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STRUCTURE OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN

This Management Plan is set out in Five Parts and is structured as follows:

PART 1. CONTEXT AND RESPONSIBILITIES (Sections 1 to 4)

- a summary of the background to the overall management of the park, ownership, leases and access (Section 2);
- the strategic planning framework, designations and other relevant documents
- a brief history of the park (Section 4).

PART 2. DESCRIPTION, USE AND CHARACTER

- a short description of the physical context (Section 5), Natural Fabric (Section 6), Buildings and Structures (Section 7) and Public Use (Section 8) of the park;
- a description of the park by reference to Landscape Character Areas (Section 9);
- each section identifies key management issues and opportunities to be addressed in the management plan;

PART 3. LANDSCAPE STRATEGY

- the Statement of Significance for the park is set out in Section 10;
- Section 11 provides an overview of the key management issues and opportunities to be addressed through the plan
- a vision for the park which sets out what TRP wants to achieve and the plan objectives are described in Section 12;

PART 4. MANAGEMENT POLCIES

- a series of policies, management objectives and actions are described which aim to achieve the vision in Sections 13 to 18. Some policies are "park-wide", others relate to specific areas;

PART 5. IMPLEMENTATION

- this part of the plan describes proposals for the implementation of the plan and monitoring and review (Section 19) and the Project Register to be delivered in the period covered by this Plan (Section 20).

This Management Plan provides the overall policy and strategic context for the management and maintenance of the park for the next ten years. The Royal Parks prepare an annual park Operations Plan, which sets out management actions together with a priority for action each year. The Operations Plan is submitted in support of annual applications for the Green Flag Award and is structured in line with the Green Flag Award Criteria. The Operations Plan sets out the actions and activities to deliver aspects of this Management Plan each year.
AIMS OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Regent's Park and Primrose Hill are renowned for features of horticultural excellence and the wealth of activities and facilities, particularly sporting, available to Londoners. The management plan is a tool to enable The Royal Parks (TRP) to undertake management of the Park more effectively. In particular the aims of the plan are:

- to provide a vision for the park for 100 years informed by a back view of 350 years;
- to provide a clear statement of the significance for the park;
- to set out the framework and procedures for the conservation and management of the Park for a 10 year period to work towards achieving the vision;
- to guide future managers and ensure continuity of management over time;
- to provide priorities for managing multiple use and potentially conflicting interests within the park;
- to highlight areas of concern where additional resources may need to be made available in the future to achieve the aims of the plan; and
- to provide a document to demonstrate to other groups and organisations how the park is being managed.

It is intended that the plan is strategic in nature, setting out the vision for the Park and broad objectives to guide management. This can then be used to prepare detailed specifications for management, and allow budget preparation, allocation and work programming as outlined in the operational plan. Annual Operations Plans are prepared for all the Royal Parks, which set out annual priorities and an action plan.
PART 1: CONTEXT AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill

Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill (the park) are distinct but contiguous public parks jointly managed by The Royal Parks (TRP). They are located in Central London and occupy a total area of some 191ha (472 acres) including land which is leased or in private ownership (See Figure 1: Location of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill). By 1541 the rural and wooded character of this area, which was within easy riding of the city of London, led to Henry VIII enclosing the current area of Regent’s Park as a deer park, which became known as Marylebone Park. This land was later converted to pasture to supply the needs of the rapidly growing city of London to the south. With the exception of the brief period of Cromwell’s commonwealth this land has remained in crown ownership to the present day.

In 1811 The Prince Regent (later George IV) commenced the development of the land to an ambitious design by the Crown Architect John Nash (1752-1835). The plan was for an exclusive residential estate of private villas set in parkland around an ornamental lake and canal and surrounded by magnificent Georgian terraces, which were to be the culmination of a grand thoroughfare (Regent’s Street) from the Prince’s Carlton House residence. When construction was eventually completed in 1832 only eight of the intended villas had been built; but the surrounding terraces, ornamental water and canal - which are key features of the contemporary park – were in place. In response to demand for public open space Regent’s Park (as the area became known) was incrementally made accessible to the public and additional land at Primrose Hill was purchased in 1841. Public amenities have continued to be added. Hence, unlike St James’ Park (1925-26), Regent’s Park was not designed as a public park but adapted later. However, the park is now one of the most important and well-known in London and possibly the world.

Regent’s Park is significant at the national level on account of its connections with John Nash and as an important historic landscape in its own right, which is reflected by Grade I listing of Regent’s Park on the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest. Indeed, many would argue that it is significant at the international level and worthy of World Heritage Site Status. Primrose Hill is not of such historic importance but provides a much valued, more local open space which is defined by the magnificent views over Regent’s Park to the London skyline and a more semi natural character. These views are recognised as some of the most important in London and are protected as Designated Views through the London Plan and the Borough Core Strategies.

Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill fulfil an important role as greenspace, providing an oasis of peace and ‘fresh air’ within the bustling city, valued by locals and international tourists alike and with significant wildlife habitats. The park also provides the largest centre for outdoor sport in Central London and encompasses London Central Mosque, the Open Air Theatre with its wealth of theatre and music and London Zoo, which remains as one of the most popular tourist attractions in the Capital.
In summary, the essential character and strong genius loci of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill are created by a sense of grand internal spaciousness and the strong formal relationship of the parks to their city setting and, particularly, of Regent’s Park to the architectural splendour of Nash’s regency terraces.

Figure 1: Location Plan
1.2 The Management Plan Context

This Management Plan is the first full update of the 2003 Management Plan. A revision of the 2003 document was issued in 2005 (Revision A). The Management Plan has been prepared within the context of the following Royal Parks Plans, Strategies and Guidance:

- TRP Management Agreement (2012/2015)
- TRP Corporate Plan (2013-2016)
- TRP and Other Open Spaces (Amendment) etc. Regulations (2010)
- TRP Sustainability Policy 2014
- Hosting Major Events 2014
- Small Events in The Royal Parks 2010
- TRP Annual Report 2013/2014
- The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill Tree and View Management Strategy (July 2013)
- Ipsos Mori Visitor Survey (Publish date end January 2015)
- TRP Green Travel Plan (2014)
- TRP Education Strategy (2013-2015)
- TRP Volunteer Strategy (2013-2015)
- TRP Stakeholder Strategy
- TRP Sports, Health and Wellbeing Strategy (2010-2012)
- Artificial Lighting: a Draft Position Statement by The Royal Parks regarding its Ecological Effects and Implications for Planning (January 2009)
2.0 GENERAL AND MANAGEMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Location
Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill (the park) lie approximately 3.5 km north west of the City (see Figure 1) in Central London. The park is open to the public and covers an area of some 191 ha. (472 acres) including 28 ha (70 acres) within the curtilage which is leased and 12 ha (30 acres) which is in private ownership. The majority of the park (west of the Broad Walk) lies within the City of Westminster, whilst the remainder of the park (including all of Primrose Hill) lies within the London Borough of Camden.

2.2 Existing TRP Management Agreement
TRP is an Executive Agency of the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS). As part of the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007, the Government changed the framework for PSAs and there are now 30 cross-governmental PSAs for the period 2008-11.

In 2011 it was agreed by DCMS that the Greater London Authority (Mayor’s Office) should have more input into the strategy for the agency. In early 2012 a board appointed by the Mayor was tasked to provide strategic guidance for the agency. The new Chief Executive Officer has been working with the board and agency on strategic direction from 2013 onwards. Alongside, TRP is working to the DCMS Departmental Strategic Objectives (DSOs) designed to complement the Public Service Agreements (PSAs) and focus the Department’s priorities.

The objectives for TRP Corporate Plan 2013-16 are:

- To conserve and enhance sustainably, for the enjoyment of this and future generations, our world class natural and built historic environment and our biodiversity
- To engage with our visitors, stakeholders and partner organisations and understand their views
- To manage the parks efficiently and secure investment in the parks’ assets and services through an appropriate combination of government funding, commercial income and philanthropy
- To be a centre of professional excellence where people want to work

To assist in meeting its PSA and DSOs, and within the context of its strategic priorities DCMS sets the objectives for TRP and its non-departmental public bodies.

The purpose and corporate objectives for TRP are set down within the TRP Management Agreement (2012-2015) which is the strategic direction, within which the purpose will be met. It is endorsed by the Royal Parks Board and Ministerial agreement.
Our purpose is:
“To manage the Royal Parks effectively and efficiently, balancing the responsibility to conserve and enhance the unique environments with the creative policies to encourage access and to increase opportunities for enjoyment, education, entertainment and healthy recreation.”

Our Values
We will:
- Treat everyone with honesty, fairness, equality and respect;
- Be open, collaborative and professional;
- Be proud of who we are, and strive for excellence in all we do;
- Demonstrate integrity in our day-to-day work, trusting and empowering each other.

TRP Key Performance Targets are set out in The Royal Parks Management Agreement for 2012-15. These are:

**TRP Key Performance Targets 2014-2015**

- Achieve and maintain ISO 14001 for 2014/2015.
- Publish updated assessment of accumulated works maintenance backlog by March 2015 accompanied by an updated prioritisation list in order to allocate funds.
- Engage with key stakeholders and produce an interim Royal Parks’ transport strategy by March 2015.
- Implement, monitor and evaluate The Royal Parks Stakeholder Engagement Strategy by March 2015.
- Generate 60% of TRP's income to meet the reduction in Grant in Aid by 31st March 2015.
- Produce a strategy on The Royal Parks Effective Water Management by March 2015 including proposals to reduce mains water consumption.
- Produce an organisational capability plan by December 2014 informed by the skills audit.
- Increase by 5% the “Learning and Development” score in the Staff Survey.

**2.3 Management Structure: The Regent’s Park & Primrose Hill**

The management of the parks by the Government DCMS was delegated in the 1993 Royal Parks Framework Document to The Royal Parks (TRP). This made TRP an executive agency answerable to Parliament for their responsibility for policing and managing the parks. From 2012 TRP have reported to a new Board which includes three members nominated by London Councils as part of the 12 Board Members. The funding for TRP comes from central government and has been effectively cut in real terms over recent years.
The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill has a core TRP staff comprising a Park Manager, two Assistant Park Managers, an Office Manager, two Administrative Officers, a Wildlife Officer, a Sports Manager, two Duty Officers and a Active Sports Officer (see Figure 2). The Royal Parks Operational Command Unit (TRP OCU), part of the Metropolitan Police, is responsible for policing the park.

Figure 2: Management Responsibilities of The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill
Core TRP Staff Functions

The Park Manager, in conjunction with the appropriate Board member, is also responsible for liaising with Licensees and Concessionaires, contractors, park users, event organisers etc. and the independent bodies controlling adjacent land (e.g. private owners, the Unitary Authorities, Crown Estate, Crown Estate Paving Commission and the Canal & River Trust).

Arboricultural condition surveys and safety inspections are undertaken by TRP Arboricultural Officers supported by external consultants. Surveys and inspections are undertaken in accordance with TRP Tree Risk and Management Policy Document, which identifies tree risk zones for all parks. All trees with a diameter at breast height (Dbh) of greater than 15 cms are inspected at least once every three years, with more frequent inspections in high risk zones and of individual trees identified by inspectors as of potential risk. Tree works programmes are agreed between the Park Manager and Arboricultural Officers and works are undertaken by term contractors.

The park also benefits from the support of TRP Ecology unit. The unit works closely with the Park Managers advising on species protection and habitat management, preparing impact assessment surveys and also undertaking or administering park wide ecology surveys.

The Park Management team also work closely with the Park Services team that includes landscape architects and horticulturalists who project manage landscape improvements in the park, undertake surveys, research and prepare the management plans and operations plans. The Park Manager can also call on the services of Landscape Term Consultants through the TRP Framework. The Works Team and Park Management team manage the facilities management contract that delivers maintenance work on the hard infrastructure of the parks. The Major Projects teams undertake larger development projects.

The Park Management team is also building strong partnerships with a range of organisations with regard to volunteering, education, community events and sports. Current partners include Capel Manor College, the Trust for Conservation Volunteers (TCV), Capital Growth and the various local leagues, teams and clubs who call Regent’s Park home. The emerging partnership between TRP and the Field Studies Council in relation to education in TRP has identified Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill, along with Bushy Park and Greenwich Park, as one of three parks to provide the focus for the development of projects and activities.

2.4 Landscape Maintenance

Landscape Maintenance is undertaken by the appointed Contractor (LMC) working to the direction of the Park Manager. In practice, day-to-day supervision of the LMC is undertaken by the two Assistant Park Managers who each have responsibility for specific geographical areas and facilities.

The scope of works is controlled by the LMC specification and identified on a set of CAD drawings at 1:1000 scale. The contract includes grass cutting, horticultural services, cleansing (including waste disposal) and other maintenance.
The current contractors are The Landscape Group whose 7+ year contract took over delivery from Veolia Environmental Services on 9 June 2014.

The LMC is not responsible for hardworks maintenance (i.e. items such as buildings, hard surfaces, footpaths and lighting) which are the subject of a separate contract and are currently undertaken by Vinci Facilities Ltd – employed as management contractors. There are also a number of specialist contractors including the Nursery Contractor (R.A. Meredith & Son (Nurseries) Ltd), attendant and cleansing contractor and others.

The toilet facilities are managed and cleaned by Vinci Clean under a contract which includes provision of toilet and play area attendants. As from Spring 2015 admission charges will be applied for the first time to adult toilets. The contract places responsibility for upkeep and maintenance of the facilities on the contractor.

Arboricultural works are undertaken by a specialist contractor under a three year term contract.

**Management Issues: Park Management Structure**
- TRP staff are delivering a varied and complex range of works in the parks under greater pressure with limited resources and more demands on the parks.
- Delivery on the ground by contract partnership: with associated benefits and costs, financial and other).
- TRP management has a strong identifiable presence in the park through liveried vehicles and colour scheme, which needs to be preserved.
- Fundraising activities and initiatives undertaken by The Royal Parks Foundation need managing to gain funding for maintenance costs of essential projects in the parks.
- Baseline survey drawings for the Landscape Maintenance Contract need regular update.
- The increasing number of partnerships with community and volunteer groups and the new links with the Field Studies Council provide opportunities for increased community involvement but require additional management resources.

**2.5 Policing and Enforcement**
Responsibility for policing Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill falls on the Metropolitan Police Royal Parks Operation Command Unit (TRP OCU).
There are duties on the Police to enforce The Royal Parks and other Open Spaces (Amendment) etc Regulations (2010) the Statutory Instrument governing access to and use of the Royal Parks by members of the public.

2.5 Database and Archive

Landscape maintenance data (principally an inventory of land use and rates for scheduled work) is held in the "CONFIRM" system.

The Royal Parks Arboriculture Manager has implemented a tree management system using the electronic data management system Arbortrack. The Arbortrack database is populated with the existing trees and is updated regularly through survey work. The system allows tree data to be stored electronically and linked to a mapping system which is compatible with geographical information systems (GIS).

The Royal Parks Ecology Section currently holds ecological and biological data for the park. The Royal Parks Head of Ecology has been working with a full time member of staff seconded from Greenspace Information for Greater London (GiGL) to set up and manage a biological recording system (for collection of information on species, habitats and other environmental information) for all of the Royal Parks. The data management system, based principally on Recorder 6 and MapInfo GIS, is now implemented and the process of managing existing and new data is ongoing. The data, now consisting of over 200,000 records (June 2011), are accessible to internal and external customers via information requests from the Ecology Section. Data reports and mapping are customised to meet the needs of the request. Data sharing with other organisations such as; Natural England, the GLA and the Environment Agency partners and consultants working for TRP is now possible, within the terms of the data use agreement with GiGL governing the use of third party data.

The Royal Parks has assessed the feasibility of an organisational GIS system, as current data are generally only accessible from the Ecology Section. Investment in the IT systems within the organisation is required along with long term investment to manage the system.

Management Issues: Database and Archive

- IT investment needed in GIS system to give comprehensive mapping of services; trees; ecology; furniture & artefacts; hardworks and softworks features.

2.6 Sustainability

TRP is aware that the relationship of the park to the surrounding area raises wider sustainability issues, including the use of the park by traffic and access of visitors to and through the park. In accordance with sustainability principles, TRP supports
development of improved public transport links to the park and a reduction in traffic through the park.

The Royal Parks will strive for the highest standards of environmentally sustainable park management. Since 2014 TRP has been re-accredited with the ISO 1400 Environmental Management Standard. This will include every effort to minimise energy consumption and emissions, to reduce waste through recycling practices, including composting and to pursue other opportunities for recycling including re-use of water. Application of chemicals will be minimised in compliance with good horticultural practice and use of water resources will be judicious. The importance of TRP in meeting wider sustainability objectives, for example in maintaining quality of urban life, will be considered in all aspects of park management and further opportunities for connecting with the wider sustainability agenda will be considered.

