College of Physicians designed by Sir Denys Lasdun was opened.

Today The Park is valued for the public green space; a rural environment in the centre of London where it is possible to lose sight of the city. The area is arguably the greatest urban design of the Regency period.
4.5 Spatial analysis

The spatial elements are made up of:

- the open space of the Park, which gives a sense of being in the country. The space is encircled by the palace-fronted terraces and punctuated by spires

- the areas enclosed by classical elevations, for example the forecourts of Cumberland Place, the arched entrances to Chester Terrace and the less formal spaces of Chester Place

- the mews under the cliff faces of the rear of the terraces with narrow forecourts

- Albany Street, a service street with typically a hard edged austerity,

- Park Village West and East, picturesque on a domestic suburban scale

- the secluded canal basin at the north of the conservation area with its footbridge and the spire of St Mark’s, seen above its wooded slopes

- the horticultural allotment site within Cumberland Basin, surrounded by high quality neo-georgian pre-war housing blocks of the Cumberland Market Estate, and the barracks site to its north.
4.6 Key views

Approaching the area, these views emphasise the relationship of city to green space:

- Chester Terrace from Chester Road and from Chester Place
- From the Park to the Terraces seeing a clear roofline (without buildings in the background)
- Views up Portland Place past the Circus and along the Park Square East
- Views into the Park from across the Gloucester Gate Bridge towards Gloucester Gate
- Mornington Street to Park Village East

Looking out of the area:

- From Cumberland footbridge in the north of the conservation area to the spire of St Mark’s Church
- West across the expanse of the Park

Within the area:

- Views between the Terraces and the Park seen from the Outer Circle, and along the raised terraces
- From Cumberland Place to St George’s Cathedral (formerly Christ Church) spire
- Towards St Katherine’s, the Danish Church, with its spires and precinct
- Into the wooded dell between the Park villages seen from Gloucester Gate Bridge.
- Views in the original mews, contained by walls, particularly Gloucester Gate Mews
- Glimpse view of St George’s Cathedral Spire from the northern arm of Redhill Street.
The park and buildings are such a complete and integrated composition, handled with absolute thoroughness, that all views from within the park have significance.

4.7 Character zones

The character zones have been defined as sub areas within the whole planned development (see character area map):

- the Regent’s Park and Terraces fronting the park and their mews
- Park Village East and West
- Albany Street Barracks
- Redhill Street - St George’s Cathedral
- Longford Street - Mary Magdalene
- The former Cumberland Basin and surrounding buildings

1 The Regent’s Park and Terraces fronting the park, and their mews

This area is from the northern apex of the conservation area at Cumberland Footbridge to Park Square East. At the southern end, the Adam’s design in the 1770s for a circus was not completed; the design for the circus was opened out instead to form a square (1822) which frames the entrance to the Park.

This character area is at the transition of park and terrace. The eastern part of the Park that lies within the conservation area contains the Broadwalk, and Nesfield’s Avenue Gardens of 1863 at its southern end, which lie on the boundary with Westminster City Council. The buildings at the parks’ edge form a triumphant classical route; buildings with giant orders and sculpture to be seen from a distance and to impress. The gates, metalwork, paving and stone details all contribute to the quality of the area.

The stucco terraces were originally rendered and intended to look like stone. The variation in finish was not acceptable to the Estate from the start, and over time a uniformity of finish has been achieved, by control of the paint specification by the Crown Estate along with many other details. The quality of the lighting and paving are all exceptional.

On Albany Street are access ways to the mews behind the terraces on its west side, and and routes to the former markets and smaller scale working area planned by Nash on its east side. The eastern side has been much redeveloped over the twentieth century by the Crown and by St Pancras to provide high density housing.

Albany Street is now in part a dividing line between the Nash Terraces and mews and the Regent’s Park Estate. But elements of Nash’s original built scheme survive in significant parts. From the north, on the west side of Albany
Street, the stucco houses at Gloucester Gate are followed by plainer terraced houses on Alban Street, with, behind them, Gloucester Gate Mews, which is substantially intact, followed by the important rear elevations of St Katherine’s church and the significant survivals of Cumberland Terrace Mews. The rear elevations of the Chester Place houses offer important evidence of the original form of the rear elevations of middle grade formal terraces. In the central section of the street, on the west, is much post Second World War rebuilding including good examples by the Louis de Soissons Partnership. On the east side, also from the north, Park Village West is followed by the Regent’s Park Barracks which is part of the original design. The former Christ Church survives as St George’s Cathedral, while the scale of the original houses is evident at a terrace of houses at the southern end, numbers 34, 36-38.

The street skyline is punctuated by the brick and stone churches and spires of St Katherine’s Danish Church and St George’s Cathedral.

At the northern apex of the conservation area lies a basin in the Regent’s Canal within a wooded dell. It is, today, called the Cumberland Basin, but is not to be confused with the historic Cumberland Basin to the south. It is in fact the survival of a short stretch of a branch (the Collateral Cut) which extended from the main Canal as it ran from the north side of the Park towards Camden Town. The Collateral Cut continued the Canal through the Park Villages, extending to the original Cumberland Basin which was the end of the canal and the heart of the service area of Nash’s original built scheme, with wharves, warehouses, and housing for the markets designed to serve the whole Park. Infilled during the Second World War, most of the original stretch from the footbridge to Gloucester Gate bridge is marked by a wide and shallow depression in an area of hard surfaced open space, currently used as a car park. The basin is now an attractive location for canal boats and a floating Chinese restaurant. The Cumberland Footbridge connects the Park to St Mark’s Gate where the church and spire overlook the footpath.

2 Park Village East and West

The Park Villages are a distinct and distinctive part of Nash’s wider scheme for Regent’s Park. They are clearly of different form and layout from the other areas of the Park. Individually composed of a mix of villas, paired houses, and groups of smaller terraced houses, their design ranges from ‘Italianate’ to gothic. The buildings are unified by the setting, a picturesque landscape which largely survives. The balance of building to landscape is often visible in views between buildings and across intriguing sight lines and is a fundamental element in the special character of the Park Villages.

Park Village West forms a loop off the east side of Albany Street. Here the houses by Nash and Pennethorne are arranged individualistically, they are inventive and ‘Italianate’. The corner house at number 12 has a distinctive corner entrance and a side view of the pediment to the studio behind. The canal formerly ran at the rear of the properties forming the boundary between Park Villages West and East.
The houses of Park Village East are similarly as inventive and pretty as Park Village West. Whilst they all front onto the road behind small front gardens, they have large rear gardens which contain the former canal cutting. The infilled canal cutting can be appreciated in views from the east side of Gloucester Gate Bridge looking towards the gardens of Park Village East, where it appears as a wonderfully secluded and semi-wild area of mature trees and undergrowth.

In 1906 the houses on the east side of Park Village East were demolished in order for the 1836 railway cutting to be enlarged (the houses on the western side of Mornington Road (now Terrace) on the far side of the railway line were also demolished). A high red brick wall with stone tops to the piers was erected which reflects the materials and design of Mornington Bridge, with its listed stone piers. A strip of soft landscaping bounded by a low brick wall creates a green edge to the street and is important in providing some sense of enclosure and balance to the remaining west side of Park Village East.

The York and Albany stands at the entrance to Park Village East and has high townscape value. Once on English Heritage’s ‘Buildings at Risk Register’ it was listed in 2000 and following this a sensitive refurbishment by local architects Arts Lettres Techniques was undertaken. The neighbouring No1 Park Village East was built as an indoor riding school in the York and Albany’s tea garden in 1892. The ramp leading to the stables on the first floor remains intact and a replica horse has been re-instated, copied from the original sculpture now within a local garden. The building has housed a photographic and film studio since 1969.

3 Albany Street Barracks

This extension to the conservation area contains the original barracks site on the east side of Albany Street, built in 1816. It is of rectangular plan and provides an austere and dominant edge to the northern part of Albany Street, formed by continuous brick elevations which front the street. There is minimal overlooking at street level, and one principal arched entrance way and one secondary vehicular entrance. The interior of the site is only visible in glimpse views through the principle entrance. It backs onto the rear gardens of Park Village East, but does not have a visible presence in views from this street.

4 Redhill Street

Redhill Street is a loop that runs off the east side of Albany Street. St George’s Cathedral is the principal building in this group. By Sir James Pennethorne and dating to 1836 it is of grey stock brick with stucco and stone dressings in a neo-Grecian style. Its rectangular form faces onto Redhill Street and presents an attractive, yet austere elevation onto Albany Street. A former School house sits on the eastern arm, alongside an attractive late 19th century red brick light industrial building, now in residential use. A modern low rise
primary school, and modern mews housing sit on the east and northern arms. York Stone paving exists on the southern arm of Redhill Street, and granite setts on the eastern arm, providing a high quality traditional street setting to the historic buildings here.

5 Longford Street

This small extension to the conservation area at its southern end contains an early 19th century terrace of 4 storey plus basement houses on Albany Street, a corner pub, a block of flats in arts and crafts style on Longford Street and St Mary Magdalene’s Church. It is a remnant of the former historic layout of the area, and the surrounding historic townscape has been comprehensively redeveloped in post-war years.

6 Cumberland Basin

The former canal basin (also known historically as Regent’s Park basin) with its surrounding buildings including the pre-war Cumberland Market Estate and post war flatted development on the east side, is bounded to the west by Redhill Street, to the east by Augustus Street, and to the South by Cumberland Market. A well preserved granite setted street surface exists to the west of the estate on Redhill Street.
4.8 Land use activity and influence of uses

Residential
Residential is the primary function in this area. Tenure is varied between the council, Crown Estate tenants, Peabody Housing Trust tenants, leaseholders and freeholders.

Shopping and retail
Part of the Robert Street Neighbourhood shopping area is within the conservation area on Albany Street under Chester Court. An array of shops includes a piano sales room on Albany Street.

Commercial
Offices are located within terraces particularly at the southern end towards Euston Road and Park Square East. The Diorama is converted to offices.

Worship
There are three churches: St Katherine’s Danish Church faces the Park, and has landscaped spaces to the park and the southern side. St George’s Cathedral Antioch Greek Orthodox (formerly Christ Church) is on Albany Street and St Mary Magdalene Church of England Church on Longford Street.

Churches bordering the area also have an important effect on the quality of the area. St Mark’s Church and its spire on Prince Albert Road is a picturesque backdrop to Cumberland basin; Holy Trinity Marylebone Road, by Soane, marks the corner with Albany Street and Marylebone Road with its Ionic porch and domed tower.

Civic
The Zoo (outside the conservation area boundary) affects the area by the large car park and the flow of visitors at the north end of the park.

The Royal College of Physicians’ building houses a major and historic professional institution, attracting members of the professional body, conference delegates and architectural sightseers. The Royal College occupies a cluster of buildings, including St Andrew’s Terrace (or Place), and the recent ‘terrace’ in Peto Place, to the rear of St Andrew’s Terrace.

Public houses
The York and Albany (in 2011 a boutique hotel, with restaurant and retail delicatessen) is on the corner of Park Village East and Parkway; The Queen’s Head and Artichoke, on the Albany St/ Longford St corner; The Chester Arms on the Albany St/Chester Gate corner, and the former Prince George of Cumberland on the Albany St/ Chester Place corner.

Education
Christchurch Primary School on Redhill Street is a post-war, self-effacing building, that adds little to the townscape.
4.9 The quality of buildings and their contribution to the area

There is a very clear hierarchy of building types in this conservation area that conforms to Nash’s grand masterplan. Each has a particular contribution to make. The Audit of Heritage Assets, below, and the townscape map set out the assessment of the contribution of buildings within the conservation area. This was based on the set of questions which might be asked when assessing the contribution made by unlisted buildings to the special architectural or historic interest of a conservation area, within Appendix 2 of Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals (English Heritage 2005).

The buildings are discussed in the following order, starting with the terraces from the south and running north.

The terraces, the mews, the houses of Park Villages West and East, the three churches, Bridges, the Barracks, School, Public Houses, Hotels and Restaurants, Cumberland Estate, Post-war development.

Terraces

The stucco terraces, facing Regent’s Park, have the appearance of palaces on a triumphal route. The line of terraces extends beyond this conservation area, around the Outer Circle of the park; and the overall development continues to the south, to Regent’s Crescent and ultimately down Regent Street to the site of Carlton House above the Mall. The terraces in this conservation area should be understood in the context of this whole composition.

Park Square East including Diorama

Park Square East stands to the north of Park Crescent, at the formal entry into Regent’s Park from the south. Originally Nash’s Crescent was to have been the largest Circus in Europe bisected by the New Road (now the Marylebone Road). The modification to form the square is a successful end to the route leading from Carlton House to the Park.

