

**Queens Head and Artichoke**

**A Planning Statement**

**Alterations and additions to 30-32 Albany Street Camden**

**London NW1 4EA**



## **Introduction**

This Statement accompanies a planning application for the extension of 30-32 Albany Street (The Queens Head and Artichoke Public House) to provide an extension to the existing living accommodation at second floor level and additional commercial kitchen accommodation at first floor level together with a loft conversion and dormer roof extension to the side of the existing building and a new fire escape/access stair to the existing residential accommodation.

The site lies within the London Borough of Camden specifically in the Longford Street character area which is within Regents Park Conservation Area formed in 1985.

The proposal is to retain all the architectural features of the existing front and side elevations of the building, to extend within the yard area to the East of the building but to limit the scope of works to the yard and to the rear (East) elevation and East roof pitch only.

This statement is set out as follows;

1. Assessment
  - a. Physical
  - b. Social
  - c. Economic
  - d. Planning Policy
  - e. Planning History
2. Design
  - a. Proposals
  - b. Use
  - c. Amount
  - d. Amenity
  - e. Character and Appearance
3. Access
4. Heritage Statement

It also takes account of the local requirements of the Council as well as setting out the appropriate planning background to the proposals.



Queens Head and Artichoke

Longford Street Elevation





Queens Head and Artichoke

Corner View from Albany Street



Queens Head and Artichoke

View from car park to Rear of Walton House

## **1. Assessment**

### **a. Physical**

The site consists of a corner site Public House currently used as such with a restaurant and kitchens at first floor level and an apartment above which is currently accessed through the pub at ground floor level. The building is thought to have been built around 1900.

To the rear of the existing side/rear yard at ground floor level is the washroom block serving the pub, the remainder of the yard space is currently underutilised.

To the East adjoining the yard is a Victorian apartment building; to the North is a terrace of early Victorian houses.

### **b. Social**

The key consideration is that the proposals provide good quality additional accommodation for the current residents of the building and that the proposals do not impact on the amenity of adjoining sites.

The windows to the front and rear elevations of the adjoining terraced houses to the North of the site are parallel with the front and rear facades of 30-32; no windows look onto the site from neighbouring properties. The amenity of the gardens to the rear of the terraced houses is not affected by the new fire escape stair or the dormer extension; the fire escape stair is set well back from the North boundary of the site and the dormer roof addition is set back behind the line of the existing rear parapet.

The Victorian apartment building to the East of the site presents a flank elevation which contains no windows however to the rear of the building; a projecting half-hexagonal bay includes windows to the flats. The presence of these windows was a deciding factor in establishing the massing of the proposed extension; the extension will not extend into the area above the flat roof of the ground floor toilet block so the new fire escape stair is set back away from the bay windows.

Opposite the site, to the South is the White House Hotel. The yard which is the site for the proposed extension is situated to the West of the North South building line described by the front elevation of the Hotel. It is thought that the part of the Hotel nearest to the site contains an access staircase.

### **c. Economic**

The extension of the existing commercial kitchen at first floor level will allow the current restaurant to expand its menu and to cater for the tastes of a changing and more diversified clientele.

Currently, the existing apartment at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor level is accessed solely through the restaurant and pub; this arrangement is unsafe and is untenable. The provision of a new fire escape staircase to the will enable to continued use of the apartment as the primary residence of our client.

## **d. Planning Policy**

### Camden's Core Strategy

'CS8 Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy'

- *Extension of the kitchen accommodation at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level will create employment both within the kitchen and within the restaurants.*

'CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

The Council will ensure that Camden's places and buildings are attractive, safe and easy to use by:

- a) requiring development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character; Camden Core Strategy 2010 90  
*This is achieved by ensuring the proposals;*
  - *appear visually subservient to the existing architecture,*
  - *contrast sympathetically to the style of the existing*
  - *are of a scale that does not adversely impact on the massing of the original building.*
- b) preserving and enhancing Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens;
  - *The proposals will not impact on the facades of the existing building.*
- c) promoting high quality landscaping and works to streets and public spaces;
  - *The proposals aspire to contributing to the streetscape by the introduction of planting.*
- d) seeking the highest standards of access in all buildings and places and requiring schemes to be designed to be inclusive and accessible;
  - *There will be no change to the existing access arrangements other than for the provision of a private passenger lift and fire escape staircase.*
- e) protecting important views of St Paul's Cathedral and the Palace of Westminster from sites inside and outside the borough and protecting important local views.
  - *This point is not applicable.*

## **e. Planning History**

In June 1981, consent was granted for the erection of a roof over the rear yard to provide improved toilet facilities and the installation of a new frontage to part of the Longford Street elevation (ref M11/5X/A/32213). The works to the Longford Street elevation were not carried out; however the toilet block was extended.

In August 1994, consent was granted for alterations to the Longford Street elevation comprising the replacement of existing double doors with a new window in connection with the conversion of the side yard/store area to a covered bar seating area (ref PL/9400670). These works were not carried out.

## 2. Design

### a. Proposals

The proposals are as follows;

- Extension of the existing commercial kitchen at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level.
- Extension of the existing residential accommodation at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor level.
- A roof extension in the form of a dormer at 3<sup>rd</sup> floor level.
- The installation of a new fire escape staircase and mini-lift within the existing yard.