Management Issues: Sustainability

- To push forward agenda on a range of practices to retain the ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard

2.7 Areas of the Historic Park not Managed by TRP

In contrast with most other Royal Parks, there are large parts of the former historic extent of the park which is not controlled and managed by TRP. This land is either in private ownership and/or under the control of other Government executive agencies. This is illustrated below in Figure 3: Land Ownership, Access and Management.

- Winfield House – the lease of this area is owned by the Government of the United States of America and is privately managed.
- London Central Mosque - this area is privately run and managed.
- Crown Estate (CE) – the ironworks on the Inner Circle.
- Crown Estate Paving Commission (CEPC) – own the roads and pavements

For historical reasons a significant proportion of land within Regent's Park is managed by the Crown Estate and leased for private occupation/institutional use. These areas are:

- St John’s Lodge – this area is privately leased and managed, with the exception of St John’s Lodge Garden which is maintained by TRP and opened to the public.
- The Holme – this area is privately leased and managed. It is open two weekends a year to the public under the National Gardens Scheme.
- Regent’s College (formerly Bedford College) – this area is run and managed by Regent’s College for educational purposes.
The Crown Estate also control much of the land within the historic purlieus of Regent’s Park, including the Nash Terraces and Park Crescent.

**The Crown Estate Paving Commission (CEPC)** share responsibility with TRP for the management of the Outer Circle and spur roads. In this somewhat erratic but long-standing arrangement their duties including cleaning, maintenance, control of footway and streetlights. TRP remain responsible for kerbs, road surface and structure, bridge structure and footway, traffic lights, drains and clearing out the gullies.

The CEPC retain a significant interest outside of the park but within the historic purlieu of the park includes management of the pavements, roads and gardens of Crown land including the Nash terraces, Park Crescent Gardens and Park Square Gardens.

**The Regent’s Canal** (Grand Union Canal) is owned and managed by the Canals and Rivers Trust (C&RT - formerly British Waterways). They are responsible for the canal bed and banks (below high water mark) and the towpaths. The London Boroughs of Camden and the City of Westminster have responsibility to clear litter from respective areas of the towpath. TRP is responsible for the maintenance of all other areas associated with the Canal within the park boundaries.
Figure 3: Land Ownership, Access and Management
Management Issues: Areas not managed by TRP

- Large areas of the historic estate, which are not controlled by TRP, which can impact on the park.
- Division of responsibilities is complex and can be operationally difficult
- Regular meetings between Park Management and key senior staff of these managing bodies are essential to ensure strategic cohesion.
- Recent joint meeting of TRP Park Managers with Managers and Head Gardeners for other properties provided a valuable forum for discussion and review of issues and opportunities

2.8 Leases, Licenses and Concessions

A number of leases, licences and concessions are in effect in the park through which areas of land or specific facilities are controlled by bodies other than TRP or responsibility is shared. These include:

**London Zoo** which is located in the north of Regent’s Park, is leased by TRP to the Zoological Society of London (ZSL) and covers 15 ha (37 acres). The 60 year lease expires in June 2055. A further area of land east of the zoo from St Mark’s Bridge to Gloucester Gate (Gloucester Slips) comprising Car park and Basin are licensed to the Society on a 10 year licence. Within this area the Zoological Society have an obligation to ‘keep the estate in good order’ and ‘keep all buildings, roads, pathways, boundary fences, walls, railings and other structures including the tunnels on the premises in a physically safe condition to the reasonable satisfaction of the landlord save that the repair of the tunnels will be subject to the performance of the terms of the Supplemental Agreement.’ Specifically they must:

- execute all such works as shall be required at any time during the term of the lease
- maintain the East and West Bridges
- pay to the landlord half of the maintenance costs of Primrose Hill Bridge

The Zoological Society have a right to request an additional 10 acres of Regent’s Park under an Act passed in the 1960s: although this is seen as being unlikely.

**Regent’s Park Open Air Theatre Ltd** (the ‘Open Air Theatre’), established in the park in 1932, leases an area of 0.83ha (2 acres) from TRP. The lease runs for 20 years and will expire in 2020. Within this area TRP remains responsible for grounds maintenance and the maintenance of structures and buildings except for new buildings and ‘theatrical applications’ such as lighting and ‘front of house’ facilities.

**York Bridge Tennis Centre** is run by ‘Will to Win’ on an area of the former Toxopholite Society grounds under a concession.

There are eighteen licensed openings/entrances operational which allow access to Primrose Hill directly from the back gardens of various private residences, primarily in Elsworthy Road and Avenue Road. Residents are responsible for the maintenance of doors, gates and boundary elements.
The majority of the catering facilities in the park are run by Benugo who were awarded the contract from 1 November 2014. The single exception is The Boathouse Café which is run by Company of Cooks along with the boating concession. Facilities also include The Regent’s Bar and Kitchen in Queen Mary’s Gardens, The Broad Walk Café operating as The Smokehouse, Chester Road Kiosk operating as The Espresso Bar, the café in The Hub and a number of seasonal kiosks. Mobile refreshment points are also provided in the summer months. **Park Boats** is a concession, which leases boats for hire on the lake.

**Park Deckchairs** is a concession, which leases chairs for hire around the Ornamental Water and in Queen Mary’s Gardens (as well as various locations in Hyde, St James’s and The Green Parks).

**Catering** concessions in the park are run, with one exception, by Benugo who were awarded the contract from 1 November 2014. The single exception is The Boathouse Café which is run by Company of Cooks along with the boating concession. Facilities also include The Garden Café in Queen Mary’s Gardens (to be rebranded as The Regent’s Bar and Kitchen following a major refurbishment), The Broad Walk Café (rebranded as The Smokehouse), Chester Road kiosk (rebranded as The Espresso Bar), the café in The Hub and a number of seasonal kiosks. Mobile refreshment points are also provided in the summer months. As part of The Royal Parks’ new catering strategy (in line with ISO 14001 objectives), to improve the catering throughout the Parks, TRP are working in partnership with the parks’ caterers and restaurateurs to deliver food more sustainably, using fresh, seasonal produce, minimising food mileage and food waste, and including fair trade and organic produce.

**Park Boats** have a concession to run the boats at the Boating Lake

The following facilities are used under licence:

- The Police Station - Metropolitan Police Service
- Apiaries – Pure Foods
- Horticultural Training Centre - Capel Manor

---

**Management Issues: Leases, Licenses and Concessions**

- Leases, licenses and concessions need to be thoroughly and conscientiously managed by TRP in order to ensure partnership working that serves the needs of our diverse visitors and maintains the reputation of TRP.
2.9 Public Access

Getting to the Park
The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill have free public access and there are good local public transport links, including numerous local bus routes and London Underground connections (Great Portland Street, The Regent’s Park, Baker Street, Marylebone, Camden Town, Mornington Crescent and St John’s Wood Stations are all very close). The new park maps and orientation panels provide visitors with good information on local public transport links.

Opening Hours
Primrose Hill is open 24 hours a day. Regent’s Park opens at 5.00am and generally remains open until dusk. When performances are held at the Open Air Theatre the theatregoers can exit through the Theatre exit point onto the Inner Circle, York Bridge Road and York gate which, in common with all other traffic gates is closed by the Crown Estate Paving Commissioners from midnight until 7.00am.

Accessibility
Within Regent’s Park public access is restricted to those areas within the direct control of TRP. Public areas restricted to members/fee-paying members of the public include:

- London Zoo (ticket holders)
- Open Air Theatre (ticket holders)
- Regent’s College (students/employees)

Areas restricted for use by particular user-groups include:

- children’s play areas
- private garden areas
- formal sports pitches
- Storeyard
- wildlife sanctuaries/enclosures

Areas (within TRP control) from which members of the public are excluded include:

- TRP working areas and depots
3.0 STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

3.1 National Policies and Designations

Figure 4: Designated Areas and Features
The National Heritage List for England: Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest

Regent's Park is listed as Grade I and Primrose Hill as Grade II on the National Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. Grades I & II apply to parks and gardens which due to their historic layout, features and architectural ornaments make them of national and international importance. Regent's Park is listed primarily on account of its surviving characteristic picturesque design by John Nash and the various buildings within the park by Decimus Burton. Nash had worked closely with Humphry Repton (1752-1818) between 1795 and 1802 and the influence of this association is reflected in the design for Regent's Park, especially in the positioning of groups of trees and the use of ornamental water running through parkland. Planning Policy Guidance: Planning and the Historic Environment (PPS15) requires Local Planning Authorities to protect registered gardens when determining planning applications. The National Register of Parks and Gardens entries are included in Appendix I.

Scheduled Ancient Monuments

There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments within or surrounding Regent's Park and Primrose Hill.

Royal Commission on Historic Monuments in England (RCHME) Survey

A detailed archaeological survey of Regent's Park and Primrose Hill was undertaken by the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (RCHME, August 1994). This survey concluded that, with the exception of the deserted medieval village of Rugmore, sited on the current site of London Zoo, it seems unlikely that any major pre-nineteenth century earthwork site ever existed, and none survive. Furthermore, the few earthwork survivals are neither unique nor totally unrecorded and further surface archaeological fieldwork is thought to be unnecessary within the park. There are some lynchets (field patterns) dating from mediaeval times evident on Primrose Hill.

Listed Buildings

There are a large number of listed buildings and monuments within and surrounding the park (principally the Nash Terraces and related buildings). The majority of the listed structures are under the control of and are the responsibility of others – in particular the Crown Estate.

TRP is responsible for the following Grade II listed buildings and structures:

- Boys with armorial shields on pillars (6) or puttii (late C19th), located in St John’s Lodge Garden
- The Shepherdess (statue by Ballie Waver, 1930s), located in St John’s Lodge Garden
- Hylas (statue by Henry Pegram RA), located in St John’s Lodge Garden;
- Jubilee Gates
- Chester Road Gates
- Ready Money Drinking Fountain, donated by Sir Cowasjee-Jhangir (1869), located on The Broad Walk
• Boy with Frog (statue by Sir Reid Dick, 1936), located in Queen Mary’s Gardens;
• York Bridge (York Bridge Road)
• Hanover Gate Lodge
• Clarence Gate Lodge
• Gloucester Gate Lodge

Other listings
Walking - The Silver Jubilee Walkway extends along the canal and on to Primrose Hill.

Cycling – The shared cycling route with pedestrians on Broad Walk, cycling on the park roads - Outer Circle, Chester Road, a section on the Inner Circle and York Bridge is set out in The London Cycle Guide.

The Green Flag Award
The Green Flag Award scheme is the national standard for parks and green spaces across England and Wales. The award is currently managed by Greenspace in partnership with Keep Britain Tidy on behalf of the Department of Communities and Local Government and the Green Flag Advisory Board. The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill have attained Green Flag status each year since 2005. This award has been retained each year since. The annual park Operations Plan is submitted in support of the Green Flag Award each year. The aspiration is to achieve Green Heritage Award for The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill in the next 5 years. The eight Green Flag judging criteria are:

• A Welcoming Place
• Health, Safety and Security
• Maintenance of Equipment, Buildings and Landscape
• Litter Cleanliness and Vandalism
• Environmental Sustainability
• Conservation Heritage and Nature
• Community Involvement
• Marketing

3.2 Strategic Planning Context

Draft Further Alteration to the London Plan (2014)
The London Plan was adopted in July 2011 and provides the strategic planning policy context for London. Further revisions have been made, the most recent being the draft FALP 2014. Chapter 7 of the plan describes policies for ‘London’s Living Places and Spaces’. The following provide extracts from policies in Chapter 7 which are of particular relevance to the management of The Royal Parks:

7.4 Local Character Protection and enhancement of local character including ‘visual, physical connection and natural features’
7.5 **Public Realm**

‘London’s public spaces should be secure, accessible, inclusive, connected, easy to understand and maintain, relate to local context, and incorporate the highest quality design, landscaping, planting, street furniture and surfaces.’

7.8 **Heritage Assets and Archaeology**

‘London’s heritage assets and historic environment, including listed buildings, registered historic parks and gardens and other natural and historic landscapes, conservation areas, World Heritage Sites, registered battlefields, scheduled monuments, archaeological remains and memorials should be identified, so that the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and of utilising their positive role in place shaping can be taken into account.’

7.11 **London View Management Framework**

These policies seek to protect and enhance the ‘characteristics and composition of the strategic views and their landmark elements’. The panoramic view from Primrose Hill is one of 27 Designated Views identified in the London Plan (2011) ‘that makes(s) aesthetic, cultural and other contributions’. The Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) advises on ‘the management of the foreground, middle ground and background of each view’: its ‘landmark viewing corridor’ and the ‘wider setting’ of the landmark.’ This guidance identifies two Protected Vistas from Primrose Hill towards the Palace of Westminster and St Pauls.

More information on this issue is provided in High Buildings and Strategic Views in London’s Royal Parks (1998) prepared for TRP by Colvin and Moggeridge.

**Greater London Authority Biodiversity Strategy and Local BAPs**

TRP has a statutory duty, under the **Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000** (see paragraph 3.11) and the **NERC Act 2006** (see paragraph 1.10), to further the conservation of biological diversity in the UK. TRP complies with this duty through the conservation, enhancement and management of wildlife throughout the parks and through contribution to national biodiversity records through BARS, national, capital and local BAPs and GiGL.

Regent's Park is recognised as one of the largest and most important parks in London with a total area of 102 hectares (over half of the parkland area) designated as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation.

The UK Biodiversity Action Plan sets out a national strategy for wildlife conservation, based upon action plans for habitats and species. Local Biodiversity Action Plans have also been prepared for London, Westminster and Camden. The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill contain a number of Biodiversity Action Plan species and habitats and can help to achieve specific targets associated with these BAP’s. These are explored...
further in Chapter 6. This is interpreted at the regional level through the London Biodiversity Action Plan (Our Green Capital) prepared by the London Biodiversity Partnership (2002).

In addition, the Mayor has published a Biodiversity Strategy (Connecting with London's Nature, The Mayor's Biodiversity Strategy, July 2002). This document encourages the promotion of the management of land for biodiversity, for promoting education, collating and distributing wildlife information and exchanging information on best practice for managing parks for wildlife. It sets out criteria for designating SMLs (Sites of Metropolitan Importance), the top tier of nature conservation designation in London.

TRP Ecology Unit staff provide the lead roles in the following Habitat and Species Action Plans;

London Biodiversity Partnership: Acid Grassland HAP  
Heathland HAP (Temporary)

Westminster LBAP: Standing Water HAP  
Lead recording action in BARs

Camden: Hedgehogs

**Local Planning Policies and Designations**

Regent's Park and Primrose Hill lie partly within the London Borough of Camden (which includes Primrose Hill and Regent's Park east of the Broad Walk) and the City of Westminster (which includes all of Regent's Park west of the Broad Walk). The statutory policies relating to the area within Westminster are contained in The City of Westminster Core Strategy (Adopted January 2011) and retained policies from the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (2007). Those corresponding to the area within Camden portion are contained in the London Borough of Camden Core Strategy (Adopted November 2010) and retained polices from the UDP (2001).

**City of Westminster Core Strategy (Adopted January 2011)**

The importance of the Royal Parks to the Strategic Planning Context of the City of Westminster is reflected in the Strategic Objectives for the City which includes the following:

*Strategic Objective 7. To protect and enhance Westminster's open spaces, civic spaces and Blue Ribbon Network, and Westminster's biodiversity; including protecting the unique character and openness of the Royal Parks and other open spaces; and to manage these spaces to ensure areas of relative tranquillity in a city with a daytime population increased every day by over one million workers and visitors.*

TRP make up 89% of Westminster's public open space. Policy CS 11 of the Core Strategy deals specifically with TRP and states:

*Policy CS 11 The Royal Parks*

*The Royal Parks, their settings, views and tranquillity will be protected from inappropriate development and activity. Developments will only be allowed where*
they are essential and ancillary to maintaining or enhancing the value of the park as open space, and that do not harm the park’s:

- Open landscape character
- Heritage value
- Nature conservation value
- Tranquility; or
- Value as a public open space.

The justification for this policy states: ‘Because of their location and role as Central London attractions, the five Royal Parks are all included within the Central Activities Zone. However, there is substantial pressure on these open spaces, and their importance in providing a more tranquil environment and respite from the activity of other parts of the city, needs to be carefully protected.’

Two other key policies in the Core Strategy provide local reinforcement of the policies in the London Plan with respect to heritage and views:

**Policy CS24 Heritage**

Recognising Westminster’s wider historic environment, its extensive heritage assets will be conserved, including its listed buildings, conservation areas, Westminster’s World Heritage Site, its historic parks including five Royal Parks, squares, gardens and other open spaces, their settings, and its archaeological heritage. Historic and other important buildings should be upgraded sensitively, to improve their environmental performance and make them easily accessible.

In addition to the national heritage status of the park (see National Policies and designations above, the park benefits from a number of local heritage designations. The whole of The Regent’s Park lies within the Regent’s Park Conservation Area, which crosses the Westminster/Camden Borough boundary within the park. There are also a number of Conservation Areas adjacent to the park including the Dorset Square Conservation Area and St John’s Wood Conservation Area.