Park Square East lines the route from the park entrance to the Outer Circle and faces the Park Square Gardens. In the centre of the terrace (number 18) the projecting centre bay was the double entrance to the Diorama designed by A.C Pugin; originally constructed as a diorama in 1823, it closed in 1851 and was converted to a Baptist Chapel at the expense of Sir Samuel Morton Peto. The polygonal stock-brick building is hidden behind the terrace and is best viewed from Peto Place. The exterior survives, but little of the interior although what is believed to be the masonry base of the pivot on which the original internal structure was balanced was retained in the conversion. The building is converted to offices, renovated in 1988, and is currently occupied by the Prince of Wales’s Trust.
Albany Terrace
Albany Terrace is attached to Park Square East, and runs along the Marylebone Road to Peto Place. The terrace is set back from the Marylebone Road, with pared down stuccoed details and a narrow garden strip with a path of York stone flags. At time of writing used as offices, it has a distinctly residential feel (and in fact in 2010 planning permission was granted for change of use to residential) and the path and garden provide a welcome relief and buffer for pedestrians on Marylebone Road.

St Andrews Terrace
This terrace on the north end of Park Square East faces north towards the Royal College of Physicians. It is the mirror image of Ulster Terrace across the square (City of Westminster); together they form the returns of Park Square on the Outer Circle. Built in 1823, the stuccoed front has symmetrical coupled bow windows at the ends, unique within the Nash Terraces, and these are connected by an Ionic colonnade at ground level. It now provides a calm foil to the Royal College of Physicians (see below).

Royal College of Physicians
Built in 1960-4 and designed by Denys Lasdun and Partners, the Royal College of Physicians still feels a very modern building in this context. It faces the Outer Circle, with the rear elevation on Albany Street and the south elevation facing St Andrew’s Terrace. It was built on the site of Someries House, a plain villa of 1824 demolished after war damage. The continuity of the Nash design had already been broken in this area by the High Victorian Cambridge Gate to the north.

The ceremonial areas of the entrance hall, library dining room and conference are covered in white mosaic and form a pavilion on *pilotis*; dark blue engineering brick distinguishes the ancillary functions. The offices are housed in a terrace which presents an anonymous façade to Albany Street; the plinth links to the half submerged lecture theatre.

The building is not ‘in keeping’, but within the context it does have a resonance with the horizontal levels of adjacent buildings, and it is essentially a reinvention of a villa facing the Park. The building is also enigmatic; fifty years after construction it still evokes strong reactions as either a Modernist icon or a building out of place. The juxtapositions of street and park, brick to stucco and mosaic, terrace to wall and pavilion, are brought into play in a radical way. A unique building, it was summed up by Sir Nikolaus Pevsner as ‘one of the most distinguished buildings of its decade’, and it is an extremely important building within the conservation area.

Cambridge Gate
Built in 1875 by Archer and Green, the Cambridge Gate terrace is located on the Outer Circle between Nash’s Cambridge Terrace and the Royal College of Physicians. It occupies the site of the Coliseum, part of the original design, which displayed a famous panorama of London.
Cambridge Gate is the only terrace in stone, and was constructed in the enriched style of High Victorian prosperity, details taken from French examples with consistent details in ironwork and terracotta as well as stone. It breaks the continuity of the Nash terraces. The footprint and arrangement of shared private garden and inner driveway respects Nash’s layout along the Outer Circle.

**Cambridge Terrace**

Designed by Nash, this stucco terrace is slightly eccentric. It has small alternating rusticated columns at the centre and at the ends of the ground floor; otherwise it has as decoration long incised patterns in the stucco, reminiscent of the work of Sir John Soane. Originally ten houses, it was badly damaged in the Second World War; the north end was only rebuilt in the 1980s, when it was constructed as offices: the southern, surviving five original houses were converted laterally into flats.

**Chester Terrace**

Chester Terrace is set back from the park with a strip of contained shared gardens with flowering plants, shrubbery and trees. Chester Terrace is the longest unbroken façade in the park (287m/840 ft) with a complex alternating system of bays (ABCBABCBA) totalling 99 bays, marked by giant Corinthian columns attached and detached in groups which rise from ground floor level. Balconies run continuously between and behind the columns. At either end are projecting wings, connected to the main façade by theatrically thin triumphal arches inset with the name ‘Chester Terrace’ across the full street width.

To the south is Chester Gate, a two storey house with Doric detail.

**Cumberland Place**

Located between Chester Terrace and Cumberland Terrace, this short terrace of four houses within a seven-bay frontage faces the park, with a Corinthian portico at first floor level, but has entrances at the rear facing onto Chester Place. The space formed between Cumberland Place, Chester Terrace and Chester Place is a complex arrangement. The levels slope down from the Outer Circle towards Albany Street. Cumberland Place is elevated while Chester Place is set down at the lower level of Albany Street. This is used to effect, to emphasise the grandeur of the Cumberland Place houses. The prominent bay on the south elevation of Cumberland Place terminates the view along Chester Terrace through its northern triumphal arch. The spire of St George’s Cathedral (formerly Christ Church) is glimpsed in the gap between Chester Terrace and Place.

This unique space between the three elements of Chester Terrace, Chester Place and Cumberland Pace is the point at which the alignment of the terraces turns from north to north-north-west. Nash used this brilliantly by designing this theatrical composition.
Chester Place
A plain, stucco, three storey terrace with Tuscan pilasters, this stands at a lower level than the terraces that face the park. The brick rear elevations have entrances from Albany Street.

Cumberland Terrace
The grandest of the eleven terraces in Regent’s Park, Cumberland Terrace (244m/800ft long) embodies the idea of a palace confronting a ‘natural landscape’ within the city. James Thomson was executant architect, and the terrace was completed in 1826. The centre block has a projecting temple front: a giant order of ten Corinthian columns capped with a pediment containing exuberant sculptures.

On each side of the central block are symmetrical terraces, separated by recessed triumphal Ionic arches. The archways provide access to a courtyard space with pairs of houses, and the original steeply ramped access to the mews behind survives for the northern courtyard. The archways were widely copied as a means of disguising mews entrances. It is the most daring, scenographic and successful terrace in the park.

Cumberland Terrace was badly damaged by bombing and was substantially reconstructed behind the façade. The northern range of the mews survives, the remainder was rebuilt.

Gloucester Gate and Gloucester Lodge
Gloucester Gate is the most northerly terrace by John Nash on the east side of the Outer Circle. It was built in 1827, with later additions by J.J. Scoles. The terrace rises behind densely planted sloping gardens. The stuccoed façade is modulated by giant Ionic pilasters, with attached columns to the three projecting bays.

Gloucester Lodge is stuccoed, two-storey and composed: to the right of the central portico of attached Ionic columns stands a pavilion of three bays; to the left is a more substantial building which turns the corner into Parkway, and from which the Lodge is entered by steps to a raised entrance.

The Lodge skilfully brings the giant scale of the terraces down to the height of the residential area of the Park Village.

Coliseum Terrace
To the rear of Cambridge Gate, this plainer, red brick later Victorian terrace takes its name from the Coliseum that occupied the site until the 1870s.

30-48 Albany Street
Important as a survival of the more modest scale of Regency terraces that have otherwise been lost in this area, this is like a small stuccoed cousin of the grand terraces on the Park.

Stanhope Terrace, 119-125 Parkway
A yellow stock brick terrace completed in 1834 outside the Park limits, standing at the head of Parkway that leads down to Camden Town, this provides a transition between parkscape and townscape.

**Mews**

The mews were originally the service areas for the grand terraces, providing stabling and coach houses. Whilst this was their architectural role, today many are dwellings in their own right. The original mews are protected by the listing of the frontage buildings by virtue of attachment or by being curtilage structures.

**Gloucester Gate Mews**

Accessed from Albany Street, these original mews buildings are dwarfed by the rear elevation of Gloucester Gate. These stock brick buildings are the most intact of the Nash mews, and retain a real sense of their past function. There has been little apparent alteration to the elevations, or the granite setts in the roadway. The elevations of the mews houses facing the rear of the main houses have survivals of blind arcading, which suggest another element in the integrated design of the Park, where the rear of the mews houses were designed to be seen from the main houses. They have accommodation which is located over the former coach houses.

**Cumberland Terrace Mews**

In three parts, relating to the tripartite composition of the Terrace, the original northern section survives more or less intact. It still relates to the Nash terrace, and connects via a steep ramp to the higher-level courtyard. On Albany Street the mews are hidden behind a plain stock brick wall. The central and southern sections are post-war construction, designed by Louis de Soissons Partnerships for the Crown Commissioners. They are terraced houses in their own right and no longer mews, and relate more to Albany Street than to Cumberland Terrace.

**Cambridge Terrace Mews**

A hidden terrace dating to 1983, this development is squeezed between Cambridge Terrace and 55-73 Albany Street.

**Cambridge Gate Mews**

Accessed from Albany Street, this mews is contemporary with the 1875 frontage development, but follows the same pattern of building as the earlier mews at Gloucester Gate to the north.

**Houses**

**Park Village East and Park Village West**

The Park Villages face each other over the now filled-in canal branch.
John Nash with J. Pennethorne established a model for the suburban Victorian Villa. This was Nash’s final contribution to Regent’s Park. The exteriors are in mixed styles, romantic, classical with stucco, projecting eaves and black lattice pergolas and cast iron decoration. Park Village East in particular have large gardens, which bear the vestiges of the filled in canal in their topography.

The Park Villages West and East provide individualistic variations on the theme of a villa that was to become an inspiration for suburban development, and of houses in a picturesque setting. The setting of these buildings in the landscape is of particular significance in the Regent’s Park development where landscaping, including the canal, plays an important role.

**Churches**

**St Katherine’s Hospital, the Danish Church**
The church with its precinct, between Cumberland Terrace and Gloucester Gate, faces the Outer Circle and stretches back to Albany Street. St Katherine’s Hospital was moved to Regent’s Park when its original site, next to the Tower of London, was excavated to make way for St Katherine’s Dock. The chapel faced St Katherine’s Lodge to the west until this was demolished after the Second World War, when the Foundation moved back to east London and the chapel became the Danish Church. A green landscaped forecourt now provides the setting towards the park.

This example of the nineteenth-century Gothic was designed by Ambrose Poynter and built in 1826. St Katherine’s Hospital was a royal foundation, and the chapel front is in the manner of royal chapels with a central recessed front flanked by corner turrets. Despite the medieval air to the chapel, which was designed to incorporate medieval stalls, and Tudor details to the ancillary buildings, the plan is Palladian, with the large central chapel and curved ‘collegiate’ wings connecting to the domestic quarters.

The gothic style, twin spires, un-plastered yellow stock brick with stone dressings, and landscaped setting is a stark contrast to the stuccoed classical terraces surrounding Regent’s Park.

Landscaped ‘recreation’ spaces were originally located to the north and south of the church. The southern area remains, and is precious and secluded by the surrounding walls; the area to the north has been recently filled with two neo-Nash villas that address Albany Street.

**Christ Church (now St George’s Cathedral)**
Located at the bend in Albany Street, this austere brown-grey brick church to serve Nash’s development of east Regent’s Park was designed by James Pennethorne and built in 1838. Christ Church is in an understated Grecian classicism (and now serves as the Greek Orthodox St George’s Cathedral).
The entrance is marked by two giant pilasters with a diminutive pediment. Above this rises a simple tower, with brick base, colonnade, clock and spire. On the west side facing Albany Street are two tall secondary doors; the north and south elevations have tall arched windows.

The interior was embellished in the High Church style in the 1840s, and further interior alterations were made in 1868 by William Butterfield. The axis of the nave is parallel to Albany Street (approximately north-south) with the entrance to the south on Redhill Street.

The church successfully marks the corner site, and makes sense of the bend in Albany Street. The spire has a townscape importance in the wider area, particularly when viewed from Chester Place and along the length of Albany Street, as well as the glimpse view from the northern arm of Redhill Street.

**St Mary Magdalene Church**

Built fronting the south side of Munster Square in 1849-52 to designs by R.C. Carpenter, this church is in irregularly coursed ragstone with gothic details in the ‘Second Pointed’ style. It is one of the few stone buildings in this area. A hall church, its planned tower and spire were never built. It was built in reaction to the classical Christ Church (now St George’s Cathedral) to the north. The Clergy House is from 1894: the adjacent school building was an important part of the church’s mission.

The church is remote from the main body of the conservation area, and the context in which it now sits has been changed beyond recognition in post-war years.