### b. Use

The first floor extension is to be used as an additional preparation kitchen attendant to the existing commercial kitchen serving two high quality restaurants. The existing kitchen accommodation is proving to be too cramped; the extension of the kitchen will help to sustain the existing restaurant business.

The extension at second floor level is to provide additional family accommodation for use as an additional bedroom.

The extension at roof level will provide a master suit bedroom, shower room and sitting area as an extension of the existing residential accommodation.

The provision of a lift is in response to our clients requirements following surgery; the provision of a fire escape stair will improve ingress and egress from the existing family accommodation.

### c. Amount

In order to limit potential visual impact on the existing building, the proposed side extensions occupy an area above an existing yard and occupy the smallest footprint possible.

At roof level, the new residential accommodation sits within the existing footprint of the building and does not extend into the yard area.

Approximate additional internal floor areas are as follows;

- |  |   |                     |
|--|---|---------------------|
| • First floor extension                      | - | 11.45m <sup>2</sup> |
| • Second floor extension                     | - | 11.45m <sup>2</sup> |
| • Third floor<br>(within existing footprint) | - | 65.30m <sup>2</sup> |



#### **d. Amenity**

A vertical trellised kitchen/herb garden is proposed at first floor level; this will be planted with evergreen species and will be automatically watered. Whilst there is not normally a requirement for amenity space in this type of commercial space, the vertical garden will not only provide a signifier for the restaurant but it will also soften the appearance of the new extension.

Above this at second floor level, a balcony is proposed accessed from the bedroom/study. The planted trellis from the kitchen garden will extend to this level.

#### **e. Character and Appearance**

The side and dormer extensions have been designed and detailed to be visually subservient both to the fine architecture of the existing pub and to that of the apartment building adjacent.

To enhance the prominence of the existing gateway, the decorative masonry features and the decorated main South elevation, the front elevation of the proposed infill extension is set well back behind the existing building line. The choice of darker colours for the glazing and for the cladding panels further emphasises this hierarchy.

In response to the existing architecture, the cladding and window pattern of the side extension subtly expresses vertical emphasis; this is contrasted with a horizontal layering (as is seen on the existing building) which is created by the balcony and flat top to the new South-facing external wall.

The choice of dark-coloured concrete cladding panels was made in response to several precedents in the area; the masonry cladding of the White House Hotel, the dark brick of the rear of the College building and the stone cladding on the pub building itself. It was also felt that a brick facade would 'compete' visually with the existing pub elevation and that a painted rendered elevation would be entirely inappropriate.

As described above, a vertical garden is proposed in front of the first floor kitchen extension extending up to the level of the new bedroom/study at second floor level. The garden is intended to be used for growing herbs and other plants which would to some extent supplement the restaurant kitchen. The garden would be watered using a grey-water automated recycling system and is seen as an expression of the ethical approach the restaurant owner wishes to continue.

The new dormer roof extension represents a minimal intervention on the Longford Street facade; it is set well below the existing ridge and behind the line of the existing parapet wall. The side cheek of the dormer would be simply clad in lead and traditionally detailed. The glazing at this level would be minimally framed and coloured grey to match the slate of the existing roof coverings. The dormer extends to and engages with the party wall to the North; the profile of this wall will require no modification and the existing chimney stacks will be retained.

The dormer is to be set back behind the line of the existing roof hip in order to respect this defining feature on the existing South elevation.

Whilst little of the dormer extension would be seen from street level, it is acknowledged that it may be seen from other buildings within the conservation area; the detailing of the dormer cheeks and head is intended to present a quite simple minimal intervention and it intended not to dominate the roofscape.

Overall, the detailing of the elevations to the new additions is intended to be far simpler than that of the existing building; no attempt has been made to copy or emulate the existing architecture as it is strongly felt that 'pastiche' would be inappropriate; within an immediate radius of the pub is an eclectic collection of buildings each reflecting the style of the era in which they were built.

Whilst at a far smaller scale and of lesser significance, the proposed architectural approach to the side and roof extensions attempts to respond to the precedence set by the very admirable Royal College of Physicians building on Albany Street.

At ground floor level, the only intervention is the re-use of an existing pub door on the Longford Street side as a fire escape; this replaces the existing escape via the yard; the doors to the yard will remain unaltered.

### **3. Access**

Access arrangements will be altered to facilitate direct entry to the top floor apartment via a lift and a fire escape stair separated from the pub; at present ingress and egress via the pub is not ideal.

The new fire escape stair will also serve the first floor restaurant and kitchen.

All other access arrangements will remain as existing.

#### 4. Heritage Statement

Dating from the 16th Century, the Queen's Head & Artichoke was once a Royal Hunting Lodge on the site of what is now The Regent's Park. It is mentioned in the Crew's Survey in 1753 as 'a ramshackle old tavern'. When The Regent's Park was created, several well-known Inns were demolished, one of which was the Queen's Head & Artichoke. It was re-established at its present site in 1811, although the current building dates from around 1900. The licence itself dates from the time of Queen Elizabeth 1st reign. The origin of its name is attributed to Daniel Clark, Master Cook & Head Gardener to both Elizabeth 1st & James 1st.

As described previously in this report, the proposed building interventions have been designed to be subservient to the features of the existing building and no alterations are proposed to the existing elevations.



Buildings adjoining the Queens Head and Artichoke 1929  
London Metropolitan Archives



The former Queens Head and Artichoke Regents Park

C 1750

Keith Tillman  
Tillman Architects