**Policy CS25 Views**

The strategic views will be protected from inappropriate development, including any breaches of the viewing corridors. Similarly, local views, including those of metropolitan significance, will be protected from intrusive or insensitive development. Where important views are adversely affected by large scale development in other boroughs, the council will raise formal objections. Westminster is not generally appropriate for tall buildings.

The Westminster Core Strategy Plan provides local policy protection for the Designated Views described in the London Plan.

**Policy CS34 Open Space quality and connectivity**

Protecting all open spaces, and their quality, heritage and ecological value, tranquillity and amenity. The policy also emphasises the importance of connectivity between areas of open space.

**Policy CS37 Biodiversity**
Biodiversity and green infrastructure will be protected and enhanced throughout Westminster and opportunities to extend and create new wildlife habitat as part of development will be maximised.

In addition to the core strategic policies described in the Core Strategy a number of policies within the former Unitary Development Plan (UDP) are retained. Policies of particular relevance to the management of the park include:

ENV14 Metropolitan open land
ENV17 Nature conservation and biodiversity
DES9 Conservation areas
DES10 Listed buildings
DES11 Scheduled ancient monuments; Areas and sites of archaeological priority and potential
DES12 Parks, gardens and squares
DES13 Canals
DES14 Strategic views
DES15 Metropolitan and local views

Camden Core Strategy (Adopted November 2010)

Policies within the Camden Core Strategy are set out with Core Strategic Policies (CS) supported by Development Policies (DP).

Core Strategy Policy 14 relates to:

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;
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;
c) promoting high quality landscaping and works to streets and public spaces;
d) seeking the highest standards of access in all buildings and places and requiring schemes to be designed to be inclusive and accessible;
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.

Policy DP25 - Conserving Camden’s heritage

Conservation areas
In order to maintain the character of Camden’s conservation areas, the Council will:
a) take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management plans when assessing applications within conservation areas;
b) only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area;
c) prevent the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area where
this harms the character or appearance of the conservation area, unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;  
d) not permit development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character and appearance of that conservation area; and  
e) preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character of a conservation area and which provide a setting for Camden’s architectural heritage.  

Listed buildings  
To preserve or enhance the borough’s listed buildings, the Council will:  
e) prevent the total or substantial demolition of a listed building unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;  
f) only grant consent for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where it considers this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building; and  
g) not permit development that it considers would cause harm to the setting of a listed building.  

Archaeology  
The Council will protect remains of archaeological importance by ensuring acceptable measures are taken to preserve them and their setting, including physical preservation, where appropriate.  

Other heritage assets  
The Council will seek to protect other heritage assets including Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest and London Squares.  

All of Regent’s Park falls within Regent’s Park Conservation Area. Primrose Hill is not included within the area. However, much of the area around the east of Primrose Hill is also designated as the Primrose Hill Conservation Area and to the north and west as the Elsworthy Conservation Area.  

The supporting text to Policy CS14 makes direct reference to the protected views of St Pauls and Westminster described in the London Plan.  

Policy CS15 - Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity makes direct reference to working with TRP and other organisations ‘to protect and improve open spaces and nature conservation in Camden’. The policy also makes direct reference to the preservation and enhancement of The Regent’s Canal.  

Policy DP31 which relates to the protection and improvement of open space reflects the lower open space provision across the Borough and places particular emphasis on identifying opportunities to increase and enhance open space and sports provision across the Borough.  

Open Space and Nature Conservation  
There are three notable areas of Metropolitan Open Land: Area 85 (Primrose Hill Open Space: District open space covering just over 25 ha and listed as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation in the GLA Biodiversity Strategy); Area 91 (Regent’s Park: covering just over 29 ha within Camden) and also Area 124 (Barrow Hill Reservoir: covering 17.7sqm).
Within the historic extent of Regent’s Park there are a number of local Public and Private Open Space designations which correspond to the gardens of the Nash Terraces: Areas 176 (Gloucester Gate); 270 (St Katharine’s Precinct); 152 (Cumberland Terrace); and 144 (Chester Terrace and Cambridge Terrace).
4.0 HISTORIC CONTEXT

4.1 Royal Hunting Forest and Farmland 1539-1811

The land which was to become Regent's Park originated as a tract of the forest of Middlesex within the manors of Tyburn and Rugmore, lying to the north of St. Marylebone village and crossed by the Tyburn Stream. A small mediaeval village known as Rugmore in the Ossulstone Hundred was identified in the Domesday survey but this disappeared sometime between 1251 and 1535. By 1541, Henry VIII had enclosed this land as a hunting ground known as Marylebone (or Marybone) Park which, in common with other emparkment schemes of the era, occupied an approximately circular area, possibly as a consequence of employing the most economical configuration of boundary elements. The park continued to be managed as royal hunting forest by Edward VI, who added a wooden pale and managed the Tyburn Stream to form ponds; and by Mary I; Elizabeth I and (later) James I.

The adjoining land around Primrose Hill was within the manor of Chalcot and was not enclosed within Marylebone Park. This land had been deforested in the early 13th Century under the ownership of the Leper Hospital of St James the Lesser of Westminster. When Henry VI gave the land to Eton College it reverted to meadowland and was used for rough grazing.

During the Civil War many trees in Marylebone Park were felled for fuel and in 1645 Charles I mortgaged the park to pay for armaments. At his death, the park was appropriated by the Commonwealth, which auctioned the land. Despite deforestation the sales survey prepared for Oliver Cromwell indicates that over sixteen thousand trees remained, the principal species including oak, ash, elm, whitethorn and maple. However, following the auction, the new smallholders undertook rapid tree clearance. This was in part to clear land for dairy farming but principally in order to make immediate financial gain from the sale of timber in fear of repossession if the monarchy was restored. In 1660, this became a fact - Charles II was restored to the throne and Marylebone Park was taken back into Royal ownership. In 1668 Marylebone Park was formally disparked.

For over one hundred years following the Restoration the rapidly-growing City of London spread out towards the park. The river terraces in the south of the former park were exploited to provide building material (gravels and clays). The land itself, remained leased as a cluster of farms (Willan's Farm, Mortimer Farm, and Kendall Farm) with refreshment and entertainment venues (The Queen's Head and Artichoke and The Jew's Harp) and a few private residences. The farms became important suppliers of milk and hay to London and eventually became reunited as Marylebone Farm under a single leaseholder - the Duke of Portland (see Figure 5: 1753 Plan of Marylebone Park by James Crew).

By the end of the eighteenth century, the surrounding districts had changed considerably. St Marylebone village had grown to a small town and the New Road (now Marylebone Road) from Islington to Paddington had been laid out along the southern boundary, which now represented the extreme northern outskirts of the growing residential area of the City of London.
The economic potential of land in this situation for the Prince Regent (later King George IV) was recognised by John Fordyce, Surveyor General of Woods and Forests, to be potentially as lucrative as the wealthy Grosvenor and Bedford estates. Consequently, the Duke of Portland’s leases were not renewed upon expiry (in 1803 and 1811 respectively) and the estate reverted back to the Crown.

Meanwhile, in 1794, a development competition was instigated by the Surveyor General. Although land in the south east of Primrose Hill was owned by the Crown, this was excluded from the competition, because of its limited value as a result its rugged terrain and poor drainage. The competition received little interest. Three different development plan options were submitted by John White, Surveyor to the Duke of Portland, the latest in 1809, none of which found favour. Consequently, it
was determined that the Office of Woods, Forests and Land Revenues should submit alternative proposals. Three years later their Surveyors - Thomas Leverton and Thomas Chawner – submitted a conventional ‘urban grid’ masterplan, and their Architect - John Nash, in collaboration with his partner James Morgan - submitted an alternative plan for an ‘estate set in parkland’.

4.2 John Nash and the Picturesque 1811-1832

John Nash’s plan, produced in March 1811, for a private residential estate set in parkland surrounded by palatial inward-facing terraces, was strongly influenced by the work of the eminent landscape designer and protagonist of the picturesque school, Humphry Repton, with whom Nash had worked between 1795 and 1802 (See Figure 6: March 1811 Draft Plan of Regent’s Park by John Nash).

The grand design was that the estate was to be the culmination of a new thoroughfare (Regent Street) leading from the fashionable districts near the Prince’s residence at Carlton House, to Portland Place, a circus already in existence and much admired by Nash.

In this plan the new park was to comprise an extensive framework of streets, squares, crescents and circuses, including a double circus, enclosing compartments of parkland containing villas, each presenting the illusion of being set within extensive private ground, and hence, conforming to Nash’s objective, described in a letter of 1813, of:

“presenting from without one entire Park compleat in unity of character and not assemblage of Villas and Shrubberies like Hampstead, Highgate, Clapham-Common and other purlieus of the Town”.

This was to be, in part, achieved through strategically located dense plantations of native and exotic forest trees (primarily, conifers and broadleaved evergreens with hawthorn and lilac) from which shrubs were expressly excluded. Further formal avenues were proposed to increase the attractiveness of the park (and hence value) which would then be removed and sold as development progressed. Although Nash went on to refine his plans with several variations issued later in 1811, the philosophy of this ‘parkland’ arrangement was described by John Nash in a letter to the Commissioners in 1814:

“in conducting the other Walks and Plantations my object has been to conceal every part of each Walk from any other that the lawn shall wind unbroken and indefinite among the Plantations, I have confined the Trees which are to produce the general effect to the skirts of the Plantations and not scattered them throughout the lawn to avoid spottiness and to give repose and breadth (speaking as a painter) by an expanse of turf.”

A key component of the initial scheme was the proposed interconnected ornamental system of waterways incorporating a decorative river, ornamental lake and large water basin to supply water to the residences, all connected to a commercial canal (The Regent’s Canal), which would link to the Grand Union Canal and provide picturesque views of bridges and passing barge traffic. The canal design was in fact adapted from an earlier scheme proposed by Thomas Homer in 1795 but not carried
out due to lack of funding. A prestigious new location for the Life Guard and Artillery barracks was also proposed.

Figure 6: March 1811 Draft Plan of Regent's Park by John Nash

In August 1811, at the request of the Treasury and Crown Commissioners for a greater semblance of rurality in the scheme, Nash submitted a revised design (See Figure 7: August 1811 Revised Plan of Regent's Park by John Nash).

The key concepts of the original plan were retained including all of the waterway system (albeit assuming a modified layout), the barracks and the double circus. However, the principal changes were the considerable reduction in proposed terraces, the remnants of which were pushed out to the edges of the estate, and the consequent increase in the planned number of large private villas with their accompanying vegetative screens to fifty six. In addition a guinguette or pleasure pavilion for the Prince was proposed, three new market places were added to the south east, and a number of ornamental gardens with restricted access were planned. Only one formal avenue from the earlier proposal remained.

The Treasury sanctioned this plan and construction began in the autumn of 1811 and continued until 1832, with the design continuing to evolve right through the construction period including a reduction in the planned number of villas. By the time building work stopped in 1832 the structure of the landscape had been established, following Nash’s broad concept of a picturesque and composed parkland structured around terraces (some named after the Prince’s brothers), comprising an outer and inner circle, with a serpentine water body and canal. Regent Street had also been built connecting the park with Nash’s other achievements at St James’s Park (1823-
26), Carlton House Terrace (1827-29) and Buckingham Place (1825-) (See Figure 8: 1828 Plan of Regent's Park by Edward Mogg).

Figure 7: August 1811 Revised Plan of Regent’s Park by John Nash

However, many of the detailed aspects of the scheme had been omitted or changed and the disposition of building and structural elements (roads, canal and barracks) were much modified. Only eight of the original proposed fifty-six villas had been constructed - The Holme, St. John’s Lodge, South Villa, Grove House (Nuffield Lodge), Albany Cottage (North Villa/Mosque), Hanover Lodge, St Dunstan’s Villa (Winfield House) and Holford House. One of the villas, The Holme, was owned by James Burton, a wealthy builder who had encouraged his tenth child, the eighteen year old Decimus Burton, to undertake its design, which he had done with such aplomb that Nash took him on and gave him professional architectural training. The proposed guinguette was not built and the terraces were restricted to land beyond the boundary road, called the Outer Circle.

The park lacked formal structure, consisting of large areas of sweeping and interconnected lawns and open grazing land, supporting cattle, sheep and horses; punctuated with a sensitively-sited framework of scattered trees, building site plantations
(comprising either birch/plane, sycamore/oak, larch/Spanish chestnut or ash/beech) selected to provide immediate cover and longer term effect, and framing plantations - intended to screen the villas which had never been constructed. Only one formal avenue of trees (Broad Walk Avenue) was created, leading from Park Square, in the south of the park, to link with the avenue (Chester Road) connecting to the Inner Circle (now reduced to a single circus without the proposed enclosing terraces).

The water network was restricted to the implementation of the ornamental lake and The Regent’s Canal (completed in 1820), the latter being constrained to a narrow route along the northern and eastern boundary. Because the Basin was not constructed an alternative water supply for the houses was required and therefore a reservoir was constructed on Barrow Hill, adjacent to the present summit of Primrose Hill, reducing the height of the hill and, consequently, leaving Primrose Hill as the sole summit.

Figure 8: 1828 Plan of Regent’s Park by Edward Mogg
4.3 Public Access to The Regent’s Park

George IV died in 1830 and The Regency gave way to the Victorian era. Even before completion of the park there had been considerable pressure from the public for access to the parkland and, by 1832, the Outer and Inner Circles of the park were noted in Kidd’s Picturesque Companion as a popular Sunday promenading ground. Despite Nash’s protestation, a private key-holder garden was created along the west of the lake. Ultimately, bowing to the pressure, Nash was asked by the Commissioners to review public access to the park and in response he extended the Broad Walk and avenues northwards thus extending the promenading area; although elsewhere the park became more open due to thinning and species loss. From 1835, the park progressively opened to the public with the more northerly area, including new bridges crossing the Ornamental Water, being opened by 1841.

Within the park early territorial concessions had been made including leases to the Zoological Society in 1828, the Toxophilite Society in 1832 and to the Royal Botanic Society in 1832 (on a site previously leased by Jenkin’s nursery, a supplier of plants to the estate). Thus a range of public facilities for education and instruction were established. In 1841 the Royal Botanic Society Gardens were laid out to a design by Robert Marnock, formerly curator of the Sheffield Botanic Gardens, incorporating a small lake by Marnock and conservatory designed by Decimus Burton. The gardens became the venue for numerous flower shows and other events, many of which were attended by Royalty. The flower shows were most celebrated throughout the reign of Queen Victoria and were held annually from 1839 when the Royal Botanic Society was established. The shows continued until 1932 when the Society dissolved. Decimus Burton was also responsible for much of the design of the Zoological Society grounds at the northern end of the Broad Walk including the Giraffe House.

By 1842 Primrose Hill had been specifically acquired by the Crown for public recreation and decreed public open space, putting an end to various development proposals by Eton College to exploit the increasing residential prestige of the area. It was hoped that this would allay further encroachment upon the seclusion of the wealthy residents of Regent’s Park. A public gymnasium was opened at the foot of the Hill in 1848.

In 1851 the parkland of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill was transferred by means of the Crown Land Act from the management of the Commissioners of Woods, Forests and Land Revenues, Works and Buildings to the Ministry of Works. This stimulated interest and activity and led to further public gains. During the early years, outside of the private and semi-public areas, the park had remained almost entirely unadorned and much of the parkland suffered from considerable winter waterlogging and was considered unsafe. In the 1850’s, to address these problems, the Ministry of Works installed extensive drainage systems, paths and lighting. After this attention turned to improving the ‘public park’, for the first time considered distinct and somewhat detached from the Regency context and inherited historic fabric.

By the 1860s Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill was a popular recreation area and the extended Broad Walk Avenue was a fashionable Victorian promenading ground,
although many of Nash’s avenue trees in the original (southern) section were not growing well. William Andrews Nesfield, a significant garden designer who had created the elaborate palm house parterre at Kew Gardens, was employed to advise and, ultimately, redesign the whole of the lower Broad Walk. His scheme, which became known as the Avenue Gardens, was completed in the summer of 1864 and was executed in formal Italian style with exuberant bedding displays and ornamental vases and tazzas. It was described by the Illustrated London News as ‘one of the most delightful promenades in London’. Subsequently, between 1865 and 1866, his son, Markham Nesfield, redesigned the adjacent English Garden with contrasting gentle landforms, a small water body, and extensive shrubberies (originally known as the Coliseum Gardens due to the adjoining magnificent building of that name).