**Bridges**

**Gloucester Gate Bridge**

Gloucester Gate Bridge crosses the now-dry spur of the Regents Canal and links Park Village with Gloucester Gate and the Park at the north end of Park Villages East and West. An iron-girder bridge with quatrefoil decoration and candelabra lamp standards, it was designed in 1877 by William Booth Scott and was once regarded as one of the finest bridges in London. It is listed at grade II. It suffered bomb damage in 1941 resulting in the loss of cast bronze gas lamp standards and a commemorative plaque. More recently it was damaged by a road accident and another commemorative plaque was stolen.

Now, thanks to funding from English Heritage, London Borough of Camden has reinstated the ornate lamp standards and the plaques have been repaired and reinstated.

**Cumberland Footbridge, otherwise known as St Marks Bridge**

Cumberland Footbridge crosses the west end of the Basin now known as Cumberland Basin on the Regent’s Canal (still in use as a waterway in this location) and links Prince Albert road to the Outer Circle. It sits on Camden’s
borough boundary and so the western half of the bridge is within Westminster. A cast iron single span, it rises in a gentle bow from Portland stone abutments, and was manufactured by Henry Grissell in London in c1864. It is decorated with foliate patterns in the spandrels of the bridge, and arcaded decoration on the balustrade and cast iron lamp posts with candelabra bases sit on the piers. It is listed at grade II*.

**Water Meeting Bridge**
Water Meeting Bridge carries Prince Albert Road over the Regents Canal at the north side of Cumberland Basin.

**Barracks**
Partly listed, the barracks – originally for 450 men and 400 horses – are important both as part of the original Nash plan and because of their continuity of use. On the eastern side of the conservation area, the buildings have a significant effect on it. They have been altered many times; the Officers’ Mess on the east is the only original survivor, although extended in 1866-7. Many buildings were added or rebuilt in the course of the 19th century: the Chapel School in 1857 with simple gothic details, the former hospital of 1877, built in red brick but now rendered, and the three parallel soldiers’ accommodation blocks to the south, rebuilt in 1891. Much of this is hidden behind imposing, high brick elevations onto Albany Street.

**School**
Christchurch Church of England Primary School is the only school in the conservation area. Its entrance is on Redhill Street, and it was wholly reconstructed after the Second World War. The tall, gothic-detailed no. 4 Redhill Street is the only survivor from the original National school and provided the Girls School House, with the Boys and Infants accommodation originally fronting Albany Street.

**Public Houses, Hotels and Restaurants**
A number of public houses were incorporated into the original plan, particularly on corner sites along Albany Street, but few of these buildings survived the post war redevelopment, and of those that did, some are now not in public house use.

The York and Albany in Park Village East, is now a boutique hotel, restaurant and delicatessen. Built in 1826, it was the earliest building associated with the Park Village East development by Nash. It stands at the entrance to Park Village East and has high townscape value, standing as it does on a major road junction with views of it from many angles.

The Queen’s Head and Artichoke on the corner of Albany and Longford Street dates to c1900 and replaces a former public house on the site which was contemporary with the Nash development.
The Chester Arms on the corner of Albany Street and Chester Gate dates to the early to mid 19th century, and is the surviving remnant of a terrace that was redeveloped after WW2. Its survival helps to provide an intact entrance into Chester Gate.

The former Prince George of Cumberland stands at the corner of Albany Street and Chester Place. Dating to the early 19th century it retains its pub frontage with Corinthian pilasters supporting the entablature, but is no longer in public house use.

**Cumberland Basin**

The south and east sides of the Cumberland Basin were redeveloped in the late 1920s and early 1930s by the Crown Estate, with large residential blocks replacing the workers housing, warehousing and wharfs around the basin. The blocks are on a monumental scale with a coherent design approach throughout, yet employing a range of architectural detailing which helps to distinguish the individual blocks. The blocks are of stock brick, with stone string courses and clay tiled mansard roofs, they form a continuous built edge along Redhill Street, the north side of Cumberland Market, and the southern end of Augustus Street., with generous courtyard gardens set either in front of the blocks, or behind. Devices such as projecting bays, pediments, arched vehicular and pedestrian entrance ways, blind arcading and pilasters, decorative boundary gates and railings and decorative name plaques add visual interest and variety to the estate.

**Post-war development – effect on the Nash plan**

The Gorrell Report resulted in the reconstruction where required and the restoration of the terraces and Park Village. So much had been lost through wartime damage and there was a real possibility that the Nash scheme could have been destroyed. Instead, it was saved.

The in-filling of Nash’s branch of the Regent’s Canal during the Second World War had a lasting effect on the area, visually and physically. The loss of the canal led to the provision of car parking to the north of Gloucester Gate Bridge, the creation of the dell at the end of Park Village East, the enlargement of private gardens and the allotment site in Cumberland Market Estate.

Facing the park, the key change was the building of the Royal College of Physicians (see above). It is a landmark building, one that still after half a century appears radical.

Albany Street was much altered with post-war reconstruction of mews and modest terraced housing, and the building of new houses and flats. The Nash scheme is very fragmentary in this area.
Many of the Nash frontages on Albany Street were rebuilt after the war, on the west side by the Louis de Soissons Partnership, for the Crown Commissioners. (Those on the east side, outside the conservation area, were mostly built by St Pancras Borough Council.) The Louis de Soissons work is restrained and of its time, with patterned balconies and decorative tile-hanging. The three-storey terraces in Chester Close are good examples.

Further social housing was developed to the east of Cumberland Basin. This lacked the extent and quality of architectural detailing evident in the Crown Estate’s pre-war Cumberland Market Estate, and had a much simplified, repetitive layout, but responds acceptably in terms of scale and materials to the earlier development.

There was also considerable infill, with new terraced houses and flats, including Edward Mews off Redhill Street, and the Little Albert Street development off Longford Street. These are in a contemporary idiom, and do not try to re-create in form or design any of the Nash plan.
4.10 Local details

Details within each character area mostly have a consistency of approach and are reflective of their period.

Roofs are of slate (or clay tile in the Cumberland Market Estate); and mansard roofs, shallow pitched roofs behind parapet walls, and wide overhanging eaves are all evident.

Walls are predominantly stucco facing the park and the on villas, and fairfaced brick elsewhere.

Windows are generally timber sash. The rear elevations are important and easily visible. Inappropriate window replacement which does not reflect the original pattern mars the rear elevations.

Doors tend to be solid, panelled, timber, with glazed fanlight above and the pattern is located in groups of houses or mansion blocks.

Paving within private curtilages tends to be in York stone and limited to entrances and areas, generally allowing soft landscaping to predominate.

Balconies are inventive with decorative cast iron work.

This is a brief description of characteristic local details. For further detailed descriptions please refer to the Crown Estate Property Maintenance Guide.
4.11 Prevalent local and traditional materials in the public realm

Regent’s Park public realm is of exceptional quality around the park due to the control and careful local management of the Crown Estate, Royal Parks and the Crown Estate Paving Commission. Materials include York stone pavements, and granite setts in the mews. Lighting within the Park is mostly from original light fittings stamped with the monarch’s monogram, most of these fittings are listed.

At the park gates the scene changes to the signage, concrete slabs, road markings and street clutter more commonly found and familiar throughout London.

In Redhill Street york stone paving and granite setts survive.
4.12 The contribution to the character and appearance of green spaces

Regent’s Park itself is the principal green space in this conservation area around which the development is gathered. With its formal gardens and magnificent mature trees it forms the setting for the terraces and the Danish Church, which are afforded views across the Park.

Between the park and the terraces are a series of private open spaces which are designated private open spaces in the UDP. These are important elements within the landscape structure of the conservation area although there is some variation in the structure and planting, some are raised where others are sloped banks. The planting in terrace gardens offers variety to the presentation of the terraces, and represents a ‘domestication’ of the landscaping. Generally speaking the larger trees within these spaces are the more significant landscape elements providing intermediate scale and enclosure between the park and the terraces.

A band of large canopy trees runs through the rear of the gardens of Park Village East. These with the trees clustered on garden boundaries, form part of the setting of these villas along with the generous size of their gardens.

Gardens and a rural feel are integral to the Park Villages. Gaps between houses afford glimpses into this green and mature setting. Views into the wooded dell between the Park Villages adjoining Gloucester Gate Bridge afford a view of a wonderfully secluded and semi-wild area of mature trees and undergrowth, which responds well to the picturesque design of the Park Villages.

There are large planes which front the Royal College of Physicians which are important to the setting of this building and add to the continuity of green space along the Outer Circle.

Outside the boundary, but important to the setting of Park Village East is the undesignated roadside shrubbery between the rear of the footway and the railway cutting wall in Park Village East which softens the edge of the conservation area at this abrupt change in character.
4.13 Audit of heritage assets

An audit of the fabric of the conservation area has been undertaken to identify listed buildings and unlisted buildings that contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Buildings and streetscape and other elements that are considered neutral, or which detract from its character and appearance are also identified. Please refer to Townscape Map.

There is a strong presumption to retain buildings that make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Elements identified as neutral are those, usually later interventions, that broadly conform to the prevailing character, scale, form and materials, but have not provided any significant enhancement. Those identified to make a negative contribution are those buildings which considered to be so significantly out of scale or character with their surroundings that their replacement with something of a more appropriate scale and massing or detailed architectural treatment would benefit the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Listed buildings
Listed Buildings are structures or buildings of special architectural or historic interest which are included on the Statutory List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest, maintained by English Heritage.

Albany Street  Nos. 1-17 (odd), 19, 31, 33, 34-48 (even), and attached railings, 35-53 (Rear of Royal College of Physicians) 55-77 (odd) and attached railings, 79-85, 195 (former) Prince George of Cumberland PH Animal drinking trough (opposite Regent's Park Barracks), 197-217 (odd), 219 (Albany Lodge) 206 Clarence Cottage Officer’s quarters and mess Regent’s Park Barracks, east side of site. Christ Church (St George’s Cathedral)

Broad Walk Drinking fountain (SE of Zoological Gardens)

Cambridge Gate Nos. 1-10 and attached railings (and associated mews by virtue of cartilage/attachment); four lamp posts; retaining wall and gate piers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Terrace Nos. 1-10</td>
<td>and attached railings, four lamp posts, railings to forecourt gardens; two bollards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Gate Nos. 1-4</td>
<td>attached railings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Place Nos. 1-12</td>
<td>three lamp posts; two bollards; railings to garden forecourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Road</td>
<td>Four boundary markers on north and south sides of road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Terrace Nos. 1-42</td>
<td>attached railings and linking arches; railings and parapets to forecourt gardens; 14 lamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Place Nos. 1-4</td>
<td>attached balustrade and railings; two lamp posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Terrace Nos. 1-59</td>
<td>wall to forecourt and attached railings; (and 27-31 Cumberland Terrace Mews by virtue of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester Gate Nos. 1-11, 12, 14</td>
<td>and garden railings (and associated Mews by virtue of curtilage/attachment); no. 15 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longford Street 1-8</td>
<td>Walton House 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylebone Road No. 2; Nos. 1, 2</td>
<td>and 3 Albany Terrace; forecourt railings and lamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munster Square</td>
<td>Church of St Mary Magdalene and school annexe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Circle</td>
<td>1, two boundary markers opposite 1 Cambridge Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Square East Nos. 13-24</td>
<td>six lamp posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Village East</td>
<td>Nos. 2-16, 22-34 (even) 36A and B, and attached railings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Village West</td>
<td>Nos. 1-8, 10-14, 17-19, and attached railings; two lamp posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew’s Place</td>
<td>Nos. 1-8, 9 &amp; 10; forecourt railings and five lamp posts; Royal College of Physicians (no 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Katherine’s Precinct</td>
<td>The Danish Church; nos. 1-3, 6-9 and attached railings; precinct railings and lamps; monument in courtyard; nos 4-5 (Pastor’s House and St Katherine’s Hall) with attached screen walls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Buildings that make a positive contribution**

These buildings relate to the core reason for the conservation area designation and significance. This is primarily historic development around Regent’s Park and Village. These buildings have a positive effect on the environment and could be a single building, a group or a landmark. The Council will resist demolition of buildings which make a positive contribution to the conservation area (the fabric and character of which are considered to make significant contribution to a designated heritage asset) These buildings have been assessed by reference to English Heritage criteria set out in their guidance note ‘Conservation Area Appraisals’, 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Village East</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Village West</td>
<td>15 &amp; 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhill Street</td>
<td>1-3, 4 Camberley House, Bagshot House, Swinley House, Ascot House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Street</td>
<td>32 PH Queen’s Head and Artichoke, 87 PH Chester Arms, Colosseum Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regents Park Barracks – all (except those identified elsewhere in this audit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus Street</td>
<td>Datchet House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Gate</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Market</td>
<td>Windsor House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buildings that make a neutral contribution
These relate to buildings which broadly conform to the prevailing character, scale, form and materials but neither enhance nor detract from the character or appearance of the area. A number of interventions have broken the homogeneous nature of the area and have not provided any significant townscape merit. There might be potential for enhancement.

