

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		20/07/2007	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		9.7.07	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Miss Kiran Chauhan				1. 2007/2599/P 2. 2007/2601/L			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
York & Albany P.H. 127-129 Parkway London NW1 7PS				See decision.			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>				
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
1. Amendments to existing permission 2006/0215/P for the erection of extensions, excavation of basement floor level and external alterations for reinstatement of mixed use as a public house and restaurant (sui generis) and use of upper floors as a 10 bedroom hotel (Class C3). 2. Amendments to existing consent 2006/0216/L for the erection of extensions, excavation of basement floor level and external alterations for reinstatement of mixed use as a public house and restaurant (sui generis) and use of upper floors as a 10 bedroom hotel (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Grant both.</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Full Planning Permission</b>					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>21</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
				No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Site notice also displayed.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>		<b>English Heritage:</b> No comment. <b>Regents Park CAAC</b> comment: No objections, we welcome the landscaped Park Village East frontage which was York stone and that windows on the 'pod' extension have been moved. On the side elevation, looking onto Park Village East, the blind windows on the first floor were incorrect: the glazing bars were wrongly positioned and the glazing bars the wrong colour – they should be the original colour i.e. black, not cream. <i>Response: Full details of landscaping were reserved by condition and these have yet to be submitted. No changes are proposed to the blind windows but nonetheless 1:10 details of the windows were requested by condition on the approved scheme – these details have just been submitted for approval.</i> <b>Georgian Group:</b> No response.					

## Site Description

The subject site is located on the prominent junction of Park Village East and Parkway in the Regent's Park area of Camden. The site contains a former three storey public house building known as the York and Albany (No. 129) while to the north is an attached two storey stables building (No. 127). The buildings have been empty for 20 years but work has recently started in relation to the implementation of the 2005 scheme submitted by the Crown estate (2003/1816 and 1818).

The buildings are Grade II listed (in 2000) and the public house was registered on the English Heritage Buildings at Risk Register but following the implementation of the 2006 scheme, it has been removed from the Register. Both buildings have significant architectural and historic interest and their architectural development over time is physically evident in their alterations and additions.

The site is within an area characterised by mixed development. The site is in close proximity to the rail track leading north from Euston, and is directly adjacent to a busy junction near to Regents Park. To both the south east and north is office/workshop accommodation at ground floor level, while to north east is a set of garages. The surrounding buildings are all of a mixed size and design. The forecourt area in front of the pub is used for car parking, although no formal car parking exists. The site also lies within the Regents Park Conservation Area.

## Relevant History

The site has a fairly extensive planning history. The most recent and relevant to the determination of these applications is listed below.

10/11/2004– (2003/3270 and 3271) Planning permission and listed building consent **granted** for the internal and external alterations to 127 and 129 Parkway with new rear extension, in association with bringing the buildings back into Class A3 use (Food and drink). Applications submitted by Camden Civic Society.

18/02/2005 – (2003/1816 and 1818) Planning permission and listed building consent **granted** by the Crown Estate for the erection of a 3 storey plus basement side extension (facing Park Village East) and single storey rear extension and external alterations including the construction of a new regency frontage to the York and Albany - all in association with bringing the buildings back into Class A3 use.

29/06/2006 – (2006/0215/P and 0216/L) Planning permission and listed building consent **granted** for the erection of part single-storey rear extension, part three storey extension to Park Village East elevation, excavation of basement floor level and external alterations for reinstatement of mixed use as a public house and restaurant (sui generis) and use of upper floors as a 10 bedroom hotel (Class C3). It is these permissions which are currently being implemented.

## Relevant policies

SD1, SD6, B1, B3, B6, B7, R3  
Regents Park CAS  
Camden Planning Guidance

## Assessment

This application proposes amendments to the planning permission and listed building consent that were granted in 2006 for the refurbishment of the building as a public house/restaurant/hotel. As a result of these changes, the amount of public house and restaurant floorspace (sui generis) has been increased from 638sqm to 654sqm. Many of the variations to the approved scheme have arisen in order to comply with various parts of the Building Regulations, primarily in terms of fire and access.

Some of these are extremely minor and do not materially alter the scheme. Those that do have been assessed below.

### Basement

An additional area has been excavated beneath the rear courtyard. This is not considered to harm the special interest of the listed building given the extensive works that were consented at basement level.

There have been modifications to the proposed layout of the basement floor. These are not considered to harm the special interest of this plain utilitarian area.

### Ground Floor

Reclaimed pavement lights are to be set into the floor of the bar, stable building and courtyard. These are a little unusual within the main bar area but on balance are considered acceptable. The floor treatment of the stable building is now to include a timber removable floor area where a DDA compliant platform lift could be installed in the future if this building were to be used as a separate unit. This is considered acceptable.

The position of the new stair from the ground floor level to the basement of the stable building has been moved and is now constructed in cast concrete. This has been viewed on site and is an interesting and sculptural piece of design.

A concealed smoke curtain has been incorporated above the doors into the main bar and hotel reception from the glazed link. This has avoided the need to install smoke lobbies and has resulted in a superior design solution.

The consented accessible WC has been relocated from beneath the entrance to the 1<sup>st</sup> floor hotel rooms and into part of the adjacent stable building. Additional dining space has been created where the WC was formally located. This is a minor alteration that is considered acceptable.

### 1<sup>st</sup> Floor

As at ground floor level, smoke curtains have been incorporated flush above the doors in several rooms. This avoids the need for the insertion of partitions to create smoke lobbies and is a superior design solution.

Several of the bathroom arrangements have altered and these are of little significance in design terms. The only significant alteration is that the proposed bath within the large front room is now to be housed within the bathroom pod. This is a neater solution.

### External Alterations

The key alteration is that the extension is now to be finished in render rather than clad with glazed ceramic tiles. This is considered to sufficiently complement the painted stucco finish of the existing building. Both structures will be painted the same colour so as to harmonise with each other.

The approved windows to the new extension have moved from the south elevation, further toward the east elevation. No objection is raised in design terms and no new amenity issues are raised.

The existing stair enclosure to the roof is now to be clad in lead rather than zinc. This is an improvement.

The design of the door into the glazed link between the main building and extension has been modified slightly with the incorporation of a fanlight above. This is a minor alteration that is considered acceptable.

The plant located on the roof of the main building and the new extension is now to be located within the rear courtyard. This has resulted in the modification of the parapet line to the new extension which is now higher and straighter. This is considered acceptable in design terms. The minor increase in height will not impact on the amenity of any neighbour.

The plant equipment within the rear courtyard is to have a hurdle screen which although not ideal, is not considered to harm the setting of the listed building in this concealed location. A condition was attached to the original permission requiring further details of the plant and machinery – therefore its acceptability in terms of noise and vibration will be dealt with separately under the approval of details application.

The proposed fenestration to the ground floor extension has been rationalised so as to consist of two large sliding panels. This is considered to be an improvement. The parapet height of this extension has also been raised. This is not considered harmful in this concealed location at the rear of the building. The glazed balustrade adjacent to this extension has been changed to steel and the concrete stairs up to the hotel rooms has been modified to a metal staircase. These minor modifications are considered acceptable and do not raise any new amenity issues.

### Increase in sui generis floorspace

The increase in floorspace is minor and would not intensify the uses over and above the approved scheme.

**Recommendation:** The alterations are considered acceptable and do not harm either the character or appearance of the CA nor the architectural and historic interest of the listed building. No new amenity issues are raised. Grant both.