Later additions to the Broad Walk included lodges, a bandstand (demolished after 1939) and shelter, drinking fountains and numerous seats. Such public amenities continued to be created in response to demand and the public area of Regent’s Park was expanded along the eastern and western sides. Features and amenities began to extend beyond the Broad Walk including ornamental planting around entrances, sports fields (such as cricket greens) centred upon the timber Prince’s Pavilion (1886-1918), and provision of lavatories and refreshment kiosks. The Zoological Gardens were expanded and events began to be staged, including military tattoos. Boating was permitted on the lake and ice-skating was also permitted until forty people drowned when the ice gave way in 1867, which led to the re-profiling and shallowing of the lake. Gifts from wealthy individuals began to adorn the park including the Ready Money drinking fountain on the Broad Walk (1869), donated by Sir Cowasjee-Jehangir, and further fountains from Lady Burdett Coutts and Joseph Durham ARA.

Primrose Hill developed along similar lines, although with a less ‘designed’ or ornamental character and public facilities were increasingly provided. An extensive path network was developed with a lodge, refreshment lodge, drinking fountain and seats. Eton College sold their remaining lands north of the Hill which led to the park becoming surrounded by residential development. During the 1880’s drainage and levelling was carried out, new trees (particularly Black Poplar Avenues) were planted, lighting introduced and wall boundaries constructed to the north and west sides (See Figure 9: 1870 OS First Edition Plan of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill).
4.4 Twentieth Century Consolidation and Change

The twentieth century consolidated the position of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill as a public park with private and semi-private concessions, in contrast to the earlier situation as a private estate with public concessions. Development in this period was incremental and reactive.

The oak paling boundary fence of the Outer and Inner Circles deteriorated and was replaced by iron railing with an arrow head top. Sports became a major land use and
replaced grazing pastures. Sports facilities included ten cricket pitches to the north west side of Primrose Hill, ladies hockey and cricket at Cumberland Green, children’s field sports at Gloucester Green and competitive games areas in the open area around the Prince’s Pavilion. The Prince’s Pavilion was demolished in 1918 and replaced by Bernhard Baron Pavilion, an impressive brick and stone building with clock tower and portico. A new running track was established south of the canal in 1930. Several children’s play areas were also established throughout the parks in the 1930s.

Considerable changes also occurred within the semi-public land. Further extensions to the zoological gardens were approved in 1905. South Villa was leased to Bedford College for Women and was demolished in order to make way for larger premises built in 1930, designed by Basil Champneys.

Elsewhere changes in fashion led to significant modifications. The Nesfield gardens were allowed to relax into a ‘more natural style’. Specimen or open group planting of trees in open ground of the type specifically excluded by Nash proliferated, especially on Primrose Hill.

In the First World War, between 1914 and 1918, the park was requisitioned and much was used as a military camp and drill area. Primrose Hill was used as allotments. Park-wide maintenance was reduced to a minimum. After the war the villas proved too large and expensive to be privately maintained and public institutions took over. St Dusdan’s Lodge was acquired by Barbara Hutton, the Woolworth heiress, who demolished it and built Winfield House which she presented in 1946 to the US government for the use of the American ambassador. Holford House became a Baptist College (1856-1922) and then was left empty. St John’s Lodge was used as a hospital before being incorporated as an annex to Bedford College.

Perhaps even more significant at the time were the respective exits of the Toxophilite Society in 1922 and the Royal Botanic Society in 1932. The grounds vacated by the Toxophilite Society became public tennis courts and included a refreshment lodge. The abandonment of the Inner Circle by the Royal Botanic Society led to a major redesign of the area by Duncan Campbell, the Park’s Superintendent. This included the demolition of Burton’s conservatory. The famous circular rose beds and Open Air Theatre were established. Campbell was assisted in this enterprise by wealthy local artist Sigismund Goetze who also financed many of the new works including the seating and the donation of two sets of ornate iron gilded gates to celebrate King George V and Queen Mary’s jubilee in 1935. Consequently, the area became known as Queen Mary’s Rose Garden and was opened to the public. Goetze also donated a cherry avenue for Chester Road. Further noteworthy creations included the creation of the children’s boating lake near Hanover Gate in 1930 and additional play areas.

The Second World War had a lasting influence on Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill, both directly and indirectly. Between 1939 and 1945 military camps were set up in the parks entailing creation of paths and removal of trees. Areas of the park were cultivated as ‘dig for victory’ allotments, air raid shelters were constructed and iron railings were removed for the war effort. The lookout at Primrose Hill suffered as a result of tree removal to make way for encampments. Considerable areas became affected by bomb damage - including irreparable damage to St Katharine’s Lodge, Holford House and the Bernhard Baron cricket pavilion. Rubble from this damage and the underground workings was used to fill in the east branch of Regent’s Canal and
was spread over the northern area of the park alongside the zoo boundary. Some of the surrounding terraces were also affected and became so dilapidated that they were threatened with demolition. Munster Square, Clarence Gardens and Cumberland Market were eventually sold to St Pancras Borough Council for redevelopment as housing. Denys Lasdun’s 1964 Royal College of Physicians was built on the site of the war-damaged Someries House (formerly Cambridge House) immediately to the south of Cambridge Gate.

During the 1950s public pressure influenced the decision of the Crown Estate Commissioners to restore the Nash terraces, which commenced in 1957. Various plans were drawn up for the former villa sites. Eventually the Holford House site was laid out for tennis courts, a golf school and archery ground and as a maintenance yard for the Royal Parks grounds maintenance (known as the Leaf Yard). The adjoining wooded gardens were fenced off as a bird sanctuary. The St Katharine’s Villa site was not redeveloped.

More incremental changes included alterations to shrub beds and filling in of minor water bodies, including the small reservoir near the Toxopholite Enclosure and the lake in the English Gardens. The tearooms were removed from Primrose Hill and the Inner Circle. Within Queen Mary’s Gardens a new Rose Garden Restaurant was built (formerly the library and members room of the RBS); the Triton fountain (1950), donated in memory of Sigismund Goetze, was erected; and the open-air theatre was upgraded. The Bernhard Baron Pavilion was rebuilt in 1962 to a new ‘modern’ design. Committees advising on birds (The Bird Sanctuaries Committee) and trees (The Tree Committee) were also established.

Between 1966 and 1981 the established uses of the parkland continued and further development sought to maintain the status quo through the repair or replacement of facilities or to respond to increasing tourist growth, e.g. through the addition of numerous benches. Tree planting followed a laissez faire approach of scattered groups in grass, with the exception of a maple avenue across Gloucester Green and a hornbeam avenue across Cumberland Green, which have subsequently been removed. The most significant loss was the loss of the Elm Avenue from the north Boardwalk to Dutch Elm Disease. Further trees (around 400) were lost in the storms of 1987 and 1990.

Change continues, adding new layers of history to the park. The past decade has been characterised by significant restoration works including restoration of the original 1890’s Robert Weir Shultz garden in St John’s Lodge, the Avenue Gardens, works to the English Gardens and restoration of the Ready Money Fountain and its setting. New buildings were constructed including construction of a new Boathouse Café and a centre for the study of wildlife and care of waterfowl. Outside of the park change also continues – including the construction of six villas – Ionic, Veneto, Gothick, Corinthian, Regency and Tuscan Villa - by the Crown Estate on a site between the Canal and the Outer Circle.

The one major built addition to the park in the last ten years has been the construction of the Hub in 2004/05. The Hub provides much improved facilities for outdoor sport in the park and has proved a springboard for increased use and stronger community links through sport.
Management to enhance the wildlife and biodiversity throughout the park is also introducing subtle changes to the character and appearance of parts of the park, with the introduction of less frequently mown meadow grassland and the creation of a small wetland, reedbeds and other areas of marginal planting on the Ornamental Water and the lake in Queen Mary’s Gardens.

4.5 Historical Summary and Significance

The creation of Regent’s Park was largely the work of one man – John Nash – although the park’s expression in the present day has been manipulated by many people since the creation of Regent’s Park between 1811 and 1832 and the addition of Primrose Hill in 1842. Nash’s design realised some of the English dream of ‘rus in urbe’ through an ambitious design that began primarily as an exercise in real estate development to replenish the Prince Regent’s coffers but which, once built, incrementally became the public park it is today. The creation of the adjoining sister park of Primrose Hill, never part of Nash’s original scheme, was a consequence of public pressure for open space – a futile attempt to divert pressure from Regent’s Park in order to retain the private setting of the elite residences there. Over time the park has suffered losses and adaptations but the spirit of Nash’s concepts have carried through to the present day.

Pre-Nash Features
- General shape and area occupied by the parkland largely determined by Marylebone Park, which formed part of the royal chase appropriated by Henry VIII
- Possibility of buried remains of Rugmore beneath London Zoo

Features of the Nash Landscape
- The ‘Nash’ masterplan (1811-?) which established the character and principal features of Regent’s Park
- Nash Terraces surrounding the east, south and west of Regent’s Park
- Framework of roads: The Outer Circle and Chester Road/Inner Circle
- The Ornamental Water as a design centrepiece
- The Regent’s Canal (branch of the Grand Union Canal)
- The Broad Walk formal tree-lined venue
- Surviving alignment of path on Cumberland Green
- London Zoo (Royal Zoological Society Grounds)
- Nash Villas within the parkland setting of which four (St John’s Lodge, The Holme, Grove House and Hanover Lodge) and three gate lodges remain

Post-Nash Additions
- Queen Mary’s Gardens including Jubilee and Chester Road gates and statues
- Avenue Gardens (recently refurbished)
- English Gardens
- Ready Money Fountain on Broad Walk
- London Central Mosque
• Addition of Primrose Hill to the area of the park
• Sporting facilities including playing fields, outdoor gym, tennis courts, and pavilions
• Recreational amenities including children’s playgrounds, toilets, cafes
• Recreational path network
• Framework of trees
• Part backfilling to lake to only 1.5m depth after 1860’s drowning disasters. (type of fill unknown)

Lost Features
• Nash Villas including: South Villa (replaced by Regent’s College); St Dunstan’s Villa (replaced with Winfield House), Holford House and Albany Cottage (North Villa – replaced by London Central Mosque)
• The Colosseum- lost from the Outer Circle - was demolished around 1874 and replaced by the residential property Cambridge Gate (in 1964).
• Nash marketplaces and streets to the east of the park and replacement with modern flats
• The Decimus Burton & Richard Turner Conservatory (Queen Mary’s Gardens)
• Lodge ‘ornaments’ from Broad Walk South, junction with Chester Road
• Broad Walk teahouse
• The Archers Lodge and members rooms in Toxophilite enclosure
• Lodges from Queen Mary’s Gardens
• St Katharine’s Lodge
• Golf & Tennis School

Additional Features
• These have been recorded in an artefact survey 2012 which provides a snapshot of all the smaller features in the parks such as litter bins, benches, drinking fountains and signs.
PART 2: DESCRIPTION, USE AND CHARACTER

5.0 PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

Figure 10: Physical Context for The Regent's Park and Primrose Hill

5.1 Geology

A thick layer of London Clay of up to 81m (267 ft) is the dominant influence on the character of the ground conditions across the park. This clay is underlain by thick chalk bedrock, itself overlain by the Thanet Sand Formation (a fine grained sand) and the Lambeth Group comprising the Reading and Woolwich Beds (a mottled clay with sand and pebble beds). At the southern edge of the park there is some variation
where the clay is overlain by the Lynch Hill gravel (a member of the Thames Valley River Terrace deposits) and the Langley Silt ‘Brickearth’.

5.2 Topography

The park lies within the valley of the River Thames. The Regent’s Park is naturally fairly flat to gently shelving providing wide-open spaces and emphasising the relationship of the park to the surrounding buildings, including the Nash Terraces. The landform falls gently away from a slight ridge, followed approximately by the formal alignment of the Broad Walk and culminating at around 42m AOD near the Ready Money Fountain, to its lowest point in the south of the park, near Marylebone Road (30m AOD) and around the boating lake at below 25m AOD. Within this context there are localised undulations and variations, generally caused by ground disturbance as a result of war-time bombing and infill of bomb rubble, for example around the former site of St Katharine’s Lodge. Additionally, the gentle nature of the topography permitted the creation of the grand centrepiece of Nash’s scheme (the Ornamental Water), which sits naturally within its landscape context, subtly incising the landform to the north.

In contrast to Regent’s Park, Primrose Hill is a ‘hill’ in the true sense, rising from below 40m to over 65m AOD exhibiting a steep, fairly regular, conical landform, with important and dramatic views from the summit to the Thames valley beyond (discussed fully in ‘Landscape Character’ section) in part emphasised by the deposition of excavated material taken from the adjacent Barrow Reservoir Site.

5.3 Soils

The influences of the underlying London Blue Clay geology are apparent in the soils, which are consequently stiff and difficult to work. In particular the clay substrate suffers from wide variations in moisture-retention: being waterlogged and muddy in winter and dry and cracked in dry summer months. These conditions were manifest as early as 1552 when there are records of problems with flooding leading to the digging of trenches to carry water from the Tyburn River into prepared ponds. There is also evidence of the influence of the poor drainage conditions on the success of tree planting forming part of the original Nash design. Over the years these problems have been compounded by the infilling of World War 2 bomb rubble over large areas of the park and soil compaction due to emplacement of facilities during WW1 and WW2. Whilst soil conditions continue to pose problems in some areas of the park, soil amelioration within the garden areas, construction of drainage systems and significant investment in sand ameliorated soils used in the renovation of sports pitches have led to notable improvements in ground conditions elsewhere. More recently these poorer drainage conditions have been exploited as part of habitat creation schemes, for instance in the Wetland Pen.

5.4 Hydrology, Drainage and Conduits

In response to the problems created by the clay substrate, trenches were constructed leading to the formation of a network of ponds linked by the Tyburn and tributaries, which survived throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Nash’s scheme replaced this by draining surface water into the large artificial ornamental lake. The construction of The Regent’s Canal led to the need for the Tyburn to be carried via an aqueduct over the canal between Primrose Hill and
Regent’s Park. This is thought to be the pipe located near Charlbert Street Bridge. It is also thought that the ‘iron mushroom’ within the ornamental water is an overflow for the culverted watercourse. However, in contemporary times, and certainly since excavations in Marylebone Lane in 1957, the Tyburn is little more than a ‘muddy trickle’ (Barton, 1983).

The problem of drying and cracking has been partially resolved in the most vulnerable areas i.e. the horticultural display areas such as the Avenue Gardens, Queen Mary’s Gardens, St John’s Lodge Garden and newly improved turf, by the installation of automatic irrigation systems.

5.5 Water

There are a number of water bodies in the park, created by Nash or by later schemes for the ornamentation of the park and/or in response to practical drainage issues. Both of the lakes have been subject to biannual water quality monitoring which takes place in April and August and provide an assessment of each under the following criteria; visual assessment, water quality, sediment, phytoplankton, zooplankton, benthic invertebrates. The assessment provides valuable recommendations for the management of these water bodies. As the results and recommendations were consistent, the programme has been replaced with a project to assess the alternatives for remediation.

The principal water body is the Ornamental Water or Boating Lake. This large tripartite lake takes its form from the original two small tributary streams which historically merged along the west of the park to form the Tyburn River. The lake bed was originally very varied and up to 4.0m depth but was levelled for safety reasons following the skating disaster in 1867. Currently the lake is generally 0.9m – 1.5m deep although in one location depth is up to 2.7m. The lake suffers from excessive silt problems in some areas due to runoff, drainage discharge and leaf detritus. Recent estimates state that up to 10,000m3 of silt are currently present, significantly its removal would increase the volume of water present by one third. Particular silt accumulation problems are in the stiller waters at the extremity of the lake’s ‘arms’. Some silt removal has occurred which has improved water clarity but this remains a recurring problem. There is currently no long term dredging programme and current aeration practices (diffusion aeration floating pumps) whilst adequate are not optimised. The shape of the Ornamental Water means that there are a number of ‘dead areas’ with little or no flow which inevitably leads to a degree of stagnation. Principal management issues highlighted in the biannual water quality monitoring reports include poor aesthetic condition of lake margins in some areas, dense blue-green algal blooms, high nutrient status, low density of marginal vegetation, impoverished invertebrate fauna, and some invasive species.

New reedbeds and other areas of marginal planting have been created and will be further extended as a means of both enhancing water quality, biodiversity and the appearance of the lake.

The lake created by the Royal Botanic Society within Queen Mary’s Gardens has suffered from low quality and poor clarity, being visibly green with algae in summer months for many years. In 2011 work commenced on a project to enhance the water quality, biodiversity and appearance of the lake. The lake was drained down, de-silted and the fish were permanently removed. The silt has been used to create planting
beds for reedbeds and other areas of marginal planting. A new board walk enables visitors to walk across the northern section of the lake, through the main reed bed.

The Grand Union Canal (Regent’s Canal Branch) is run by The Canal & River Trust. However, it is an important feature of the historic environment and contributes to public enjoyment of the park.

The principal water supply to the park is now a borehole which supplies a number of the toilet blocks, sports and garden irrigation and is a source of water for the Ornamental Water and the Queen Mary’s Gardens Lake. This supply reduces dependence upon mains supply with a reduction in costs and provides a consistent and constant supply. Benefits for the main lake include cool water supply to counteract botulism and algal blooms. With improved storage more efficient use could be made of the borehole supply.