Outer Circle 2, 3,
St Mark’s Bridge Gate 1, 2
Augustus Street Ambleside
Kendal
Buttermere
Goldsmiths House
Albany Street Pennethorne House
1-4, 5-26, Cumberland Terrace Mews
1-14 consecutive
Peto Place east side
Regents Park Barracks 2 x blocks at far north of site; 1 x block at far south of site
Cambridge Terrace Mews 1-7
Chester Close North 26-40 even, 25-41 odd
Chester Court 1-60 consecutive
Chester Close South 28-56 even, 27-59 odd
Edward Mews 1, 2, 3
Laxton Place 8 & 9
Little Albany Street 2 (Esther Randall Court) 4-10 even
Osnaburgh Street 27-33
Park Village East 20 (Nash House), Silsoe House, Richmond House
Redhill Street 22-29 consecutive
Christchurch School
Buildings that make a negative contribution
These buildings, elements or spaces detract from the special character of the area due to their scale and design and offer potential for beneficial change. Improvement is expected from new development.

Albany Street 180
Redhill Street 188-192
4.14 Buildings at Risk

Buildings at Risk are listed buildings known to English Heritage to be under risk from decay or neglect. Within Regent’s Park Conservation Area only one building, St George’s Cathedral, Redhill Street, is identified as being at risk due to its deteriorating condition. It is to be added to the 2011 version of English Heritage’s Heritage at Risk Register.

See also the Management Strategy for further guidance from English Heritage on Heritage at Risk.
5 Problems and pressures, and capacity for change

Problems and pressures

- Residential intensification of existing buildings manifesting in roof level alterations and basement extensions under gardens. Changes by accretion have led to loss of clarity of architectural form, symmetry, and detail in some instances.
- Conflict due to changes in tenure
- Possible changes to specification required to cope with climate change
- Building over garden space e.g. at St Katherine’s
- Inappropriate alterations to landscape in private gardens, e.g. infill into the canal
- Pressure for tall buildings that overlook the park, and that affect views out of the Park, undermining the picturesque quality
- Pastiche development that does not enhance the area
- Intensification of commercial activity in the Park may cause damage to historic landscape.

Capacity for positive change

- Quality of Albany Street, with improvement of the streetscape and public realm
- Anticipated redevelopment of much of the post-war rebuilding in due course (particularly on the east side) including opportunity for additional residential accommodation.
- Improvement of the public realm at the edges of the park, particularly in the environs of Gloucester Gate Bridge
- Restoration of the Park gates at Gloucester Gate to the original design
Community involvement

In Regent’s Park there is an established Conservation Area Advisory Committee. The Conservation Area Advisory Committee is made up of local people who meet regularly to consider and comment upon planning and conservation area consent applications and their comments are given to the council officers. The CAAC’s comments are considered during the assessment of planning applications.

Prior to the preparation of this Appraisal the Regent’s Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee, the Council’s conservation officers and John Thompson and Partners walked around the area. The members of the CAAC pointed out key issues which have been included in the draft.

Consent was given for public consultation on the draft Appraisal and Management Plan on 10th July 2010. The consultation period was held between 18th October 2010 and 29th November 2011 during which time the residents were notified and invited to a public exhibition held on 3rd November 2010. A second period of consultation was held to invite views on the Cumberland Basin extension and Barracks Heritage audit, from 14th March to 25 April 2011, with a public exhibition on 12 April 2011. The document was revised to reflect the consultation responses and a further period of consultation was undertaken for 6 weeks regarding the proposed extension to include Cumberland Basin. The Appraisal and Management Plan was adopted at the committee held on 11 July 2011.

There is opportunity for further community involvement with the management of the conservation area through the activities of the CAAC and through the planning process. The Appraisal and Management Plan are subject to periodic review.

The new planning system will encourage more community involvement in the planning process. Guidance is to be enshrined in the LDF and as foreseen in the heritage protection reform that failed to find parliamentary time in 2009.

Boundary review
As part of the Appraisal the boundary was reviewed.

As part of the 2010/2011 review of the conservation area the Regent's Park Barracks was considered for inclusion within the conservation area and this extension was agreed 11 July 2011. The Barracks form part of Nash's Regent's Park design and comprise a collection of Regency Barracks buildings and some modern additions. A comparison of the 1894 Ordnance Survey with the current plan suggests that much of the original barracks layout survives. The officer's mess is listed.

The buildings within the Barracks affect the setting of the current conservation area particularly on Albany Street; also they are clearly visible between the houses on Park Village East and Park Village West.

A further extension was also considered appropriate to the south east of the Regents Park Barracks, comprising the Cumberland Basin and Cumberland Market Estate. The area proposed for inclusion in the Regents Park Conservation Area is shown on the extension Map. Designation of the area protects the area showing historical continuity with, and spatial reference to, the original John Nash scheme.

The area contains significant physical survival of the canal and its basin, historic elements of the original built Nash scheme. It is also clear that these have largely determined the present overall plan form of this area. These physical survivals include the physical structure of the basin, now filled in, but still surviving as the ‘container’ of the allotment gardens. These elements were, historically and spatially, component elements of the larger built Nash scheme.

One of the reasons for the importance of Nash’s Regent's Park was its integration of all the elements of a living area, from the aristocrat to the worker, from the decorative to the utilitarian, in a single coherent scheme. The canal arm and its basin were the transport hub which enabled the markets supplying food for the area, hay for the horses, and sending back manure to the market gardens north of London (see the history appended to the Appraisal draft). That the physical survivals of the canal form a clear continuity with the remainder of the designated conservation area is also evident from the historic maps included in the Appendix of this appraisal.

it is clear that the spatial relationships between the later Council owned buildings on the east side of the basin have followed the historic fabric of the canal and basin, suggesting that, although transformed from a basin filled with water to a planted green space, the spatial relationships have been retained and are reflected in the planning of the later buildings.

The Cumberland Market Estate was built by the Crown Estate (the Crown Lands Commissioners) in the late 1920s and early 1930s as a precursor to, and early example of, affordable social housing for local workers and war
veterans. The architecture of the estates is considered exemplary in terms of pre-war modern urban design.

When the Canal was drained during the Second World War, the Cumberland Basin itself was filled and covered with topsoil. It became the base of the Crown Tenants’ Horticultural Society, who turned the basin into allotments as part of the ‘Dig for Victory’ campaign, and who continue to operate the land as allotments and a much appreciated aesthetic and green space to this day. It is one of the oldest, longest running and largest collection of horticultural allotments in London.
8 Summary of Issues

This is a unique area of national and international importance, managed and controlled by several disparate bodies, including the Crown Estate, the Crown Estate Paving Commission and Westminster City Council. Co-operation is the key to successful management.

Public realm
The street trees and established front gardens enhance the public spaces. Management and replanting of a mature landscape is essential in public and private spaces.

Outside the area
The quality of Regent's Park may be under threat from tall buildings.
Part 2

Regent’s Park Management Strategy
Regent’s Park Management Strategy

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

English Heritage *Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas* advises that following an appraisal of the Conservation Area, a strategy for its management in the mid to long term should be developed to address issues identified through the appraisal.

The Character Appraisal and this associated Management Strategy seek to provide a clear basis for the assessment of proposals and identify an approach to addressing issues that have the potential to impact on the special interest of Regent’s Park Conservation Area.

The aims of the Management Strategy are to:

- inform interested parties of how the Council intends to secure the preservation and/or enhancement of the Conservation Area;
- set out an approach to consultation on the management of the Conservation Area;
- confirm how issues identified through the character appraisal will be tackled;
- identify specific policy or design guidance that is relevant to the Conservation Area to support the development control function and those preparing applications for planning permission, listed building consent and Conservation Area consent;
- identify areas where the overview provided by the Conservation Area Appraisal suggests that site-specific Development Brief would assist the management of the Conservation Area and decision-making processes;
- identify areas that may benefit from specific enhancement proposals should funding become available; and,
- identify the management tools available to the Council through legislation.
1.2 Policy and Legislation

The government has introduced a new planning system in which the focus is on flexibility, sustainability, strengthened community and stakeholder involvement. Under the new system Camden was required to produce a Local Development Framework (LDF), adopted 2010.

The LDF comprises the London Borough of Camden Planning policies:

- Development Plan Documents (DPDs): the key document of this type is the core strategy which will outline broad strategy for conservation

- Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) that provide further detail and guidance on policies and proposals included in the DPD, and can supplement higher level policy in controlling erosion of the special interest that warrants designation

- Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy are to be adopted and will support the SPD. They will be a material consideration in Planning and Conservation Area Consent applications.

The management of Regent’s Park Conservation Area is unique; responsibilities fall on the Crown Estate, the Crown Estate Paving Commission and the Royal Parks Agency. Many buildings and features are listed Grade I and II* and applications will be referred to English Heritage. Regent’s Park is within a conservation area on either side of the boundary between City of Westminster and London Borough of Camden.

**The Crown Estate** manages the Regent’s Park on behalf of the government’s Department of Culture Media and Sport. The Crown owns the freehold of all the buildings in and around Regent's Park with the exception of London Zoo. The Crown Estate has prepared Management Guidelines and Standard Specifications for repair and conservation and they monitor works.

The Crown Estate area covers almost the whole of the conservation area excluding some of the area to the east of Albany Street around Redhill Road, Longford Road and the central area of Park Village West. The Cumberland Market Estate passed from the Crown Estate into the ownership of Peabody Housing Trust on 28 February 2011.

**The Crown Estate Paving Commission (CEPC)** was established in 1813 and is a separate body from the Crown Estate. It maintains the terrace gardens (Ornamental Enclosures), the railings around them and the terrace access roads and pavements. The CEPC is responsible for the provision and maintenance of street lighting and street furniture in Regent's Park. It also maintains the roadways in York Gate, Chester Gate, Park Square East and
West and pavements all around the outside of the Outer Circle. Its other functions include the regulation of parking in the private roadways, the collection of domestic refuse, patrolling the estate and the opening and shutting of park gates. The CEPC has the power to regulate and prevent the placement of signage (including estate agents boards, notice boards, advertisements and decorated hoardings) and has the power to require that the stucco work of properties is carried out in accordance with current practice and colour.

The Royal Parks Agency is responsible for Regent's Park and the Inner Circle roadway. The public park is managed by The Royal Parks, a government executive agency answerable to the secretary of state of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport who manages the parks under powers set out in section 22 of The Crown Lands 1851 Act, which transferred management of the parks from the monarch to the government.

The Royal Parks is responsible for preserving and enhancing the landscape, providing a range of sporting and leisure activities and arranging an entertainment programme. Responsibilities include the maintenance of the Outer Circle and connecting roads at Hanover Gate and North Gate (Macclesfield Bridge). It works with the CEPC to manage traffic within the park. Law and order are maintained through the operational command unit of the Metropolitan Police.
2 Monitoring and review

Monitoring
The Council will monitor listed buildings within Regent’s Park to determine whether further action is necessary to safeguard their architectural and historic interest.

Review
The Council is required to undertake periodic review of the Regent’s Park Conservation Area to ensure that its special interest is being maintained and protected to re-evaluate boundaries and see whether there are areas which justify inclusion or whether there are areas which have deteriorated to such an extent that their special interest has been lost.

As part of the review process the Council will:

• undertake a visual appraisal;
• maintain a searchable photographic record of listed buildings within the area on the Council website, ensuring that this is updated as new buildings are added;
• record the character of streets and areas;
• maintain and update a record of other aspects of interest within the Conservation Area including any buildings of merit and the historic fabric of the public realm; and
• consider current issues impacting on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

As part of the Conservation Area Appraisal, the following have been reviewed: current issues, conservation area boundaries, positive contributors to the conservation area, negative elements, buildings of merit and elements of streetscape interest.

At present the only way of monitoring change is to interpret the existing statement and from anecdotal evidence. In the future it is a recommendation of this Strategy that a photographic record will provide a visual benchmark for review.

Since the writing of the last Statement in 2002 the following points may be noted:

• The general trend in the area is towards prosperity; buildings are being maintained and altered, including examples of exemplary restoration of original features. Nonetheless, unsympathetic alterations and loss of detail are still occurring.
• Mature trees add greatly to the character of the area. The trees are protected by conservation area designation. Many trees are in private gardens and incremental careful replacement is encouraged in the future, as these trees add greatly to the quality to the street scene and the sense of the country in the city.

• The general state of the roadways and pavements is in excellent condition under the CEPC; there is a stark contrast at the edges of the conservation area where clutter and excess signage appears to be increasing.

• Tall buildings at the perimeter of the Park have introduced an overbearing effect behind the trees and the terraces, particularly at the southern end of the Park.

• Pressure for intensifying residential development is resulting in development on green space, in particular in the gardens around St Katherine’s on both Albany Street and the park side.

• Basement extensions have been built under gardens resulting in changes to the landscape and setting of the buildings

• Some alterations have been made to rear elevation windows, changing window types, and adding small roof terraces

• Privacy screens have been added behind railings (rather than hedging or shrubs)

The recommendation is for a regular and quantifiable mechanism to monitor change that will be effective at the next review. This could include a review of the planning and enforcement records and comparison with a photographic record.

Photographic record

In order to monitor and evaluate change in the Area effectively, a photographic street survey is proposed. This would have the benefit of:

• capturing a moment in time to support the Appraisal
• providing the means to review the state of the area accurately and periodically
• being a potentially useful tool in enforcement action
• being a useful public resource
This could be undertaken as a community project, possibly within a format provided by the Council. It would identify key features, buildings considered to be of positive, neutral and negative value.

Future review

The Council has a duty to review the condition of its conservation areas periodically. The next review is anticipated in five years from the adoption of this Appraisal and Management Strategy.

This may involve the designation of new conservation areas, the de-designation of areas that have lost their special character or changes to the boundaries of existing conservation areas. At that time the Regent’s Park Character Appraisal and Management Strategy will be reviewed in the light of changes to the area.
3 Maintaining Character

General Approach

The following approach to maintaining the special interest of the Regent’s Park Conservation Area will be adopted as part of the strategy for its effective management:

- the Regent’s Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy will be the subject of public consultation and will be periodically reviewed to ensure that these documents remain sufficiently current to enable effective management and decision-making on new development within the area;

- the list of buildings and other features which, in addition to those already included on the statutory list, positively contribute to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, will be kept under review to aid decision-making and the preparation of proposals;

- applications for development will be determined having regard to the special interest of the Conservation Area and the specialist advice of conservation officers and consultation with the Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee;

- in accordance with the relevant legislation most applications for development within the Conservation Area are required to include a Design and Access Statement. This will be required to adequately explain the design approach and context of the proposals and be accompanied by sufficient, accurate drawings of the existing site, its context as well as the proposed development;

- where relevant and possible further supplementary planning documents including design guidance and planning briefs will be produced in consultation with the Crown Estate;

- where relevant, regard will be had for Crown Estate publications and guidelines. These are requirements enforced by the Crown and Camden Council policies. Crown Estate publications will be available online in the future, in the meantime they can be accessed from:

  Freedom of Information Officer
  The Crown Estate
  16 New Burlington Place
  London W1S 2HX

- in undertaking its development control function the Council will ensure that that the historic grain, patterns, forms, and details which are an essential part of the special architectural character of Regent’s Park Conservation Area are preserved, repaired and reinstated where appropriate;

- in undertaking the development control function the Council will consider the impact of proposals on neighbouring boroughs, and in
particular on the City of Westminster’s Regent’s Park Conservation Area.

- the Council will seek to ensure that the departments responsible for the environment (highways/landscape/planning/conservation and urban design) work in an effective, co-ordinated and consultative manner to ensure that historic interest within the public realm is maintained and enhanced where appropriate; and,

- the Council will continue to consult the Conservation Area Advisory Committees and local amenity societies on applications which may impact on the special interest of the Regent’s Park Conservation Area and seek their input in relation to ongoing management issues.
4 Recommendations for action

4.1 Continue to promote co-operation between the key stakeholders – the Crown Estate, Royal Parks, Crown Estate Paving Commission, Westminster City Council, Camden Council, local residents and Regents Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

4.2 Prepare enhancement proposals for Albany Street including street enhancement.

4.4 Encourage enhancement proposals for the improvement of the Zoo car park area.

4.5 Continue to promote reinstatement of missing features and rectifying alterations, taking care of the rears as well as fronts of the terraces.

4.6 Improve streetscape at the exits from the area, in particular at the Gloucester Gate.

4.7 Initiate and maintain a photographic record of each street to enable effective review and monitoring, and a public record of the condition of the area.
5 Boundary Changes

5.1 As part of the 2010/2011 review of the Conservation Area the boundary was reviewed. Regents Park Barracks and the Cumberland Basin site were included within the conservation area designation on 11 July 2011. The maps were also clarified to show that the boundary as it runs along Park Village East extends to the far eastern side of the highway. No further revisions of the boundary are considered necessary at this stage.
6 Current issues

6.1 Summary of issues
The area is uniquely protected and managed by a number of different bodies with varying responsibilities. Careful stewardship and co-operation between these various bodies is of paramount importance in ensuring that an appropriately informed balance can be taken between conservation and potential change.

6.2 Maintaining special character
Details and features tend to have a distinctive character on buildings originally developed in groups or terraces. The individual group details should be retained and enhanced on a project by project basis, taking into considering the following guidance and with reference to the Crown Estate Maintenance Guide:

Doors and windows should be restored to original glazing material and configuration where they have been replaced in the past. Typically windows are wooden sliding sashes with slim glazing bars, crown glass and shutters.

Paths and boundary walls/hedges and other details characteristic of the street should be reinstated to the original design. Typically these are Portland stone steps, cast iron railings, painted house numbers, original ironmongery.

Roof materials are Welsh slate or clay tiled on the Cumberland Market Estate, dormers are lead covered or grey painted.

Aerials and satellite dishes should be hidden; never located on the front elevation and not usually on the rear elevation where this is detrimental to the listed buildings or the views of and between listed buildings or buildings which make a positive contribution to the conservation area.

Extensions to front or side roof slopes are likely to break the important, regular composition of the roof lines and so harm the appearance of the conservation area.

Infilling of front basement areas will normally be resisted in order to preserve the original plan form and setting of the building.

Unpainted stock brickwork should not be painted in the mews, or elsewhere. Decoration in the mews should follow the Crown Estate guidelines, with painted rendered reveals, white painted first floor joinery, black painted cast iron rainwater and other pipes.

Painting of the stucco and flashings follows the Quadrennial maintenance programme by the Crown Estate in Crown Cream paint.
Security cameras and security alarm boxes are subject to consent and should be unobtrusive or out of sight. Metal security grilles are not appropriate.

Pressure on removal of boundary walls and the use of gardens for parking, and the paving over of soft landscape will be resisted.

Pressure for upgrading of energy efficiency will be balanced against the effect upon or loss of historic and architectural character.

6.3 Enhancement schemes for the public realm

New buildings
There is little scope for new buildings in the area; however, new work should reflect the character, scale, building lines, materials and colour palette of the area or sub-area.

Streetscape
Where historic paving materials exist these should be retained and maintained. Redhill Street, in particular, has well a preserved granite setted surface which provides a high quality and traditional setting for the surrounding buildings. However, repairs have not always been undertaken sympathetically, leaving a patched surface in some places. Care should be taken to reinstate matching setts when works are undertaken, and to ensure that joints are narrow, and mortar is recessed in to the joint and does not overlap the top surface.

Development or design briefs
Further work to design approaches to work in the following areas is recommended, in consultation with the other key stakeholders in the area:

- public realm (surfaces and design) for Albany Street
- enhancement of the Zoo car park could integrate the hard surfaced area into the Park more sympathetically.
- Gloucester Gate gateway
- de-cluttering the street scene at the entrances to the area should be a priority while maintaining safe pedestrian movement.
- co-ordinated approaches are needed to retain the skyline above the terraces and in views from the park; past construction of tall buildings is not necessarily a guide to the future development.
6.4 Economic and regeneration strategy – grants and investment

English Heritage and the Heritage Lottery Fund run grant schemes for historic areas in partnership with local authorities. There are currently no such schemes proposed or considered for Regent’s Park.

English Heritage has undertaken research – *the Heritage Dividend* – that shows that public and private investment into conservation areas brings financial rewards as well as environmental and social benefits. More information is available on its web site.
7. Management of Change - Application of policy guidance

7.1 Quality of Applications

All applications for planning permission and conservation area consent must contain sufficient information to describe the effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Design and Access Statements accompanying applications will be expected to specifically address the particular characteristics identified in the appraisal, including the scale and character of the repeated terraced forms and the prevailing scale, mass, roof line and rhythm created by the historic pattern of development.

The level of required information may be ascertained by viewing the Council’s planning webpages or referring to Development Management Policy Annex on Information Requirements (2010) and associated Guidance on Information Requirements and Validation (2010). Both of these documents are available on the Communities and Local Government website.

7.2 Guidance

Control over new development

PPS5 and the Council’s Local Development Framework contains policies which seek to secure appropriate new development pertaining to and within the setting of heritage assets.

Development proposals should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Regent’s Park Conservation Area and that of the neighbouring Regent’s Park Conservation Area within the City of Westminster. This requirement applies equally to developments which are outside the conservation area but which would affect its setting or views into or out of the area. High quality design and high quality execution will be required of all new development at all scales.

The appearance of all buildings of architectural or historic interest (listed and unlisted) within the conservation area can be harmed by the removal or loss of original architectural features and the use of inappropriate materials. For example, the loss of original joinery, sash windows, porches and front doors can have considerable negative impact on the appearance of a historic building and the wider area. Insensitive re-pointing and inappropriate painting or render will harm the appearance and the long-term durability of historic brickwork.

In all cases the Council will expect original architectural features and detailing to be retained, protected, refurbished in the appropriate manner, and only replaced where it can be demonstrated that they are beyond repair.
Demolition

The total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building within a conservation area requires consent. New development, involving the demolition of buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area will be resisted by the Council (policy DP25 of the LDF).

PPS5 makes clear a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets. The thrust of PPS5 is that the level of significance of designated and undesignated heritage assets (including their setting) is key to the management and protection of the historic environment. Based on an assessment and understanding of the heritage assets, the extent of significance and the potential impact of development proposals is proportionate to relative importance. Policies HE 9.2 and HE 9.5 of PPS5 should be taken into consideration when justifying proposals for the demolition of buildings within the conservation area.

Conservation Area Consent is required for the demolition of garden walls that are over 1m in height fronting the highway, and 2m elsewhere. The demolition of original boundary walls will be resisted.

The Council will seek the retention of buildings which are considered to make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Where buildings are not identified as making a positive contribution, consent for demolition will not be granted unless a scheme for redevelopment is submitted which preserves or enhances the conservation area.

All applications for works of demolition within the conservation area should show clearly the extent of demolition proposed including partial demolition and garden walls.

Car parking crossovers

Reinstatement of front gardens and typical local boundaries (for example hedges or walls) is encouraged where cross-over parking has been implemented in the past.

In addition to where Conservation Area Consent is required, approval for a crossover is also required from the Council’s Highways Department. Hard standings to the front of buildings are only permitted development (development not requiring planning permission) where they are less than 5 square metres in area. Hard standings to the front of buildings that are over 5 square metres are only permitted development where they are constructed of porous materials or provision is made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwelling house.
Listed buildings

To see the location of listed buildings within the conservation area please refer to the Townscape map. To access their listing descriptions and for advice on listed building matters, visit www.camden.gov.uk/listedbuildings or www.english-heritage.org.uk.

Sub-division of houses

The intensive sub-division of houses that were originally constructed for single family occupation can have significant detrimental impact on the appearance of the CA through external alterations, extensions and possible demand for additional car parking spaces.

The creation of additional units in the roof space or through the excavation of a basement area will not therefore normally be acceptable where it is demonstrated that such works would cause harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Basements

Regent’s Park Conservation Area contains residential properties set in large gardens with an abundance of trees. In recent years, conservation areas in Camden have seen a proliferation of basement developments and extensions to existing basement accommodation, together with excavation of associated lightwells. The Council will resist this type of development where it is considered to harm the character or appearance of the conservation area.

The creation of new lightwells can harm the relationship between the building and the wider streetscape, as well as resulting in the loss of garden space. Railings around lightwells can cause a cluttered appearance to the front of the property. The inclusion of rooflights designed within the landscaping of a front garden can result in light spill from these subterranean rooms and harm the character of a building’s garden setting.