Management Issues: Physical Context

- History of parkland development has made some problematic impacts on soil; other interventions have resulted in some improvements to soil quality and usability
- Presence of the ‘lost’ River Tyburn beneath the park needs consideration during works
- Visual and biodiversity attractiveness of the lakes is challenged by limitations of the original design and inherited changes of water levels
- Maintenance demands of the Ornamental Water centrepiece
- Lakes provide increasingly important habitat interest and contribute to London wide and local BAPs, but poor water quality is a matter of critical concern
- Poor soils, much made up ground
6.0 NATURAL FABRIC

Figure 11: Natural Fabric

This section describes the different ‘living’ components that make up the essential character of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill – the grass, trees, woodland and horticultural display areas. It seeks to describe how these are important to the physical appearance of the park for visitors and to determine any other contributions that these make, such as wildlife habitat value or historical value.
6.1 Trees and Woodland

Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill have a high number of trees; a total of 5,037 individual specimens are recorded on the Park Tree Survey and Management System. There are relatively few blocks which could be classified as woodland, the main areas being the embankments to The Regent’s Canal and a small area in the north of Regent’s Park known as Leafyard Wood.

In 2005 TRP adopted a Tree Risk Management Policy approach across all parks. Under this system a zoning approach to risk, inspections and management has been adopted across all The Royal Parks. The Zoning Plan for Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill is included as Figure 12. in this Management Plan. Inspections are carried out by TRP Arboricultural Team with consultant support.

The majority of trees within the park are relatively young, being predominantly under 50 years old with some between 50 and 100 years old. It is not thought that there are any ancient trees within the park and it is unlikely that anymore than a handful of the current trees are remnants of the original Nash planting. This may be partly attributable to the unfavourable soil conditions and consequent susceptibility to disease.

There has been a significant increase in both the geographical range and occurrence of a range of pests and diseases affecting trees throughout London and within the Royal Parks. Of particular concern is the recent spread of Massaria, which affects London Planes, Acute Oak Decline, Oak Processionary Moth, Ash dieback, Horse chestnut bleeding canker, amongst others. The spread of these pests and diseases has immediate implications for safety and the frequency and level of inspections and, in the longer term, planning for tree succession.

The structure of tree planting in the park is generally fairly informal with few elements of the formal axial geometric distribution common to other Inner London Royal Parks, such as Kensington Gardens. The major tree in the original plantings was elm but many elms were lost from the park in the 1970s and 80s (particularly 1979-1981) to Dutch elm disease. There were also many trees lost in the storms of 1987 and 1991.

Within this informal framework there are a variety of subtle characteristic groupings which include:

- **One principal formal avenue** – the Broad Walk – based upon an earlier (extended) avenue designed by Nash, which, in the central section, contains an uneven age and species structure of elm, oak, alder, horse chestnut and other species arranged in five double rows

- **An avenue of cherries** donated by Sigismund Goetze along Chester Road

- **Larger forest tree species**, principally of London plane park boundary and perimeter planting of private enclosures, areas of which affect views of the historic buildings

- **Isolated clumps of small ornamental trees**, such as the hawthorns on Primrose Hill
Dividing clumps of oak trees and other large forest trees in open 'parkland' in the style of Nash (however few broadleaved evergreens, lilacs or conifers which were also part of his preferred planting groups)

Informal parkland planting of native and ornamental species including weeping willow and conifer amongst shrubberies, such as in the English Gardens or Queen Mary’s Gardens

Boundary hedges: there is an estimated 6,300m of boundary hedge in the park. This is predominantly hawthorn, slightly gappy in parts, which surrounds the Outer Circle and shorter stretches of Privet

Island and bankside planting, principally of alder and willow on the Ornamental Water

Dense bankside planting or ‘thicket’ along the canal slips comprising suckering elm and larger trees but affected by shrubbing-up with self-sown sycamore and ash which is being managed with a regular coppicing programme

Small area of woodland in the vicinity of the Leafyard
Figure 12: The Regent's Park and Primrose Hill Tree Risk Zoning Plan

Zone 1. High occupancy – annual inspections
Zone 2. Moderate occupancy – biennial
Zone 3. Low occupancy – 5 yearly
Zone 4. Non accessible to public
6.2 Grassland

There are some 104ha of grassland in Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill, which are managed to create a varied character and appearance and to suit differing aims, objectives and levels of use:

**Fine lawn** – located in more formal areas of ‘ornamental’ character comprising Queen Mary’s Gardens, St John’s Lodge Garden and the Avenue Gardens. In some of these areas, such as Queen Mary’s Gardens the lawn is not of the highest quality because of compaction and impeded drainage

**Informal general amenity grassland** located throughout the park creating a fairly uniform, pleasant but uninspiring texture, for example along the boundaries of the managed sports areas including the ‘Greens’. In some places, such as along the Board walk, this is of low visual quality due to erosion caused by visitors and shading by trees. Some areas of general amenity grass surrounding the Ornamental Lake are maintained naturally short by the grazing action by geese and other ducks and suffers from over-grazing, fouling and puddling.

**Amenity sports turf** – this covers approximately 15ha and includes the majority of the north of Regent’s Park and Cumberland Green to the East. The areas are intensively used through managed bookings and also suffer occasional overuse from unmanaged/non-booked games. There has been significant investment in soil and turf amelioration with improvements to drainage. There has been a significant improvement in the quality, resilience and performance of the sward as a result of these works.

**Meadowland areas** – Managed meadow and long grass areas exist in a number of locations including 11ha forming the perimeter to the sports pitches, the East Wing Meadow (former Golf and Tennis school enclosure), Longbridge Sanctuary, and areas around the Primrose Hill Summit and the park perimeters, in particular in the north west section. Management regimes are structured where possible to provide spring and summer flowering meadows with the timing of cuts adjusted to suit particular meadow species present. Regimes also vary from areas cut two to three times a year to annual meadow cuts, two and three yearly cuts and some areas left unmown. In areas such as the East Wing Meadow Garden, a grassland mosaic is being created through the management of small compartments on different regimes.

6.3 Horticultural Display Areas

Horticultural areas are an important characteristic of Regent’s Park with over 15,000 rose bushes in the park and around 184,000 bulbs planted each year. In addition to the visual delight the displays provide these also supply an invaluable nectar source for invertebrates. Horticultural areas are located in a number of discrete and well-defined locations with strong individual characters (explored further in Chapter 9) found, predominantly, clustered in the southern/central area of the park around the
Inner Circle. These areas have a strong historic character and horticultural pedigree being associated with the Royal Botanic Society, Marnock, Robinson and the Nesfields.

**The Avenue Gardens**, located at the southern end of the Broad Walk, are the Italianate Victorian bedding showcase of the park. Designed by the significant Victorian garden designer William Andrews Nesfield and completed in 1864 the gardens were restored to their original splendour between 1993 and 1996, mainly conforming to their original footprint, and are much admired for their exuberant intricate bulb/bedding displays, Victorian borders with the addition of water fountains introduced by David Castleton, ornamental fountains and ornamental urns, all of which require a very high level of horticultural and engineering maintenance.

**The English Gardens**, located adjacent to the Avenue Gardens, were designed by Markham Nesfield (William’s son) and completed in 1866. The more relaxed character of these contrasts with the formal qualities of the Avenue Gardens. The gardens comprise informal shrubberies of nineteenth century origin rolling amongst a topography of raised mounds and with a good range of specimen trees. Large parts of the English Gardens have been renovated through new planting, improved pruning and general horticultural maintenance ensuring that the integrity of the Nesfield design is maintained.

**Queen Mary’s Gardens**, located within the Inner Circle, this area originated as the Royal Botanic Society’s garden, which was designed in the 1840s around a conservatory by Decimus Burton and Richard Turner. This was substantially revised to its current form in the 1930s by the first Superintendent Duncan Campbell, with design and financial support from the local artist Sigismund Goetz, and included the dismantling of Burton’s Conservatory. Later additions have also been made and today Queen Mary’s Gardens is famed for its rose gardens and its variety, including the ‘begonia’ garden, Mediterranean borders, alpine island and national collection of Delphiniums. Recent plantings of herbaceous perennials have also introduced a planting style and character which contrasts with the more formal style of the gardens.

**St John’s Lodge Garden**. This small recently-restored (1994) ‘secret’ garden, designed by Weir Shultz in 1888, was once part of St John’s Lodge but has been separated and opened to the public. It comprises a number of garden rooms framed with hedges, pleached lime trees and well maintained turf which provide structure and formality which acts as a foil/framework for the relaxed and informal planting which includes perennial and mixed borders, shrubs and some seasonal bedding. A number of pieces of statuary are present. It is a tranquil and peaceful space.

**Park Entrances (including Hanover Gate, Charlbert Street Gate, Holme Green Gate and Clarence Gate)**. There are horticultural beds and shrubberies around the entrances into the park. These include horticultural themes not found elsewhere, such as plantings for seasonal interest (e.g. ericaceous plants).
**Ready Money Drinking Fountain.** The planting borders around the Ready Money Fountain have recently been redesigned (1999-2001) in conjunction with HLF funded restoration of the fountain using a range of perennial plants and shrubs, which provide an appropriate setting for the fountain.

**Primrose Hill Shrubbery.** The shrubbery on the western edge of Primrose Hill is undergoing re-planting which will introduce a greater variety of flowering shrubs.

There are some significant horticultural areas within the private enclosures such as Winfield House, The Holme and Regent's College. As these are outside the direct control of The Royal Parks they are not described here.

### 6.4 Ecology and Wildlife

The park, along with the other central London Royal Parks, is of huge importance to the biodiversity of the Capital. A total of 102 hectares is designated as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation, with the bird fauna and mosaic of parkland habitats highlighted as of particular importance. In addition to the range of habitats and species supported, TRP also provides opportunities for education and involvement of the local community in habitat management.

A full Phase I Species and Habitats, NVC Vegetation Communities and Epithytic Bryophytes survey was carried out by the London Wildlife Trust on behalf of TRP in 2008. The survey provides an assessment of the types and extent of vegetation habitats throughout the park as described in the GLA Open Space survey for Greater London Methodology. Figure 13 shows the Phase I Habitat Survey for the park and Figure 14 the NVC Vegetation Communities and Biological Survey Compartments for the park. The survey includes recommendations in support of maintaining and improving current levels of biodiversity interest within the park. A number of other specialist surveys have been commissioned and carried out by TRP staff and volunteers. Data and records from the surveys are supplied to GiGL and as updates to the Westminster and Camden BAPs through the national Biodiversity Action Reporting System (BARS).

There are a number of resources for learning and management in the park. The Nature Study Centre located at the northern end of the Ornamental Water, includes an office and a very small classroom, was formerly the waterfowl collection breeding centre, but this programme has now ceased, following sudden cuts to funding. There is now only a single Wildlife Officer dedicated to the park, although all the Royal Parks benefit from the support and involvement of TRP Ecology Unit.

‘Artificial Lighting: a Position Statement by The Royal Parks regarding its Ecological Effects and Implications for Planning Authorities’ (2009) sets out TRP’s position with regard to developments which will introduce new lighting within or adjacent to parks, with particular regard to conservation and the effects of lighting on wildlife in the parks.
Biodiversity Action Plans

The park contributes directly to the Westminster Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) (latest edition launched in January 2008) and within this has targeted actions for both habitat (HAP’s) and species action plans (SAP’s). The principal habitat action plans in the Westminster BAP are listed below with examples of where Regent’s Park contributes.

Parks and Green Spaces

*Meadow grassland* – diverse grasslands exist in an number of locations where a relaxation of the mowing regimes and in some cases plug planting and sowing wild flower seed mixes have increased both numbers of flowering plants and structural diversity as well as providing nectar sources and refuges for invertebrates.

*Acid grassland and species-poor, amenity grassland* – these continue to be of value for habitats and for small birds.

Standing Open Water

*Waterways, Wetlands and Waters Edge* – a wide variety of native and non-native birds are supported and the park boasts a heronry and bird sanctuary area. Improved management of water quality and new reedbeds and other marginal planting is enhancing the wildlife value of the waterbodies in the park. In addition to open water, wetland and marsh habitats have been created in the Wetland pen and new meadow gardens.

The Built Environment

*Vertical habitats* including trees and buildings

Veteran Trees and Decaying Wood

*Trees and Woodland* - Two significant areas of woodland are located within the park being the Leafyard Wood and alongside Regent’s Canal. Both are of great conservation interest supporting Tawny Owl and Stag Beetle populations. There are relatively few Veteran Trees within the park. Standing and fallen dead timber is left in situ where safe and appropriate to provide invertebrate habitat.

Acid grassland on Primrose Hill makes a contribution to the UK and London (regional) BAP targets for lowland dry acid grassland conservation. Management is subject to constant review with a decrease in mowing more frequently noted as the best approach to conserve and extend the area of this important grassland type.

Brownfield habitat exists at the site of the former golf and tennis school and provides a unique ecological site given its setting in the context of Regent’s Park. Management includes delineation of an area as a refuge with restricted public access. The rubble will be managed with cyclical disturbance so as to promote ruderal species and to arrest proliferation of less valuable succession species.
With regard to priority species, the following UK, London or Westminster BAP species are known (or have been known) in Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill:

**Birds:**

*House Sparrow*: Breeding in ZSL with a population of about 80 birds.

*Heron*: Breeding resident with 29 nesting pairs recorded in 2009.

*Tawny Owl*: 2 pairs breeding in 2009 at Queen Mary’s Gardens and the Holford Sanctuary/Leafyard Wood

**Invertebrates:**

*Holly Blue*: Probably breeding.


*Small skipper*: Small colony known (1990s).

*Common Darter Dragonfly.*

**Dragonflies and Damselflies.**

**Mammals:**

*Bats*: Several species of bat have been recorded.

*Hedgehogs*: Regent’s Park is the only central London park to support a hedgehog population. 45 hedgehogs have been found over an area of 160 ha in a survey led by Dr Nigel Reese and Professor John Gurnell from Queen Mary University of London.

**Plants:**

Surveys (2008) have recorded 26 notable plant species for London

**Native Trees and Shrubs**: The park supports a wide range of native trees and shrubs in the woodlands, as specimen trees and in areas of scrub and hedges.
**Management Issues: Natural Fabric**

- Presence of a mosaic of habitats with high potential for further actions towards ecological enhancement and species habitat
- Develop habitat recommendations resulting from the hedgehog survey; share best practice with other parks
- Large and species diverse tree resource of a variety of ages including over 6,000 individual trees requires intensive arboricultural attention
- Mosaic of different grassland habitats providing appropriate surfaces for activities and creating visual contrast requires knowledgeable and attentive application of different maintenance regimes
- Legacy of Victorian high horticulture in Regent’s Park including eminent horticulturalists such as Marnock, Robinson and the Nesfields bears high maintenance demands
- Attractive and diverse horticultural areas concentrated in a few key locations (Avenue Gardens, English Gardens, St John’s Lodge Garden, Queen Mary’s Gardens and park entrances) maintained to a high standard and including colourful bedding and shrubberies
- One of the largest and most important parks in Central London for wildlife designated as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and supporting numerous key habitats and species, including an important breeding wildfowl and hedgehog populations
- Exotic waterfowl collection for much of the 20th and early 21st century an important element of the park’s identity to be maintained without a breeding programme
- Poor water quality in The Ornamental Water will require a major investment to remediate
Figure 13: 2008 Phase 1 Habitat Survey
Regents Park and Primrose Hill
NVC Habitat Survey (2008)

Figure 14: NVC Communities and Survey Compartments

KEY: GRASSLAND COMMUNITY TYPE
MG7e: Lolium perenne leys and related grasslands, Lolium perenne- Plantago lanceolata grassland
MG11a: Festuca rubra – Agrostis stolonifera – Potentilla anserina grassland, Lolium perenne sub-community
OV23a Lolium perenne – Dactylis glomerata community, typical sub-community
OV25a: Urtica dioica- Cirsium arvensis community, Holcus lanata- Poa annua sub-community
OV26e: Epilobium hirsutum community, Urtica dioica-Cirsium arvense sub-community
UI: Festuca ovina – Agrostis capillaries – Rumex acetosella grassland
UIE: Festuca ovina – Agrostis capillaries – Rumex acetosella grassland, Hveochoeris radicata sub-community

Figure 14: NVC Communities and Survey Compartments
7.0 BUILDINGS AND HARD LANDSCAPE FABRIC

Figure 15: Buildings and Hard Landscape Fabric
7.1 Buildings and Structures

Buildings are an integral part of the landscape of Regent’s Park and, to a lesser extent, Primrose Hill. As already described the ‘park’ landscape is largely created by the interaction between the green spaces and the Nash Villas and the interface with the surrounding Nash Terraces. Thus, the importance of these buildings whether in the control of TRP or other bodies is hard to overstate. This is recognised in the listed building status of many of these buildings as important architectural features in their own right and, significantly, the inclusion of the built area outside the ‘park’ boundaries in the English Heritage listed landscape. However, it is not just the early nineteenth century buildings which are important: the legacy of later built features which have collectively supported nearly two centuries of public use are also important, ranging from the cafés and toilets to the paths and benches.