Where there are trees on or adjacent to the site, including any street trees, an arboricultural report will be required with the submission of a planning application.

When considering applications for basement extensions within the conservation area, the Council will need to be satisfied that effective measures will be taken during demolition and construction works to ensure the stability of the building and neighbouring properties.

A recent planning permission approved a basement extension to Cambridge Terrace which extends from the building under the open space to the Outer Circle. This work comprises 50% of the open space being excavated and reinstated with a new open space design in terms of planting and layout. Within all of this a large existing lime will be retained as a feature of the
existing landscape structure. Future pressure on these spaces from basement development will need to ensure that the landscaping in front of the terraces is preserved or reinstated. These will not be allowed where they would affect large mature trees.

To check whether planning permission is required for basement works, please visit the Council’s website at www.camden.gov.uk/planning and refer to the Council’s New Basement Development and Extensions to Basement Accommodation Guidance Note (February 2009). Alternatively, please contact the Council’s Duty Planner on tel 020 7974 5613.

**Estate agents’ boards**

A profusion of boards can have a detrimental impact upon the conservation area in terms of visual clutter. Only one advertisement, of specified dimensions and height, per property to be sold or let has been deemed consent under the Regulations. Applications for consent to exceed the deemed consent level will usually be refused in Camden. The Council will, where appropriate, use its powers to prosecute agents who display boards illegally.

**Front garden spaces**

Where refuse bin stores are considered necessary, these should be located within rear garden spaces if at all possible. If location within the front garden area is the only possible solution, great care should be taken to ensure that the store is located sensitively. This would include concealment by existing boundary walls and planting, the use of sensitive materials and siting away from the main frontage of the building.

**Rear garden spaces**

Development which results in the loss of private open spaces is unlikely to be acceptable due to the positive contribution of these spaces to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Particular care should be taken when considering development within rear gardens in prominent positions, for example those on corner sites, where the visual impact of a proposal may be greater.

**Alterations to roofs and dormers**

Proposals for alterations to roofs within the conservation area will be considered on their own merit. Particular care is needed to ensure sensitive and unobtrusive design to visible roof slopes or where roofs are prominent in long distance views.
Raising the roof ridge and the steepening of the roof pitch to the front, side or rear slopes is unlikely to be acceptable. Most buildings will also be subject to listed building consent and consent from Crown Estate. Dormer windows may be allowed at the rear, subject to advice contained within Camden Planning Guidance (CPG). Recessed roof terraces may be allowed to the rear roof slope in line with CPG so long as it does not detrimentally affect or clutter the quality of the building or be to the detriment of longer views of the building.

Conversion of roofspace will not be permitted if this involves the formation of a separate unit. Generally, such a conversion will only be allowed if it is in conjunction with the flat or house below, providing additional habitable floorspace for that lower unit. Notwithstanding this, where the proposal is for the conversion of the whole house, the Council will still expect family flats to be provided with direct garden access wherever possible.

Roof lights may be considered acceptable if fitted flush with the roof and significantly subordinate to the roof itself (conservation roof lights). The individual merits of each proposal will be considered in relation to their impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. Roof lights in highly visible/dominant positions such as turrets and the roofs of window bays will be resisted.
7.3 Enforcement Strategy

The Council has adopted an Enforcement Policy for handling complaints regarding unauthorised development and will investigate, and where necessary, take enforcement action against unauthorised works and changes of use. In operating that policy special attention will be given to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Regent’s Park Conservation Area.

Guidance regarding enforcement issues can be found in *PPG18: Enforcing Planning Control* and *Circular 10/97: Enforcing Planning Control: Legislative Provision and Procedural Requirements* (published by DETR). Also see *PPS5*.

The Planning Appeals and Enforcement Team can be contacted online, at the website: [www.camden.gov.uk/planning](http://www.camden.gov.uk/planning)

Enforcement action is costly and time consuming to both the Council and to the property owner, and is best avoided through applying good practice and seeking advice from the Council about necessary permissions prior to carrying out work.
7.4 Article 4 Directions

Some works to dwelling houses are permitted development and do not require planning permission. These permitted development rights are restricted within conservation areas. However, this is not always sufficient to protect the area’s special interest. An Article 4 direction restricts the range of works that it is possible to undertaken without planning permission.

English Heritage defined the usefulness of Article 4 Directions in the Heritage at Risk Report 2009:

‘Article 4 directions are well-established tools that enable local planning authorities to manage change in conservation areas that otherwise would be harmful to their special character. They are particularly effective when used as part of a well-considered management plan supported by guidance to local owners

Article 4 directions are justified when there is firm evidence that permitted development is damaging the character or appearance of a conservation area, or is likely to. An Article 4 direction is therefore a targeted response to specific types of alterations and changes that cumulatively can undermine local character. When used in conjunction with design guidance they can provide clarity and certainty for owners when they are considering proposals for change.’

Further advice on Permitted Development is available from Camden Planning Advice and Information Team on 020 7974 5613 or the Planning Portal www.planningportal.gov.uk

Article 4 Directions are not currently considered necessary in the Regent’s Park conservation area. This will be reviewed at the next review.
7.5 Heritage at Risk

English Heritage maintains a register of listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments which are known to English Heritage to be at risk, though neglect or decay or are vulnerable to becoming so. Within Regent’s Park Conservation Area only one building, St George’s Cathedral, Redhill Street, is identified as being at risk due to its deteriorating condition. It is to be added to the 2011 Heritage at Risk Register.

English Heritage launched a Conservation Areas at Risk Campaign in 2009 which aims to identify the causes of decay and threat to conservation areas nationally. The first report in 2009 showed that the main risk to conservation areas is incremental loss of original features which cumulatively strips the area of its architectural quality and special characteristics. It found that 1 in 7 conservation areas across the country are classified at risk from ‘neglect, decay or unsympathetic change’. Regent’s Park Conservation Area was not identified to be at risk.
7.6 Trees, green spaces and biodiversity strategy

The landscape and buildings are part of one composition and are of equal importance in the character of the area. As stated above, the Royal Parks Agency, the Crown Estates Paving Commission, the council and private individuals have responsibility for the upkeep of parts of the landscape. The trees in the park and the terrace gardens make a significant impact on how the area appears today.

Gardens and front boundary treatment

Front and rear gardens within the residential streets make an important contribution to the streetscape and character of the residential area. The Council will resist the loss of soft landscaping and original boundary walls and railings, as well as the loss of gardens through basement developments.

Trees and open spaces

The street trees in the residential areas are a valuable part of the streetscape and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. General advice on street trees may be found at www.camden.gov.uk/streetscape or contact the Royal Parks Agency for the public park, and the Crown Estates Paving Commission for the private shared spaces.

Many trees within the conservation area have statutory protection through tree preservation orders (TPOs). Additionally any tree within the conservation area over 75mm diameter that is not covered by a TPO is still protected and anyone proposing to cut down, top or lop a tree is required to give six weeks notice to the Council.

Camden’s Tree Officers within the Regeneration and Planning Service can advise on all aspects of trees on private property within the Regent’s Park Conservation Area.

The Council’s free publication ‘A Guide to Trees in Camden’ contains information on the benefits of trees and the law relating to trees in conservation areas. email env.devcon@camden.gov.uk

If building or excavation works are proposed to a property in the Conservation Area, consideration should also be given to the existence of trees on or adjacent to a site, including street trees and the required root protection zones of these trees. Where there are trees on or adjacent to the site, including any street trees, an arboriculture report will be required with the submission of a planning application. This should provide a statement in relation to the measures to be adopted during construction works to protect any trees on or adjoining the site and justification for any trees to be felled. Further guidance
The street trees of Regent’s Park add greatly to the character of the area. Damage to pavements is sometimes caused by root growth, and the canopies need periodically to be pruned. This is a matter of on-going monitoring and maintenance in order to preserve the leafy character.

As trees die, replacement with varieties that encourage biodiversity, adaptability to climate change and less root damage is to be encouraged while maintaining the overall character and historic planting schemes.

All new development should have a high standard of external space which should respect the character of the conservation area.

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) makes special provision for trees in conservation areas which are not the subject of a tree preservation order (TPO). Under section 211 anyone proposing to cut down or carry out work on a tree in a conservation area is required to give the local planning authority (LPA) six weeks prior notice. The purpose of this requirement is to give the LPA an opportunity to consider whether a TPO should be made in respect of the trees. In the case of trees covered by a TPO, a standard form must be submitted to the LPA. Anyone who cuts down, uproots, lops, tops wilfully destroys or wilfully damages a tree in a conservation area or covered by a TPO without prior Council consent is guilty of an offence and if convicted in a Magistrate’s Court could be liable for a fine. Please contact the Tree and Landscape Team for more information on 020 7974 5616.

The Council would generally resist the removal of trees within the conservation area unless they were dead/dying/dangerous, causing damage to buildings or not considered to be of visual or wildlife importance. The unsympathetic pruning of trees would also be resisted. Trees that form part of the landscape of any part of the Park should be sensitively and minimally pruned to conserve the natural appearance of the canopy silhouette, whilst allowing some flexibility to reduce trees to allow important views through the park and estate to be retained.

Where tree works are required in order to mitigate the effects of perceived subsidence, supporting evidence to demonstrate the tree’s involvement is required with any application.
8 \textbf{Consideration of resources to sustain the historic environment}

London Borough of Camden has conservation officers and landscape officers who support the aims of the designation of the area and give advice and assistance to the public.

Camden has a Heritage Champion to promote heritage issues.

The Conservation Area Advisory Committee is run on a voluntary basis and receives no funding from the Council.

The Crown Estate, the Royal Parks and The Crown Estates Paving Commission all provide advice regarding the Crown Estate property.

Owing to the large number of buildings listed Grade I and II*, English Heritage will be involved in many applications for works to properties and strategic issues.
9 Procedures to ensure consistent decision making

The Council requires high quality applications for works in the conservation area, and therefore applicants need to:

1. ascertain where planning permission or conservation area consent is required for alteration and demolition
2. ascertain what is significant about the space/feature/building
3. understand the relevant policies and guidance
4. show what effect the proposal will have on the space/feature/building – this may require an historic environment impact assessment
5. illustrate the effect of the proposals on the local context – this may entail perspectives or visually verifiable montages

The Council has strict procedures to ensure that applications will only be validated where there is sufficient information to assess the proposals.

It is recommended that applicants view the guidance information on the website, and consult the conservation officer and duty planner prior to application.

Planning applications will be determined in accordance with local guidance (Camden’s Planning Guidance and the Conservation Area Appraisal) local policy (the Local Development Framework), The London Plan and PPS5.

Other guidance, for instance that published by English Heritage on listed buildings and conservation areas, will also be taken into account.
10 Community involvement

Community involvement is encouraged in order to:

- promote ‘ownership’ of the Character Appraisal and Management Strategy by both the local community and the Council in order to achieve incremental improvements

- support the Sustainable Community Strategies and Local Area Agreements within the draft LDF to promote satisfaction with the local area and increased civic participation in the decisions affecting conservation areas

‘Conservation Area designation is about recognising the significance of an area and what gives its special character. Designation is not intended to prevent change but to make sure that the effects on what people value about a place are properly considered.’

English Heritage.

Camden has a statutory duty to publish proposals for the enhancement of the Conservation Area.

Local residents are already involved in the Regent’s Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee. This group considers planning and conservation area consent applications and brings issues affecting the conservation area to the Council’s attention.

If you wish to become involved or find out more please contact the CAAC c/o Camden Councils Regeneration and Planning Service.

English Heritage launched a campaign called Conservation Areas at Risk in 2009 to support the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas and it provides a campaign pack of information on request. To find out more see www.English-Heritage.org.uk
11 Guidance

Information


A range of information is available on the Council’s website to assist businesses, occupiers and developers in making applications that will meet the objective of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

*Regent’s Park Estate Property Maintenance Guide*, the Crown Estate

Protocol for the Care of the Government Historic Estate, 2003, DCMS

*Standard Specifications*, the Crown Estate

London Borough of Camden ‘*A Guide to Trees in Camden*’ contains information on the benefits of trees and the law relating to trees in conservation areas.

London Borough of Camden ‘Your Camden’ is an internet magazine for the borough.

English Heritage has many useful publications, all available on their web site including:

- *Heritage at Risk*
- *Streets For All*

There is a wealth of further information provided by English Heritage, the Georgian Group, the Victorian Society, Twentieth Century Society and The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) and other conservation organisations. The Planning portal is also useful for general planning issues. Contacts are listed below.
Contacts

Camden Council
Regeneration and Planning
Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London
WC1H 8ND

tel 020 7278 4444
www.camden.gov.uk
email env.devcon.camden.gov.uk

The Crown Estate
16 New Burlington Place
London
W1S 2HX
tel 020 7210 4398
www.thecrownestate.co.uk

Cluttons  Managing agents for Regent’s Park
Portman House
2 Portman Street
London
W1H 6DU

Crown Estate Paving Commission
12 Park Square East,
Regent’s Park, London
NW1 4LH

tel 020 7278 4444
www.camden.gov.uk
email urban.design@camden.gov.uk

English Heritage (including the Government Historic Estates Unit)
London office
1 Waterhouse Square
138-142 Holborn
London
EC1N 2ST

tel 020 7973 3000
web www.english-heritage.org.uk
email london@english-heritage.org.uk
The Georgian Group
6 Fitzroy Square
London
W1T 5DX

tel 087 1750 2936
web www.georgiangroup.org.uk
email info@georgiangroup.org.uk

Victorian Society
1 Priory Gardens
LONDON
W4 1TT

tel 020 8994 1019
web www.victoriansociety.org.uk
email Admin@victoriansociety.org.uk

Twentieth Century Society
79 Cowcross Street
London
EC1M 6EJ

tel 020 7250 3857
web www.c20society.org.uk
email caseworker@c20society.org.uk

The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
37 Spital Square
London
E1 6DY

tel 020 7377 1644
web www.spab.org.uk
email info@spab.org.uk

Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
Design Council
34 Bow Street
London WC2E 7DL
United Kingdom

Tel: +44(0)20 7420 5200
web www.designcouncil.org.uk
Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee
See Camden's CINDEX for contact details

The Planning Portal
Web www.planningportal.gov.uk
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‘Regent’s Park: a history’, Richard Simpson FSA, 2001 – reproduced in Appendix, below
The land which includes today’s Regent’s Park is recorded in the Domesday Book (1086) as held by the Abbess of Barking. It became part of the royal estate in 1538-39 during the dissolution of the monasteries, when the area of the Park was taken over by Henry VIII to create a hunting forest at a convenient distance from Whitehall. Known as Marylebone Park, the land has continued as part of the crown’s property, although the wooded character changed to farmland after the Civil War (1642-49), when the timber was used to build ships for the Navy or to pay off debts.

In 1756, the ‘New Road’, now Euston and Marylebone Roads, was built across the south of Marylebone Park. Still well to the north of the built-up part of the West End, the Park was largely let as farms which provided hay for the horses of London, and dairy produce for its people. But following the transfer to parliament of the revenue from crown land after the accession of George III in 1760, the whole estate was reviewed. An important consideration was the spread of the estate of the Duke of Portland – who also leased Marylebone Park from the crown – from the south toward the New Road. In about 1774 a scheme for the building of Portland Place, which brought terraces of houses to the southern boundary of the Park, was begun, with the active involvement of the architects Robert and James Adams.1

In 1793 John Fordyce was appointed Surveyor General to His Majesty’s Land Revenues and began to plan to increase revenues from the crown’s land by residential development. In his first year he organized a full survey of the estate.2 The survey was printed in 1797, with the announcement of an architectural competition to find the best plan for the development of Marylebone Park. The only entry was by John White, a resident in the Park. But although White was also the Duke of Portland’s surveyor, his plan broke away from the pattern of terraces on streets and squares characteristic of the aristocratic estates south of the New Road, and proposed to maintain a large open area, with a landscaped park encircled by villas, and including a grand crescent of houses, a church, and a market.

Fordyce responded to the lack of interest in the architectural competition by setting out, in 1809, to enhance the development value of Marylebone Park by proposing a more comprehensive approach to the planning of the area. He suggested a link – the later Regent Street to Trafalgar Square axis – to the centre of government at Westminster and Whitehall, which included another site for Crown development, Carlton House. Within the Park he sought to provide for water supply, sewerage, and street-lighting; like White, Fordyce envisaged local markets and an important church which should ‘do credit ... to the Country’.3

No plan could be implemented by the crown until the Duke of Portland’s lease came to an end in 1811, so in 1810, and as another result of the failure of the

---


2 The following history from 1793 to 1811 is based on the *First Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty’s Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues* (London 1812) pp. 9-13 and Appendix 12, pp. 71-124.

architectural competition, two groups of government architects were asked to prepare plans for a development programme using Fordyce’s 1809 report. One scheme, by Thomas Leverton and Thomas Chawner, broadly proposed to extend a system of squares and terraces on the pattern of the Portland estate across the south of the Park, with large houses on substantial plots to the north, a barracks, a church, and two markets. The other, by John Nash and James Morgan, put forward a scheme with similarities to White’s proposals. Nash sought explicitly to create parkland scenery that would act as ‘inducements to the public’ to move into the new development, with its link to parliament and the Inns of Court, and while the utilitarian areas were to be screened from the park, the residents were to benefit from the ‘immediate supply afforded of the necessaries and luxuries of life, which will be obtained by the commercial canal and markets’. At the same time, the estimates accompanying the projects showed that Nash’s scheme would generate very much more revenue for the Crown than the alternative. Nash won the Commissioner’s approval, and in 1811 George, Prince of Wales, was declared Prince Regent, and supported Nash in a project which he saw competing with the Paris of Napoleon – with whom England had been recently at war.

Nash’s plans of 1811 set out basic elements which were built, and which still survive, although others were altered as the plan was adapted to respond to changes which affected London during the period of construction during the 1820s and 1830s. The overall concept which expressed the range of economic and social functions in an architecturally coherent scheme was retained – from the ‘set piece’ groups of houses and the ‘drives’ for social display, to the service road (Albany Street) with its stables, mews, and markets linked to transportation provided by the canal.

Within this overall scheme, Nash’s designs were developed in detail, and building was undertaken, using the legal mechanism of the building lease, which transferred the cost of development from the landowner to the contracting builder. This process explains the broadly chronological sequence of construction on the eastern side of the Park, as development progressed from the southern boundary with the Portland estate.

The link to Portland Place was to be by a new circus, crossed by the New Road. The southern half, Park Crescent, was built as two arcs from 1819, but to complete the whole Nash squared the circle, and the half to the north of the Road, became Park Square. Park Square East was built in 1823, before the West, and continued the Ionic order used in the Crescent. Within this terrace, and using its central bay for its

---

4 Leverton and Chawner’s scheme, First Report of the Commissioners, Appendix 12 (A), pp. 75-82.

5 Nash to the Commissioners, 29 August 1811, First Report Appendix G, pp. 113-14.

6 Leverton and Chawner’s scheme was estimated to generate annual revenue additional to the return on the existing lease of £17, 819: for Nash and Morgan’s project the equivalent figure was estimated to be £54,243. First Report of the Commissioners, Appendix 12, pp. 72-73.


8 The following account of the building history is largely derived from Michael Mansbridge, John Nash. A complete catalogue (Oxford, 1991), where Nash’s work is listed chronologically.
entrance, A. C. Pugin with James Morgan designed the Diorama in 1823, for James Arrowsmith, brother-in-law of Daguerre, whose Diorama in Paris had opened successfully in 1822. The flank to the south-east, 1-3 Albany Terrace, on Euston Road, is dated 1823-25, also using an Ionic order and setting a pattern followed on the west by Ulster Place. The north-east flank, St Andrew’s Place, of 1823-26, was later matched by Ulster Terrace to the west. The long view down the Outer Circle to the east is closed by a ‘villa’ – in fact two houses, 1-3 St Andrews Place, with a Corinthian portico. The group overall was built by Jacob Smith.

At this point, the sequence of formal groups of houses was interrupted by the Adult Orphan Asylum, later Someries House, by Nash, and built in 1824, and the Colosseum – despite its name derived from the Pantheon in Rome – which was designed by Decimus Burton, and built 1824-27. The Colosseum displayed a painted panorama of London as seen from the dome of St Paul’s cathedral in 1822.

The terraces continued with Nash’s Cambridge Terrace, 1824, using unusual rusticated Doric columns or piers to the front porches, and his Chester Gate (originally Cambridge Place), c. 1825. At Cambridge Terrace, to the south of Chester Gate, and 3 Chester Terrace, on its north side, Nash used incised pilasters derived from Sir John Soane. Both developments were constructed by Richard Mott.

At Chester Terrace (1825) – nearly as long as the Tuileries in Paris, Nash noted⁹ – he used Corinthian columns supporting a plain attic storey with simple pediments to the projecting bays. The building-lease-holder, James Burton, father of Decimus, did not follow Nash’s plan, substituting free-standing north and south pavilions for the proposed wings. Nash’s solution to the architectural problem raised by these blocks was to use the ‘triumphal’ arches which link the pavilions to the main terrace at each end.

At Chester Place, 1825-26, which is visible from the Park but forms a subsidiary group between Chester Terrace and Cumberland Place screening Albany Street from views from the Park, Nash used a Doric order with simple attic storeys at the ends.

Nash designed the four houses at Cumberland Place (1826) to appear from the Park as one large house. At Cumberland Terrace (1826), Nash returned to the Ionic order, but provided attic storeys and a large central triangular pediment with acroteria. This visual elaboration was designed to provide an appropriate view from the royal palace planned for the Park itself, but not built. The service entrance to the mews houses which were directly attached to the rear of the main terrace was integrated into the overall design by a further use of ‘island-blocks’ of building, as at Chester Terrace, although this time pairs of smaller houses were ‘off-set’ from the main terrace to the rear, and linked to it by ‘triumphal’ arches. Both Cumberland Place and Terrace were built by William Mountford Nurse.

North of Cumberland Terrace, a site was provided to accommodate the mediaeval charity, St Katherine’s Hospital. The chapel, the houses in the precinct, and a villa, across the Outer Circle in the park, were designed by a pupil of Nash, Ambrose Poynter, and built 1826-28 in a ‘Tudor-Gothic’ style, and using a light-

---

The predominant feature of the Park was provided by Nash’s own work. The Canal, originally planned for the north of the Park, and intended to make use of the Canal, were built in 1820-21. To the north and east of the Barracks, the Park Villages, were developed by Nash himself as leaseholder from 1823 until 1834. The designs of the ‘picturesque’ villas in their landscape – the Canal here providing water as a visual element in the landscape – have been linked to Nash’s work at Blaise Hamlet in Gloucestershire. The Park Villages were probably completed after Nash’s retirement in 1834 by James Pennethorne, who worked with Nash on their designs from 1832, although other pupils of Nash, like Charles Lee, may also have been involved. Pennethorne was also responsible for Christ Church, Albany Street, built 1836-37. The York and Albany, built 1827, with its adjoining tea garden with south facing arbours, was designed by Nash himself and was the first building to be completed by Nash himself.

The service areas, including Cumberland Market (1819), provided for the essential function of transporting foodstuffs into London, and horse manure out to the farms on the urban periphery and beyond, again using the Regent’s Canal. Clarence Market, by Nash, in 1824, was a vegetable market, and included a nursery garden. The housing in the area, like Augustus Street (1819-26), probably by Nash, provided accommodation for those working in the area.

The external finishes of the buildings in the Park were used by Nash to establish a predominant visual unity within the range of architectural forms. Stucco was to be painted to match Bath stone, woodwork to resemble oak, and ironwork a bronze colour. The only exceptions were Christ Church, Albany Street, and St Katherine’s,

10 Geoffrey Tyacke, Sir James Pennethorne and the making of Victorian London (Cambridge, 1992), p. 34, observes that a ‘Tudor-Gothic’ style was favour ed for churches by the Commissioners.

11 The plan for a cavalry and artillery barracks, its location functionally linked to the Canal, was approved in 1812, First Report of the Commissioners, Appendix 12 (B), pp. 87-88 and 115.

12 Nigel Temple, John Nash and the village picturesque (Gloucester 1979), pp. 44 and 106.


15 Mansbridge, Nash, p. 159.
both in a grey brick, suggesting an attempt to distinguish these from the secular buildings on the estate.

The landscape was always fundamental to Nash’s project. In his first submission, Nash explained that his plan sought that ‘Marylebone Park shall be made to contribute to the healthfulness, beauty and advantage, of that quarter of the Metropolis ...’. The landscape explicitly underpinned the high value of the development, and his initial intentions were taken further by government. In August 1811, he was persuaded by Spencer Perceval, Prime Minister, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and until 1807 a local resident at Belsize House, to reduce the number of buildings and increase the extent of parkland. In accepting Perceval’s request, Nash stated that the buildings ‘when combined with the rural and picturesque scenery of the Park itself, formed by the intermixture of trees, lawns and water, (provided that in the grouping of them a general unity of Parklike character be preserved), as great a variety of beautiful forms, comprehended in one magnificent whole, will be produced, as the mind can conceive.’