This section describes only those buildings and facilities that lie within The Royal Parks controlled land including (with the exception of the London Zoo Compound) those currently subject to licenses. Those lying outside of this area, notably including the Nash Villas and Terraces, which are managed by the Crown Estate, are described more fully in Chapter 9.

Early Nineteenth Century Buildings

Gloucester Gate Lodge (c.1827): This Grade II listed building is a small two storey designed to imitate masonry with a Doric entablature and pair of pediments fronting the slate roof. It is currently used as a private residence.

Clarence Gate Lodge (1820-21): This is the oldest lodge in the park, listed Grade II. Designed by Nash, it is a single storey building of white stucco with three elegantly arched side windows. A later brick extension has been added. Recently refurbished, it is currently used as a staff residence.

Hanover Gate Lodge (1828): This is a small square Grade II building with an octagonal upper storey, which was probably designed by Nash. It is executed in white stucco with big consoles and swags. It is currently used as a staff residence. The presence of the nearby mosque and the loss of the main gates have marginalised its relationship and legibility within the parkland context.

Mid-Late Nineteenth Century Buildings

Bandstand: This elegant structure is in good repair and was brought to its current site from Richmond in the 1970s.

York Bridge Pavilion (Archers Lodge) (c. 1930): This building is a single storey white-painted mock-Tudor construction with dark timbers. It is in good repair and is currently used as a café and pavilion for the Tennis Centre.

Primrose Hill Lodge (c.1860): This is an attractive one and a half storey ‘Victorian’ red brick building with high chimneys, painted stone dressings and mullioned windows. It occupies an important position at the gateway to Primrose Hill, although does not seem to command its setting. It is currently used as a staff residence.
New Lodge (Park Superintendent’s Lodge) (1879): This simple but attractive brick built lodge with tile-hanging and white painted windows is located on the Outer Circle. It remains in use as the residence of the Park Manager.

Broad Walk Refreshment Lodge (c.1850): Located at the south end of the Broad Walk this is a picturesque little brick building of gothic character with attractive bargeboards. It is currently used as a refreshment kiosk. This was once one of a pair in this location.

Broad Walk Café (1913): This is a sizable black-and-white building that replaced an earlier café (1879) in the same location. It remains in use as a café.

Broad Walk Shelter (1913): This rusticated octagonal shelter with dark painted ‘natural’ timber uprights was built at the same time as Broad Walk Café and is located off of the Broad Walk between the refreshment lodge and the Broad Walk Café.

Nursery Lodge (Gardeners Cottage c.1840): Originating as part of the Marnock scheme for the gardens it is considered that this simple brick built lodge may have been designed by Decimus Burton. It is in reasonable repair, although its surrounding landscape is poor. It remains in use for staff housing.

Early-mid Twentieth Century Buildings

Storeyard Complex (1920s with more recent additions): The storeyard complex located on the Inner Circle comprises brick single storey buildings, including TRP Information Office with attached offices for the park management team; the former St Dunstan’s (and English Heritage) workshops; Capel Manor College; the office for The Regent’s Park MPS team; TRP’s deckchair concessionaire. Beyond this, there are glasshouses, currently used as a holding area, and a number of low quality buildings used by the grounds maintenance contractor and hardworks contractor. The Allotment Garden is also located here.

Playground Attendant’s Rooms and Toilets: each of the four children’s play areas located on Marylebone Green, Gloucester Green, at Hanover Gate and at the south of Primrose Hill have a playground attendant’s office and toilets, which, with the exception of Primrose Hill are not open to the general public. Other toilets facilities are located behind the Broad Walk Kiosk, in the various cafés, at The Hub and in Queen Mary’s Gardens. These have recently been refurbished.

Late Twentieth Century Buildings

Queen Mary’s Gardens Restaurant (The Regent’s Bar and Kitchen) (1965): This building was constructed on the site of the RBS museum. It is a ‘modern’ building distinguished by its multitude of honeycomb-design roofs.

Queen Mary’s Gardens Workshops (c.1970): These brick-built architecturally simple functional buildings are now in a semi-derelict state with visible cracks. They remain partially in use for storage. Shared use toilets (Capel
Manor college/TRP/grounds maintenance contractors were renovated in 2009. Additionally Capel Manor College have erected a Studio comprising 3 classrooms for teaching horticultural courses within the park. This is a single storey timber clad modular building which cannot be fully viewed from the inner circle.

**Open Air Theatre and Box Office** (c. 1932 with recent additions): The Open Air Theatre has undergone a major improvement with a new Box Office building being constructed at the entrance from Queen Mary’s Gardens, refurbishment of the auditorium, changing rooms and catering and construction of new toilets and offices.

**Gloucester Gate Lodges 1 and 2** (1960s): A pair of fairly bland brick and timber clad houses, which are located adjacent to Gloucester Gate Lodge and are highly visible from the Outer Circle. These appear somewhat incongruous and detract from the Regency character of the adjacent nineteenth century lodge. These remain in use for staff housing.

**St Marks Bridge Lodges 1 and 2** (1960s): These two houses were built contemporaneously with the Gloucester Gate housing and, similarly, detract from the parkland setting blocking visual linkages at the northern edge of Regent’s Park. One remains in use for staff residence, the other as a private residence.

**Nature Study and Waterfowl Care Centre** (1992): John Hackworth designed this redbrick centre in the style of a Victorian park building. It was used as an education centre and for rearing chicks to maintain the park’s kept waterfowl collection, and to supply waterfowl across TRP’s estate, but following funding cuts requires sponsorship if it is to continue to function.

**Boathouse Café** (opened 2000): Located on the north west shore of the Ornamental Water near Hanover Island which houses a café as well as serving as a boathouse (replacing earlier boating functions). It is attractive, painted green and sits well within its landscape context, which incorporated mature willows already on the site.

**Avenue Gardens Shelter** (1996): This small ‘pavilion’ located at the North end of the Broad Walk was designed by Nightingale Associates as part of the Avenue Gardens restoration scheme. It is constructed in the spirit of traditional Victorian garden buildings using traditional materials including a copper-panelled roof and gilded finials.

**Pumping Stations/pumphouses:** there are eight pumping stations in the park. One owned by Thames Water near St Mark’s Bridge and four operated by TRP in the Avenue Gardens (to operate the fountains and irrigation), in Queen Mary’s Gardens (to operate the cascade), the Leaf Yard for sports irrigation, QMG Yard for QMG irrigation, Saint John’s Lodge irrigation - pump house in nursery, Community Wildlife Garden Cascade pumps station adjacent to York Bridge, waterside irrigation adjacent to college facing bandstand. These are functional structures, which are screened from public view to the greatest extent possible.
The Hub – Sports and Community Hub. The Hub was opened in 2005 and is the largest central London outdoor venue for sport. It is located at the heart of the sports pitches. This modern building is set on a low circular mound which houses changing facilities for 290 people beneath a grassed mound.

‘Will to Win’ Tennis Centre: The proposals to convert the former toilet block on York Road to a combined toilet, refreshments and treatment area, which would be for use by users of the ‘Will to Win’ tennis courts was refused planning permission.

Other refreshment kiosks (temporary): There are a number of temporary kiosks used for vending light refreshments throughout the spring and summer.

Management Issues: Buildings and Structures

- The setting of most of the early nineteenth century buildings and some of the good quality late nineteenth century buildings has been compromised by the location of later buildings and/or the impact of landscaping.
- There is a need to achieve better assimilation of some buildings of poor visual, structural and/or architectural quality such as the Queen Mary’s Gardens Workshops and Storeyard grounds maintenance buildings.
- The presence of buildings that are unused or under-utilised including the former St Dunstan’s Workshops; the Stable Block and Storeyard Glasshouses.
- There is a need to agree a long term strategy to ensure adequate toilet facilities remain available and accessible.
- Many of the buildings that are critical to the character of Regent’s Park lie outside the control of The Royal Parks.

7.2 Boundary Treatments and Entrances

The quality of the boundary treatment and entrances into Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill are very important because they create an impression of the quality of the park from the wider landscape and also create the important ‘first impression’ for people entering the park for the first time or crossing between The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill.

Boundary Treatments

Most of the park and enclosures within Regent’s Park are surrounded by formal boundaries such as rails or fence treatments, sometimes in combination with hedges or other impenetrable vegetation (as described in the chapter on ‘Natural Fabric’). The Outer Circle, which would originally have comprised an oak pale is reinforced with a chain link mesh fence which is of low quality, but for most of the year is hidden by the hedgerow. The Inner Circle is defined by a relatively low iron railing, painted invisible green, (nearly black) again sometimes supplemented with hedge and boundary planting. The painted iron railings also define the eastern boundary of Primrose Hill. However, the remainder of the park is defined by the interface with the adjoining properties including walls and fences thus creating a less unified and
satisfactory edge. Responsibilities for maintenance rests with Eton College and individual householders.

Gates

There are over 20 separate entranceways into Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill allowing relative ease of access to any part of the park. Regent’s Park is locked at night and a spear-top style gate serves each entrance. These gates are well maintained but of a fairly municipal quality which in the daytime fail to create the appropriate sense of entrance into and arrival at the park. In contrast, there are two magnificent sets of gates donated by Sigismund Goetze which make very grand entrances into Queen Mary’s Gardens:

Chester Road Gates (1932): Grand iron and gilded gates at the Chester Road entrance to the garden donated by Sigismund Goetze.

Jubilee Gates (1935): Grand iron and gilded semi-circular gates at the (main) York Bridge entrance to the garden which were donated by Sigismund Goetze to commemorate the Silver Jubilee and opening of Queen Mary’s Gardens.

Management Issues: Boundary Treatments and Entrances

- Some of the principal entrances to the Park, for instance from Portland Place fail to create the required sense of entry.
- Some missing gates and poorly proportioned entrances to Primrose Hill creating a neglected appearance.
- Strategic maintenance of boundary treatments and entrances is necessary to prevent costly replacement due to lack of repair and painting regimes.
- Boundary areas of Primrose Hill in part dependent upon the maintenance, upkeep and personal choice of adjoining residents.
- Structural maintenance needed on all bridges.
- Signage at entrances, currently of standard issue road signage and failing to inform on several levels, needs renewing.

7.3 Road and Path Network

There are a total of four and a half miles of road within The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill including the Outer Circle, Inner Circle, York Bridge and Chester Road. There are also over 140,800m² of paths providing access throughout the park. In total hard surfacing makes nearly 9% of the park. Due to the presence of water, in particular The Regent’s Canal, a number of bridges have also been constructed to permit connectivity between areas.

Roads
Nash’s plan established the principal road network, which remains in place today. The Outer Circle rings the park, defining its eastern, southern and western extents and acting as a physical separation between Regent’s Canal and Regent’s Park. This is a dimly lit public road, although closed to certain types of traffic, and from midnight to 7am. The Inner Circle is accessible via Chester Road or York Bridge providing access to the heart of the park. These roads are of a special quality in part due to the colouration of key areas with distinctive red tarmac surfacing. The quality of the adjacent paving is also important to the ambience, although these aspects are in part the responsibility of other agencies (discussed in Chapter 2). Surrounding these are public roads including Prince Albert Road, which lies between Primrose Hill and Regent’s Park. These are standard public highways and therefore lack the ambience of TRP/CE/CEPC roads.

Footpaths
There is a network of footpaths throughout the park, although people are (with the exception of designated areas such as wildlife sanctuaries and children’s play areas) free to roam and are not required to stay on the path. The main linking path within The Regent’s Park is the wide linear boulevard of the Broad Walk, although awkward juxtaposition of surfaces disrupts the sense of continuity. This acts as a spine road which is connected by the network of paths elsewhere. Many of the paths are pragmatic straight connections between entrance points (particularly around the sports fields in the north of Regent’s Park). Some less formal paths more suited to such ‘ambling’ are the circumferential paths around the Ornamental Water and those wending across the various greens – including a path across Cumberland Green that follows the original Nash alignment. In some locations there are informal paths running parallel with existing routes, such as along the Broad Walk, whilst in others these follow desire lines, such as along the eastern park boundary.

The use of golden gravel top dressing is located in special and contained character areas where possible such as the Avenue Gardens and summit of Primrose Hill. However in some locations there are unsatisfactory transitions between different surfacing styles and lack of clear character-based rationale for their (piecemeal) distribution. Areas of the Broad Walk have had the golden gravel surface treatment to indicate to visitors that they are busy intersections and are shared-use zones that require a more considerate approach to interactions.

In some areas, such as around the children’s boating lake, the extent of the tarmac has become excessive. On the eastern side of Primrose Hill the network is very dense, probably unnecessarily so. Thus, some areas of the path network would benefit from some rationalisation of length, character and width.

Cycling in the Park
There is one shared-use cycleway within the park which follows the northern section of the Broad Walk. In other locations cycling is restricted to the road network. There is a docking station forming part of the London (Santander) Cycle Hire Scheme located near the tennis centre in the Toxopholite Enclosure. There are docking stations on the periphery of the park and in the ZSL car parks which are areas of the park licensed to ZSL London Zoo.

The majority of the footpaths are surfaced with grey/black tarmac. Most are in reasonable repair but some. More recently, bound golden gravel has been used as a
surface treatment, such as around the Ready Money Fountain and in the Avenue Gardens. This creates a softer texture and reinforces the ‘Royal Parks’ ambience. Where this abuts the older tarmac surfacing it can however, create an unsatisfactory transition.

**Bridges**

In total there are thirteen main bridges within the park allowing access over the various water bodies: The Regent’s Canal, Ornamental Water and small ornamental lakes:

- **Charlbert Street Bridge** (1813 refurbished 1988): A pedestrian bridge over The Regent’s Canal, originally constructed to carry a sewer.

- **Macclesfield Bridge** (1876): A three-arched structure allowing vehicular and pedestrian access over The Regent’s Canal, replacing the earlier bridge destroyed by a munitions barge explosion in 1874.

- **Primrose Hill Bridge** (1906): A decorated cast iron arched pedestrian bridge over the Regent’s Canal and the most direct access between Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill. A major renovation of the bridge was completed in 2005/06.

- **St Mark’s Bridge** (1865): A cast iron arch with granite piers and Portland parapets allowing pedestrian access across The Regent’s Canal. The 1977 Silver Jubilee Walkway crosses over here and is marked by a plaque.

- **Clarence Gate Bridge** (1885): A pedestrian bridge over the Ornamental Water with stone piers and lattice girder. Recently refurbished (2012).

- **Hanover Gate Bridges** (1990s): There are three bridges over the Ornamental Water connecting Hanover Island. These are of an attractive modern style and painted blue.

- **Longbridge** (1905): A cast iron pedestrian structure over the Ornamental Water with ornamental balustrade and stone piers.

- **York Bridge** (late 19th C): A brick rendered vehicular bridge over the Ornamental Water with cast iron replacing an earlier bridge.

- **‘Chinese Bridge’** (1934): An ornamental pedestrian bridge in Queen Mary’s Gardens gifted by Sigismund Goetze to provide access to the lake island.

- **Cascade Bridge** (1992): Bridge over the cascade in Queen Mary’s Gardens.

- **College Footbridge**: Bridge over land occupied by Regent’s University London.

**Tunnels**
There are two tunnels that pass under the Outer Circle allowing access between the Zoo areas north and south of the Outer Circle. There is also a tunnel that passes under the Marylebone Road between Park Square and Park Crescent gardens but this is not maintained by TRP.

### Management Issues: Road and Path Network

- Complex roles and fragmented responsibilities between agencies in the maintenance of Park Roads leading to some breakdown in unity and presentation of roads.
- Prince Albert Road disturbs the connectivity and perception of unity between Primrose Hill and Regent’s Park.
- Maintenance demands for the structural and visual quality of bridges.
- Inherently unstable ground conditions due to underlying clay and made up ground.
- Extensive network of paths, the majority of which were not designed for current usage.

### 7.4 Park furniture and Signage

Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill are relatively well furnished with a variety of structures specifically designed and located for the use, safety and comfort of visitors. It is not possible to list each of these features individually. However, the key themes and issues are set out below. The Royal Parks Landscape Design Guide (2010) provides guidance on TRP ‘house’ furniture styles and specifications for all elements of park furniture and signage.

#### Benches and seats

There are several hundred benches in the park of a wide variety of styles, mostly of very high visual quality and repair. Some of these are ‘specials’ designed and/or chosen specifically for their location such as the Arts and Crafts English oak benches in St John’s Lodge Garden or the round seat on the mound in the English Garden. In contrast, some areas have more standard manufactured benches employing either a single or complementary suite of styles suited to an area’s particular character, such as the use of the formal, elegant Yates Haywood metal and timber slat style in the Avenue Gardens and the teak benches in Queen Mary’s Gardens. Elsewhere, these themed approaches break down, largely attributable to financial constraints, and has resulted in a seemingly random juxtaposition of ‘leftovers’ from other areas or of styles being phased out, for example on Cumberland Green and, in part, Primrose Hill. Thrift has also resulted in the presence of odd cut-down and recycled benches. In addition to fixed benches deckchairs can also be hired around the Ornamental Water and in QMG. These provide a colourful and more informal parkland experience. Green oak timber from Richmond Park has been used to create ‘Stump seats’ and ‘Cathcart seats’ which provide for a relaxed seating style and these can
mostly be found within the open spaces. The addition of these seats has led to a significant increase in the total number of seating opportunities across the park.

**Litterbins and dog bins**

The litterbins are either the invisible green and gold TRP cast iron variety or a timber slatted style. In the main these are unobtrusive, however sometimes they fail to co-ordinate with the benches or other furnishings or are inappropriately located. It is thought that there are a sufficient number of bins to suit visitor needs (currently around 210). The dog bins are a standard invisible green and gold painted cast iron style. Since some areas suffer from fouling there may be scope to increase the number of encourage the use of these more. Some timber litter bins are also of a bespoke design which are expensive to replace. This design may not be financially sustainable in the long-term. There are currently no recycling bins for public use in the park. TRP Waste Strategy sets the principles for managing all wastes, including type of bins and their optimum placement.

**Lighting**

Most areas of Regent's Park are closed at night and therefore lighting is not required. Some lighting is provided in those areas that are accessible, including the Inner Circle, Outer Circle, York Bridge and Chester Road. The lights are of a variety of styles, which tend to coordinate, all being painted black. Primrose Hill is accessible after dark and, therefore, the majority of paths across the Hill are lit: these take a variety of styles and were adapted from Georgian and Victorian gas lamps. Generally, these are well co-ordinated, being black-painted and with similar lamp styles. Some low level lighting to assist pedestrian access is located alongside the path from The Hub to Monkey Gate and at the Queen Mary's Gardens workshops. New lighting projects are assessed against TRP Position Statement of Lighting (2009).

**Signage**

Good quality signage comprising black-painted cast metal cases with adequate space for the display of maps and information has been installed throughout the park. The main orientation boards were updated two years ago and now have an easy to read axonometric style. These are in appropriate locations by the entrances and at key points of interest. Roadside signage has recently been rationalised and entrance signage is currently being reviewed.

**Management Issues: Park Furniture and Signage**

- Replacement of benches has been progressively implemented to comply with TRP Landscape Design Guide (2010).
- Entrance signage to be revised with a view to minimising clutter, presenting unified message (CEPC, CE, TRP) and the very clear indication that you are entering a special place.
- Significant savings to be made changing from incandescent to LED lighting: the challenge is to maintain the heritage look and feel and to avoid any additional light spills or higher light levels.
7.5 Other Artefacts

There are a number of other smaller-scale features that have been placed or remain within the park solely for visual delight and visitor enjoyment rather than any strictly practical use. These include sculptures, which are important in creating a sense of intimacy and grandeur, and other historic artefacts such as roadway markers:

**Sculptures:** Sculptures are an important feature of Regent’s Park being confined largely to the horticultural display areas:

- **Boys with armorial shields on pillars** (1906): a Grade II structure comprising stone piers with putti holding the armorial shields of Bute, by Sir William Goscombe John RA, located in St John’s Lodge Garden.

- **The Shepherdess** (or The Goatherd’s Daughter) (1932): Grade II statue by C.L. Hartwell RA, located in St John’s Lodge Garden in 1994 (presented by NCAW in honour of Baillie Weavers)

- **Urн** (1863): original Austin and Seeley cast stone urn relocated to St John’s Lodge garden from Avenue gardens in 1995.

- **Hylas and the Nymph** (1933) Grade II bronze statue set on stone pedestal by Henry Pegram RA located in St John’s Lodge Garden (gift of the RA).

- **Ready Money Drinking Fountain** (1869), an impressive Grade II gothic drinking fountain of Sicilian marble at the highest point of The Broad Walk donated by Sir Cowasjee-Jhangir.

- **Drinking Fountain** (1901): granite fountain presented by Metropolitan Drinking Fountain and Cattle Trough Association located near Hanover Gate.

- **Matilda fountain** (1878): Cornish rock structure with bronze milkmaid by Sir Joseph Durham located near Gloucester Gate.

- **Boy and Frog** (1936): Grade II bronze on granite statue by Sir Reid Dick, located in Queen Mary’s Gardens (donated by Sigismund Goetze).

- **Mighty Hunter** (1913): bronze by A.H. Hodges located in Queen Mary’s Gardens (donated by Sigismund Goetze).

- **Lost Bow** (1915): bronze by A.H. Hodges located in Queen Mary’s Gardens (donated by Sigismund Goetze).

- **Stone Lantern** (1936): located in Queen Mary’s Gardens (donated by Sigismund Goetze).

- **Bronze Eagle** (c.19thC): Japanese bronze located in Queen Mary’s Gardens (presented in memory of Edward Greene).

- **Lead Trough** (1736): located in Queen Mary’s Gardens.
**Frieze Art Fair** (since 2003): the annual art fair provides a free public access sculpture garden in the English Garden in October.

**Fountains and urns:**

- **Griffin (or lion) tazza** (1893): originally supplied by Austin and Seeley located in Avenue gardens, restored 1994.

- **Set of recast fountains and urns** (1994): moulded from 1863 Austin and Seeley originals plus eight new fountains sourced from contemporary catalogue.

- **Triton Fountain** (1939): bronze fountain group by William McMillan RA set in pool (donated by Goetze family) located in Queen Mary’s Gardens.


- **Smaller Cascades**: in QMG, Community Wildlife Garden, Hanover Island.

**Other**: Fossil trees in QMG placed by RBS (1845); floor plaque at Primrose Hill commemorating the first gathering of the bards of the modern era in 1792, and The Avenue Gardens.

**Timber sculptures**: three are located close to the Monkey Gate in the northern sections of The Regent’s Park, just north of The Hub.

**Management Issues: Other Artefacts**

- Low-key image of Primrose Hill, which is free from permanent sculptural artefacts (and should remain so).

- Large areas of Regent’s Park, which are free from sculpture although potential for limited introduction of new sculpture in most ornamental areas and around entrances.

- Setting and juxtaposition of sculptures does not always ensure that they make the most positive contribution to the parkland landscape.

- Need for carefully controlled layout and location of temporary displays, with a presumption against more than 3 month installations.

- Aim to update the artefacts survey regularly and move to a database/GIS system.
8.0 PUBLIC USE

This chapter examines the use of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill. In particular it considers the numbers and profile of park visitors, the range of activities or events that attract users to the park and the level of satisfaction with the visitor experience. Information is informed by Visitor Surveys conducted in the park and current activities and events.

8.1 Public Access

Some form of public access to The Regent's Park has existed since the 1630s.

The Regent's Park is open every day of the year. The park opens at dawn and closes at between 4.30pm (January) and 9.30pm (summer). Primrose Hill is open 24 hours a day and in fact, there are currently no gates that could enable closure of the park.

All of Primrose Hill is accessible to the public. There are a number of areas in Regent's Park which are either not accessible to the general public or are subject to restricted access either as a result of the need for payment, operational or management reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Sites not accessible to the general public</th>
<th>Areas accessible by paying members or users</th>
<th>Areas of Regent's Park from which public are generally excluded for operational reasons</th>
<th>Areas of Regent's Park with restricted access for management reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regent’s University London Winfield House The Holme (occasional public open days) St. John’s Lodge</td>
<td>Open Air Theatre ZSL London Zoo ‘Will to Win’ Tennis facilities</td>
<td>Staff Residences Storeyard and nursery compound The Leafyard Depot</td>
<td>Nature Study Centre The Longbridge Sanctuary The Wetland and Cricket Pens Leafyard Wood East Wing Meadow Enclosure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management Issues: Public Access

- History of some areas of the park being used by specific interest groups such as London Zoo, consequently some areas not accessible to the general public.
- Some areas used by TRP which have potential for enhanced public access at certain times or in certain restricted areas.
8.2 Visitor Profile

The most recent survey in 2014 of the total number of visits per annum to The Regent's Park was over 8 million. An additional 2.6 million visits were made to Primrose Hill. This compares to 12.8 million for Hyde Park and 2.3 million for Bushy Park at that date.

The 2014 Ipsos Mori survey (mostly targeted towards discovering park visitors’ opinions) gives some visitor profile information for The Royal Parks, individually and collectively. Detailed information was gathered for the combination of The Regent’s Park and Primrose Park.

It is likely that, although the recent survey combines The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill, and not disregarding the previous survey data, that despite the presence of the designated London Panorama view towards the city, Primrose Hill attracts a high proportion of local visitors. It is also furthest from the main public transportation network. Of the recent increase in visitor numbers, the largest age group (54%) is young adults aged 25-44. More mature age groups, aged 55 to over 75, made up 18% of those surveyed. A little less than half of visits were made with children. Most park visits (approximately one third) were between one and two hours. Visits were rarely longer than 3 hours.

Visitors’ mode of transport maintained its sustainable trend. 50% arrived by foot, 33% by public transport, 4% by bicycle with only 11% arriving by car. 14% of visitors’ journeys were less than one mile.

Reasons for visiting predominantly (79%) followed general, relaxing motives: peace and quiet, fresh air, picnic/ lunch, being in the park, meeting friends/ family, a pleasant route somewhere else, reading, sunbathing. Visiting for exercise (73%) was the second most cited motive: walking, walking the dog, non-sport exercise, informal games, running, boating, model boating, rollerblading/ skating, organised sport, horse riding, other. Planned visiting for events or sightseeing made up 12% of the reasons for visits. 21% of visits were motivated for children’s activities. Being in nature motivated 10% of visits, seeing trees and animals, bird watching, feeding the birds, and fishing.

There are a large number of underprivileged wards located around The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill, and data is insufficient to judge the use that residents make of the park facilities. These include Somers Town and St Pancras, which have been noted as being areas of multiple deprivation in England (worst 10%). The pockets have had Single Regeneration Budget status, and have benefited from huge projects such as the St Pancras scheme, and are up and coming.

Management Issues: Visitor Profile

- Engagement of local community in Regent’s Park Estate will be more important with impact of HS2 on available green space in the St. Pancras area.
8.3 Events
Regent's Park and Primrose Hill host a number of significant annual events including the Frieze Art Fair and Taste of London. There are other smaller events from spring through to autumn.

The Hub provides a comprehensive range of summer, winter and school holiday sports programmes and activities. Information about events is published on the TRP website.

All Events are managed and administered in accordance with TRP Hosting Major Events 2014 strategy. The Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between the demand for and benefits to be gained from events and the need to protect and maintain the park infrastructure. There is increased demand for events, many of which can generate important income. Although all events are subject to hire terms and conditions, the progressive compaction and wear and tear, in particular at regular events locations such as Marylebone Green, can impact on the quality of the park landscape.

Management Issues: Events
- The Regent's Park’s hosting of a number of large and small events, with a cumulative effect from annual events, results in:
  - Wear and tear on the park fabric
  - Displacement of park activities
  - Disruption to residents, neighbours, park visitors and park wildlife
- Park Manager to continue to work with Events team to seek to maintain a balance between events and conservation of the park.

8.4 Visitor Amenities
Refreshment facilities are provided by The Regent’s Bar and Kitchen at Queen Mary’s Gardens, on the Broad Walk, at the Boating Lake (near Hanover Gate), at York Bridge Road (Tennis Centre), at Chester Gate Lodge and at the Hub. A number of mobile sites and kiosks are also provided at Holme Green, on the NE side of the lake and at Primrose Hill. Mobile catering outside the park (e.g. at Primrose Hill Bridge) is not on Royal Park’s land and is licensed by the Borough.

The 2010 Visitor Research Report prepared by Synovate on behalf of the Royal Parks reported on visitor satisfaction in relation to key performance indicators for the park, based on interviews with park visitors. The table below summarises the findings of the survey in the park.
### The Regent's Park with Primrose Hill Management Plan

#### Park | Best performing aspects based on mean score | Worst performing aspects based on mean score
--- | --- | ---
Regent’s Park | General tidiness and cleanliness<br>Quality of the natural environment<br>Upkeep of the park<br>Ease of access<br>Ease of getting around<br>Peace and quiet | Number of toilets
Primrose Hill | Upkeep of the park<br>Ease of getting around<br>Ease of access<br>Quality of the natural environment<br>Peace and quiet | Park staff<br>Number of catering facilities<br>Car parking facilities

The findings of the survey with regard to the park are largely consistent with other Royal Parks.

Toilet facilities of good capacity and reasonable condition are maintained by TRP at the Hub, at Chester Road, in Queen Mary’s Gardens, and near the NSC/W&WC.

Additional children’s toilets are sited in the four playgrounds, which are located at Gloucester Gate, Hanover Gate, Marylebone Green and Primrose Hill. The Hanover Gate and Primrose Hill Play areas have been improved through the Playbuilder Scheme. Playgrounds are well equipped for motor play although would benefit from diversifying the range of play types provided for at each location. There a currently 2 playful spaces identified adjacent to the Hub and by Gloucester Gate Playground.

**Management Issues: Visitor Amenities**
- Potential to increase the use of catering facilities
- Some demand for improved toilet provision
- Opportunities to enhance play areas to enable a wider range of play types and also to provide opportunities for teenagers to use more natural environments as a regular part of their social activities

### 8.5 Organised Sports and Facilities and Other Activities

The park offers the largest single venue for outdoor sports in central London, with 64 acres dedicated to formal and 35 acres to informal sport. A wide range of sports
facilities are provided in the park and these are continually evolving to meet the needs and requirements of park users. The Hub provides excellent changing and booking facilities for pitch users. TRP sports team, based at The Hub, have responsibility for the administration and booking of all organised sports; fitness licensing; sports events; corporate hire of the Hub and children’s activities such as school sports days using the running track. TRP offers an extensive and diverse range of sports activities with 45 sports events booked for 2013.

The layout and quality of the pitches has improved significantly following the implementation of the Sports Masterplan in 2003. The TRP Health, Well-being and Sports Strategy (2010-15) sets out a Vision and Action Plan for TRP; the delivery of which is captured in the annual sports business plan. The Strategy identifies the importance of the Hub and the sports pitches and other facilities in Regent’s Park as being central to the delivery of the strategy.

Current sports pitch provision comprises:

**Regent’s Park – Winter**
- 22 Football Pitches (9 senior, 1 junior and 13 mini pitches)
- 3 Rugby Pitches
- 1 Lacrosse Pitch

**Regent’ Park - Summer**
- 6 Cricket Pitches (5 senior and 1 junior)
- 18 Softball Areas

**Regent’ Park – Other**
- 1 Running Track

**York Bridge Tennis Centre**
- 12 Hard Tennis Courts (4 floodlit)
- 2 Children’s Tennis Courts

**Primrose Hill**
- 4 softball areas
- 1 Trim Trail/Outdoor Gym
- 1 Petanque/Boules Court

Informal and semi-formal activities are provided with facilities to enhance more quiescent visitor enjoyment of the parks. These include the boats for use on the Ornamental Water, which can be hired from boating concession (Park Boats) and serviced from Boathouse Café. There is also a specific Children’s Boating Pool. In addition, Park Deckchairs hire deckchairs out for visitor relaxation and enjoyment.

Other semi-formal activities include Tai Chi classes and the hiring of areas (such as the running pitch area) for community and school sports days and picnicking. Licences are also issued to sports trainers using the park.
The boating concession is let to Park Boats and is serviced from the new Boathouse Café.

**Management Issues: Sports and Facilities**

- Important to maintain actions set out in The TRP Health, Well-being and Sports Strategy (2010-15)
9.0 LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

This section describes the visual and aesthetic characteristics of the park and associated issues. These aspects are considered in relation to specific views and vistas - within the park, of the park and from the park – and the variation in character across the park as a whole. Because ‘character’ is in effect a combination of the different elements that make up the landscape described in the previous sections, many similar issues are raised. However, this approach is felt to be beneficial to highlight where particular areas of concern occur and to indicate where combinations of issues are cumulatively impacting upon perceived landscape character or quality. Refer to TRP ‘Tree and View Management Strategy’.