Tree planting began in 1811, and the landscape forms were further developed as the project was implemented. The Regent’s Canal formed as essential a component in the Park landscape as it did in the economic functioning of the area. Re-routed to the north boundary of the Park in 1812, Nash saw the canal, its banks planted with low growing evergreens, as a ‘wooded valley, with its water in front and the hills of Hampstead and Highgate behind’. Other views from outside the Park, as well as from within it, were of continuing concern. In 1822 Nash emphasised the importance of views of the Park from the surrounding roads and terraces. In 1832 he commented on the need to ‘control’ the views of the eastern terraces from within the Park, by trees planted in groups. Plans for the gardens adjacent to the terraces allowed for holly hedges, trees, and more varied planting.

The priority to be given to the landscape of the Park was formally endorsed by the Commissioners in 1826, when they reported that the character of the parkland and its associated views were of sufficient importance to lead them to abandon plans for more building:

‘... the carrying into execution, to their full extent, the original plans for occupying so much of the ground, and particularly in the interior of the Park, by building, would so far destroy the scenery, and shut out the many beautiful views towards the villages of Highgate and Hampstead, as to render it very advisable to reduce the number of sites to be appropriated for villas, and also to leave open the

---


18 Nash to Commissioners, 31 August 1812, PRO CREST 6/119 vol 25.

19 Nash to Commissioners, 28 September 1822, PRO CREST/2/751.

20 Mansbridge, Nash, p. 303.
The northern boundary of the estate, formerly intended to be built upon ... [the Treasury] ... have desired that there may not be any extension of buildings northward ... and that no sites be let for villas within the park, in addition to those now built or in progress ... According to this decision ... the ground along the banks of the Regent's Canal, on both sides, will be continued in plantations and shrubberies.21

The character of the Park continued to develop, although the visual priorities set in 1826 were largely maintained to the east of the Broadwalk. To the west, the Zoological Society leased land for a garden with aviaries and stables, with a careful concern for the character of the park: 'Our buildings would for the most part be low'.22 In 1832, the Toxophilite Society were leased land to the south-west for archery, and in 1838, the newly founded Royal Botanic Society of London began to rent land within the Inner Circle for their botanic garden.23

Like the rest of the park, these areas were essentially private, but Nash's original concern that his project should contribute to the health of the metropolis was given a new emphasis, and the park a major new role, when the outbreak of cholera in London in 1832 stimulated action to improve public health through better access to public open space. A Select Committee of the House of Commons set up in 1833 recommended that the whole of Regents Park be opened to the public and Primrose Hill acquired for public use. The Park on the east side was opened to the public in 1835: the rest of the Park and Primrose Hill followed in 1841.24

New access led to changes in the landscape. The Nesfield and English Gardens reflected popular fashion in garden design of the mid-century, as promoted by Prince Albert, while drinking fountains, like the Readymoney fountain of 1865, met a public need.25

In terms of the buildings, the changes which took place during the rest of the nineteenth century and until the Second World War were mainly individual. Only one of the original buildings was lost. The Colosseum was a commercial failure and was demolished, to be replaced by a residential terrace, Cambridge Gate, with its own mews, designed by Archer and Green, in 1875. The Diorama was converted to a Baptist chapel in 1852, and then to a rheumatism clinic in 1921. In 1878 the southern of the pair of lodges at Gloucester Gate was moved to adjoin the northern. A number of changes to individual houses took place, including internal alterations reflecting the domestic design of the Arts and Crafts and modernist movements. But these individual changes also marked a cumulative decline, and in 1947 a government

21 Fifth Report of the Commissioners, 6 May 1826, p. 11.
24 Tyacke, Pennethorne, pp. 88-89: Victoria Park, planned by Pennethorne, followed.
25 Saunders, Regent's Park, p. 120.
committee criticised the management of the crown estate for allowing external alterations to the terraces, and for failing to take adequate responsibility for repairs.  

This decline accelerated during the Second World War, which precipitated significant changes to the buildings of Nash’s project. On the eastern side of the Broad Walk, St Katherine’s villa and the northern half of Cambridge Terrace were destroyed by bombing. 18-20 Park Village East was damaged and demolished in 1941. The Canal had been partly drained to reduce its visibility to enemy bombers and to avoid the danger of flooding, while Cumberland Market, Munster Square and Clarence Gardens suffered war damage. The lack of building materials and craft skills during the war, but also the Crown Estate’s failure to undertake even ‘the most elementary protective repairs’ continued decay: in 1945 there was scarcely ‘a single terrace ... which does not give the impression of hopeless dereliction ...’.

The post-war period has seen major changes to the buildings, while recorded responses to the problem of the state of the buildings reflect the wider development of attitudes to historic buildings.

In April 1945 – the war yet to end – the Royal Fine Art Commission advised that the Terraces should be retained only as front and side elevations or facades ‘in the most advantageous and economical way, having regard to post-war requirements’, that Someries House, Cambridge Gate, and Cambridge Terrace could be demolished and their sites redeveloped, and supported the ideas of the Crown Estate’s architect Louis de Soissons for taking ‘full advantage of the backland’ areas.

In 1946 the Atlee government set up the Gorrell Committee to investigate the future of the terraces. The Committee reported in 1947, giving as its main conclusion:

We are unanimously of the opinion that the Nash Terraces are of national interest and importance and that ... they should be preserved as far as that is practicable and without strict regard to the economics of ‘prudent’ estate management.

In the long term, the Committee sought the residential use of the terraces, criticising the Ministry of Works for occupying the majority of the houses in the terraces as offices, an arrangement which they noted was due to end in December 1952. They further advised that rents be fixed to ensure that ‘occupation of these magnificent sites should not be the privilege of any particular income group’. Although they agreed that Someries House, Cambridge Gate, and Cambridge Terrace could be demolished, they proposed that they should be replaced by student hostels for London University. They deprecated any further building in the park itself.

---


27 Mansbridge, Nash, p. 257. The site was redeveloped as ‘Nash House’ in the 1960s.

28 The Gorrell Report, p. 10 §16.

29 Quoted in the Gorrell Report, p. 7.

30 The Gorrell Report, p. 23 §71c.
Occupation as government offices secured some basic protection for the terraces, and the first major changes came when the Crown Estate sold the ‘service’ areas to the east of Albany Street for local authority redevelopment as housing. Cumberland Market, Munster Square, and Clarence Gardens were demolished, and building of the Regent’s Park Estate began in 1951. Partly constructed on a masterplan by Sir Frederick Gibberd, building continued, with several changes of approach to density and the use of high- or low-rise buildings, until 1959.\(^{31}\)

In 1957 – ten years after the publication of the Gorrell Report – the newly reconstituted Crown Estate Commissioners issued the first of three statements entitled The future of the Regent’s Park Terraces.\(^{32}\) They proposed to carry out the demolitions already suggested, although in the case of Cambridge Gate – ‘It has no architectural merit’ – and the surviving part of Cambridge Terrace, these plans were later postponed.\(^{33}\) Someries House was indeed demolished, with the agreement of both the Royal Fine Art Commission and the London County Council, and Denys Lasdun’s plans for a new building for the Royal College of Physicians, reported in 1959, were completed in 1964: the building was listed, Grade I, in 1998.\(^{34}\)

For the rest of the terraces, the Commissioners developed an approach over seven years which essentially abandoned many of the major recommendations of the Gorrell Committee. They also rejected the suggestion that they seek government funds to preserve the terraces, preferring to work with private developers, even though that approach required that a number of the buildings should not revert to residential use, while the ‘first-class residential accommodation’ sought by the private sector meant that ‘the lower income groups’ would be excluded from occupation of the houses facing the Park.\(^{35}\)

The Commissioners also had problems with fulfilling the major objective set by the Gorrell Committee. Although they reported in 1957 that ‘a number of Nash Terraces will definitely be preserved for effective use for many years to come’, and that ‘present plans do not provide for the demolition of any [Nash or Burton] terrace, or for the elevation of any such terrace to be altered.’, by 1962 they found that their claim required a redefinition of terms:

The preservation of Nash Terraces in Regent’s Park means in our view ... the preservation, if at all practicable, of the whole of the grand design that remains. ...

---


\(^{35}\) Crown Estate, [First] Statement (1957) p. 4 § 13 and § 12, ‘To assist in these conversions, we shall need some latitude to use parts of the buildings not facing the Park for some non-residential uses.’ Second Statement (1959) p. 7 § 18 development at Cumberland Market ‘for people in the lower income groups who will be unable to pay the rents which will have to be charged for the Terrace flats.’
'Restoration' includes works of all degrees of magnitude, including partial demolition and radical changes in the structure. ...

'Renewal' meant complete rebuilding.  

The physical changes were greatest where the Crown Estate adopted the use of ‘replica’ facades. This was undertaken in cases where war damage made other techniques of conservation impossible, but the same approach was also used where the main problems were the result of long-term neglect. On the east side of the Park, the Commissioners announced in 1962 that at Chester Terrace ‘the whole of the internal construction of each house is new’, while Cumberland Terrace was generally converted into flats, its southern mews demolished to build small blocks of flats: Louis de Soissons was the architect. The Commissioners reported:

In summary, the only important original features on Cumberland Terrace visible from the Park are some restored statues and the stuccoed sculptural group (heavily repaired) in the tympanum of the pediment. Practically the only unseen original work left in this terrace is the brickwork and stucco remaining after ruthlessly eradicating dry rot. Broadly this is the picture which must be assumed for future restorations of a main terrace.  

One of the last examples of the ‘replica’ policy practised on behalf of the Crown Estate was to be seen at Cambridge Terrace in 1983-84, consents granted on appeal. The five houses to the north were rebuilt externally as replicas of the houses destroyed during the war, but, despite the Commissioner’s statement of 1957, put to office use.  

Although claiming in 1957 to have restored rooflines, a mansard storey was also added.  

The five surviving original houses were converted to flats using lateral conversion involving the destruction of original stone staircases, but consistent with the Commissioners’ statement of 1962:  

We shall not insist on the preservation of party walls where conversions into flats are to be carried out. They never had any significance in the Nash design and in some terraces their retention would seriously hinder proper conversions.  

The policy was the subject of debate. The Commissioners reported that the London County Council alone refused to accept the need for ‘replicas’:  

---

38 ‘... we shall need some latitude to use parts of the buildings not facing the Park for some non-residential uses’, Crown Estate, *First Statement* (1957) p. 4 § 12, italics added.  
... on the ground that no evidence satisfactory to them has been put forward to show why preservation, without demolition, at least of the main walls could not be achieved.41

In part policy was informed by contemporary historical thinking. John Summerson, whose assistance the Crown Commissioners acknowledged, had argued before the Gorrell Committee in 1946 that ‘the Park ... is not by any means an indivisible artistic unity, but merely a loose scenic grouping’.42 The emphasis on the exteriors, and on the main elevations, was also reinforced by attitudes which concentrated on the work of the ‘great man’. The Commissioners reflected that it was well known that Nash left ‘architectural detail to his subordinates and internal planning and decoration to the individual developers.’43 Nevertheless, the Gorrell Committee noted agreement that Regent’s Park was a unique example of early town planning’,44 and by 1980, writing of Fordyce’s project as the precursor of Nash’s scheme, Summerson spoke of a ‘wonderfully clear perception of the Park as a social, architectural, and, as we might say, organic totality’.45

The importance of the landscape was acknowledged. In 1957 the Commissioners stated:

Perhaps the major contribution of Nash was his creation of Regent’s Park itself, its entrances, and gardens. None of these can, or will, be altered, except perhaps in detail.46

It was only in the 1980s that the Crown Estate initiated schemes for construction in the gardens of villas to the west of the Broad Walk, which include the current (2001) construction of substantial houses on the land along the canal, until now preserved since the decision of the Treasury in 1826 as ‘shrubberies and plantations’.47
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42 Crown Estate, Third Statement (1962) p. 4 § 9, acknowledged that Summerson had given them ‘informal advice from 1945’, that is before the hearings of the Gorrell Committee, which recorded his views as an independent expert witness, Gorrell Report, p. 18 § 47.


45 Summerson, Nash, p. 61.

46 Crown Estate, Statement, 1957, p. 2 § 3.

47 For comment on these developments, see the Royal Parks Review, chaired by Dame Jennifer Jenkins, Report on St James’s and Green Parks, Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill (London, 1993), § 227-30.