9.1 Views

The visual character of the park is dependent upon the quality and nature of views (see figure 16). There are seven key relationships to consider:

**Views of Regent’s Park:** Due to the relative flatness of Regent’s Park the main views to the park are elevated views from the surrounding buildings, including from the Nash terraces, and views from the streets immediately surrounding the park. There are no views of Regent’s Park from the wider landscape due to its topography and the impact of the immediate surrounding multi-storey buildings. The views from the surrounding buildings, particularly the terraces, are of particular historic importance, although trees within TRP and Crown Estate Land are obscuring some of these. The views from the streets are dependent upon the nature of the boundary, which tends to limit views into the park such that it mainly appears as a pleasant green space with trees towering above the railings. In particular a combination of prosaic buildings and overgrown boundary vegetation along the zoo boundary and the inappropriately landscaped car park near Gloucester Gate block/spoil any potential views into the park from Prince Albert Road. There are no views of the park per se from the Regent’s Canal due to the depth of the cutting. There are also no open views from Park Square Gardens.

**Views from Regent’s Park:** The historic terraces bordering the park and the villas within the park are integral to the design and layout of the park. The majority of views from the park are truncated by buildings: for the most part historic views of the elegant terraces as Nash intended. Tree growth continues to partially obscure some of these views. As before, some of these are being obscured by tree growth. Some of these are also being adversely affected by views to tall modern buildings located behind the terraces, such as at Sussex Place. There are also views to attractive or well-known landmark buildings beyond or adjacent to the terraces, with particular landmarks being the attractive copper-domed London Central Mosque, the BT Tower and the spires of surrounding churches including The Danish Church (St Katharine’s), St Mark’s and Marylebone Churches. To the north, views of the zoo buildings including the Elephant House are prominent. Beyond these the modern flats of St John’s Wood/Primrose Hill do not contribute to the Regency character of the park. Large areas of the park are currently unaffected by the impacts of modern high
buildings beyond the terraces, preserving an illusion of the nineteenth century character.

**Views within Regent’s Park:** Within Regent’s Park the views were historically intended to provide seclusion for the residents of villas whilst allowing a view out. However, today many of the remaining villa sites are enveloped in vegetation and views in are limited to strategic pencil-line views: for example the view of the Holme over the Ornamental Water. In other areas, for example at Regent’s University, the building that has replaced the Nash Villa commands its setting to a greater extent than the original building would have. In general the north of the park is more open with ‘pastoral’ views punctuated by trees. In the south views tend to be shorter and more intimate – close range views of the Ornamental Water are particularly satisfying. There are no formal axial vistas designed by Nash within the landscape, although the long view up the Broad Walk to the Ready Money Fountain is, perhaps, the most orchestrated view.

**Views of Primrose Hill:** Primrose Hill is a local landmark, its unusual topography making it stand out from the adjoining streets. However, it is insufficiently high to appear as a landmark in the wider landscape, except perhaps as a green locus when viewed from the higher land at Hampstead Heath to the north. The zoo buildings and structures partially obscure views to Primrose Hill from within Regent’s Park, in particular from the Sports Pitches.

**Views from Primrose Hill:** The views from Primrose Hill are spectacular, its elevated position close to the city and yet largely free from intrusive tall buildings providing some of the best views of St Paul’s Cathedral and the city available from North London. This panorama is of such importance that it is protected by statute (as discussed in Chapter 3). There are also pencil views to Hampstead Hill to the north. However, these are somewhat marred by the presence of tower blocks, which dominate the view. From the lower areas the main views are of the surrounding residential areas and the unattractive structural elements of the Barrow Hill Reservoir. The proposed re-commissioning of the reservoir will involve the creation of a Green Roof which will improve the character of these views.

**Views within Primrose Hill:** Views within Primrose Hill are, from the lower slopes, dominated by views to the summit itself. Elsewhere there is little to look at and so views are directed out to the surrounding area as described above.

**Views between Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill:** From Regent’s Park there are no meaningful views of Primrose Hill, except from the Prince Albert Road at the park boundary. From Primrose Hill Regent’s Park visually merges with the zoo to create a pleasant green buffer, which acts as a counterfoil to the cityscape.
**Management Issues: Views**

- Need to maintain and where opportunities arise, restore the character and presence of views between historic buildings and surrounding parkland including Nash terraces and villas.
- Some limited potential for unblocking views into the park, eg from Gloucester car park, would be an improvement.
- Where opportunities arise, restore the character and presence of views between historic buildings and surrounding parkland including Nash terraces and villas.
Figure 16: Key Historic and Modern Views
9.2 Description of Character Areas and their Management

The full diversity of Regent's Park and Primrose Hill can be appreciated by sub-dividing the park into character areas, which are perceived due to their particular combinations of features and facilities. In total there are twenty-seven such distinctive areas recognised for the purposes of this Management Plan within Regent's Park and Primrose Hill, ranging from the ornamental formality of the Avenue Gardens to the functional openness of the Sports Fields. These are shown on Figure 17: Character Areas within and around The Regent's Park and Primrose Hill.

A number of the character areas have a well-defined boundary as a result of a feature such as a road or fence (for example Queen Mary’s Gardens which is defined by the Inner Circle) whereas the distinction between other areas is less precise (for example the transition from St Katharine’s Glade to Cumberland Green, which has here been defined principally by the surrounding footpaths so covering an area greater than the extent of the villa’s former garden).

Character areas provide a useful basis to appreciate the origins and evolution of particular areas of parkland and to appraise their presentation and use in the present day. This also provides an appropriate foundation from which to determine long-term objectives for the management of the character and content of an area and to determine specific opportunities for restoration and enhancement.
Figure 17: Landscape Character Areas
9.3 REGENT’S PARK CHARACTER AREAS

Area 1: The Avenue Gardens

The Avenue Gardens occupy a linear corridor in the south east of Regent’s Park. They are the southernmost part of the Broad Walk (Area 2) but have evolved to become a distinct area in their own right. The Avenue Gardens have developed from the only formal avenue shown on John Nash’s masterplan (1811) that was actually implemented. Originally this was part of the concept of a grand carriage drive which was to sweep through north London linking Carlton House through Regent Street and Portland Place to the proposed guingette (an open air refreshment and drinking establishment) for the Prince Regent’s residence in Regent’s Park and to the villas around and beyond. When the idea of the guingette was abandoned this part of the route was still constructed with four double avenues linking Park Square to Chester Road.

However, by the late 1850s, Nash’s trees were not growing well and advice was sought from various horticulturists including William Andrews Nesfield, a well-established Victorian garden designer whose former elaborate schemes included the radial avenues and parterres outside Burton & Turner’s Palm House in Kew Gardens. Nesfield proposed the removal of half the trees in the avenue retaining outer and inner rows of elm and horse chestnut. He redesigned the area (1863) with formal gardens including cast stone ornaments set within the retained framework of trees. The formality led to the gardens becoming known as the Italian or Avenue Gardens. They were instantly popular and were regularly praised in the horticultural press up to and beyond the turn of the century. There followed a period of relative decline and relaxation of the scheme’s formality due to changing tastes and the adverse impacts of the two world wars such that, by the early 1990s few of the original elements of the scheme remained. Consequently restoration work was completed in 1996. As a result of this restoration the elaborate and exuberant formal character of the gardens with its colourful and ornate bedding schemes has been restored, including twenty four garden ornaments (recast to original designs and made from reconstituted Portland stone in the manner of the Austin and Seeley originals) including the attractive lion tazza centrepiece and eight fountains (contemporary additions). The gardens are once more a honey pot of activity and enjoyment.

Area 2: The Broad Walk

Besides the Avenue Gardens, the Broad Walk is the only significant tree-lined avenue within Regent’s Park and occupies a linear corridor stretching from Chester Road, north of the Avenue Gardens, in an approximately north/ north-westerly direction to the Outer Circle. A formal tree avenue on the line of The Broad Walk was a feature of the original Nash landscape. The revised 1811 plan (Figure 8) shows this as a broad avenue with multiple lines of trees.

The concept of a north-south avenue in this part of the site was part of Nash’s 1811 plan and was intended to link to the planned prince’s guingette. The guingette was never built but the southern part of the avenue was implemented, albeit in a modified form without the section of the Broad Walk north of Chester Road.
However, the popularity of the southern Broad Walk and Chester Road/Inner Circle as a promenading ground provided the impetus for Nash (under duress) to extend the Broad Walk north of Chester Road, including Elm avenues. A further significant addition to the Broad Walk was made in 1869 when the wealthy Parsee Sir Cowasjee-Jhangir donated the Ready Money Drinking Fountain, which was located at the high point of the Broad Walk. This was restored in 2000 with funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund.

Today the character of the Broad Walk is of a pleasant avenue walk, although shared use with cyclists since 2010 has diminished somewhat the tranquillity of the space. The southern section of this area, between the Ready Money Fountain and Chester Road has a strong axial quality focused upon the Ready Money Fountain. The avenue today comprises a mix of tree species, sizes and ages, with five rows of trees either side of the main path. The trees are planted at relatively close spacings and many replacement trees are struggling due to lack of space and poor ground conditions. The density of the tree cover is also inhibiting grass growth beneath the trees and the Broad Walk itself is very shaded. There are also secondary paths, mainly used by joggers, within the tree avenues. The Park Management and TRP Arboricultural Manager have commenced a review of the Broad Walk avenue trees in order to develop a long term strategy for thinning and replacement and to rationalise the range of tree species.

The Broad Walk is popular with people using it as a through-route to connect to the zoo, for jogging, cycling and for sitting and people watching. The Chester Road kiosk (rebranded as The Espresso Bar) is located in the attractive building of Chester Road Lodge and the Broad Walk Café, now rebranded as The Smokehouse, are also important draws. The area around the Ready Money Fountain, one of the few major monuments in the park, is now of high quality with golden gravel finish and new shrub structure planting. The planting is maintained by TRP and is also used for student training purposes by Capel Manor College. Recent vegetation management bordering the Storeyard has opened up views to the Chester Road Lodge. Re-planting will seek to enhance the setting of the Lodge and retain views.

The northern section of the Broad Walk is somewhat different in character. There is a single avenue, principally of large Horse Chestnut Trees, creating a pleasant green corridor. The Walk boarders London Zoo through this section, which whilst this detracts from the ambience of this section of the Broad Walk, the desire to gain views of the zoo has caused damage to the planting on this boundary. One viewing area has already been created and it may well be that a second is needed to prevent further damage to the shrub planting. Filtered views to the animals (rheas, penguins and anteaters) through the fence are a point of interest.
Character Area 1: The Avenue Gardens

Character Area 2: The Broad Walk

Character Area 3: The English Garden

Figure 18: Character Area Photographs
Area 3: The English Gardens

The English Gardens are a clearly defined rectangular area in the southeast corner of Regent's Park, defined by the outer circle to the south and east, the Avenue Gardens to the West and Chester Road to the north. The English Gardens were designed by Markham Nesfield – the son of William Andrews Nesfield and were laid out between 1865 and 1867 in an informal 'English' style of rounded contours and shrubberies with meandering walks that contrast with the formal 'Italianate' qualities of the adjoining Avenue gardens. Ironically they occupy one of the few formal areas proposed by Nash, which was to comprise a formal square surrounded by terraces. A lake was created in the garden between 1911 and 1949, perhaps reflecting Nesfield's early concepts for the garden. However, this has subsequently been infilled with bomb rubble.

The English Gardens retain their pleasant shrubby and green character as a place where people gather for quiet contemplation and sunbathing. The gardens are now mature with attractive large trees and shrubberies, some set on characteristic mounds. Temporary exhibitions such as the Sculpture Garden associated with the Frieze Art Fair ensure changing features of interest. The close proximity of the Gardens to St Andrew’s Gate, one of the main park entrances from Portland Street and their tranquil, attractive character ensures they are particularly popular with office workers and tourists at lunch times in good weather.

Recent additions have included new and replacement tree planting, some using more exotic tree species to add interest and variety to the Gardens.

Area 4: Cumberland Green

Cumberland Green occupies a rectangular tract of land clearly defined to the west, south and east by the Broad Walk, Chester Road and park boundary and, less distinctly, by St Katharine’s Meadow to the north. This area was part of the area Nash proposed for the ‘basin’ of water that was to front the Prince Regent’s guinette, but this was never constructed and the area appears to have remained as part of the parkland ‘setting’ for the Cumberland terrace and, later St Katharine’s Lodge (also known as Master’s House), that was built to the north. An informal path crossing the area (Cumberland Gate footpath) was ultimately constructed as part of the Nash scheme and this is now one of the few remaining parkland paths originating from Nash’s scheme.

The character of this area is mixed. There is a strong impression of Nash’s grand vision due to stunning views of Cumberland Terrace (particularly in winter) and the informal tree groupings. The definition to the west is also strong due to the presence of the Broad Walk Avenue. Outward views to Cumberland Terrace are becoming increasingly lost due to the density of tree cover, mainly on the park perimeters. The central section of Cumberland Green is used for sports with a single rugby pitch. This is the only organised winter sports pitch located outside the main area of sports pitches around The Hub. This area is most used by joggers and dog-walkers in the day time. The area is also used for informal sports here during evenings and weekends. Path surfaces and furniture are of mixed quality and type.
Character Area 4: Cumberland Green

Character Area 5: St Katharine’s Glade
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Character Area 8: The Regent’s Canal

Character Area 8: The Regent’s Canal

Figure 19: Landscape Character Area Photographs
Area 5: St. Katharine’s Glade

St Katharine’s Glade occupies a triangular tract of land around the former St Katharine’s Villa, opposite St Katharine’s Church. It is defined loosely by Cumberland Green to the south, and more definitely by the park boundary to the east and the path connecting the Ready Money Fountain to Gloucester Gate to the north west.

Nash originally planned two buildings in this vicinity and the Mogg Plan of 1828 shows a residence was constructed here, which is termed ‘Masters House’ on the 1834 Bartlett and Britton St Marylebone Borough Survey and appears as St Katharine’s Lodge on the 1870 OS Map. This building was enclosed by vegetation and set in its own grounds, appearing quite introverted from the surrounding landscape. This lodge remained presumably as a staff residence, until the war when bomb damage led to its demolition. St Katharine’s Lodge was never rebuilt. The landscape today is informal and lacks a manicured appearance being characterised by rough and undulating grassland, which after rain is boggy in places. No paths cross the landscape but instead a series of informal desire lines criss-cross the area. The value of this area is its more ‘naturalistic’ and isolated qualities in contrast to much of the more ‘orderly’ and formal parkland. It was this quality which in part inspired the installation of a large climbing structure, which appears to grow out of a group of trees. This playful space is located in the glade close to the playground at Gloucester Gate and has proved popular since its installation in 2008.

A significant area of grassland towards the south of this area has recently been maintained at 150mm as a foraging site for Little Owls which have been breeding in the area.

Area 6: Gloucester Green

Gloucester Green is located in the north east of Regent’s Park and is bordered by the Broad Walk, the path connecting the Ready Money Fountain to Gloucester Gate and the Outer Circle. Nash’s plans for this area, which lay to the north of the basin, were for a formal semi-circular garden surrounded by a crescent of terraces. These were not constructed and originally the area remained as parkland setting for the Zoological Society Gardens, which lay to the west, and St Katharine’s Lodge to the south. With Nash’s extension of the Broad Walk and the addition of the Ready Money Drinking fountain in close proximity, the area grew in profile and in the twentieth century a number of public facilities were created including football pitches and the Gloucester Gate children’s playground.

The winter sports pitches have now been relocated, although softball pitches feature in the summer. The Green is growing in popularity as a venue for smaller events which is helping to ease the pressure on the more established venue of Marylebone Green. It is also used daily as a school yard by the adjacent Northbridge House School who bring c.150 children per day to play on the green. The Green is popular for softball during the summer months.

The character today is pleasant with gentle grassy slopes. However, the children’s playground and particularly the buildings within the play area are not particularly attractive or inspirational.
Area 7: Gloucester Slips

This area occupies a linear corridor north of Gloucester Green and to the east of London Zoo. This area was formerly part of an arm of Regent’s Canal, which flowed around the Nash Terraces, culminating in the Cumberland Basin north of Cumberland Market. Following the war this arm of the canal was infilled with rubble from demolished buildings.

Today only a small basin located where the canal branches northwards to connect to the Grand Union Canal remains. This is an attractive feature with an unusual floating Oriental restaurant and an attractive bridged crossing (St Marks Bridge) to the park. The remainder of the area consists of the zoo car park, which is set within an area of conservation grassland with mature trees. London Zoo currently occupies the car park under licence. Although the landscape surrounding the zoo car park remains the responsibility of TRP, the ZSL grounds and garden team undertake management to promote the area for wildlife and there is a perception that this is part of the zoo as opposed to Regent’s Park.

There are a number of important mature trees in the Gloucester Slips including a number of elms. Cars are obtrusive and the area would benefit from low level screening of the car park, for instance by hedging. The car park incorporates one of the London cycle hire docking stations.

Area 8: The Regent’s Canal

The Regent’s Canal is in the north of the park and occupies a thin linear corridor, north of the Outer Circle and the Holford Sanctuary. It is defined to the east by the boundary with London Zoo.

This area is part of The Regent’s Canal Branch of the Grand Union Canal (and as such includes areas of land controlled by Canal and Rivers Trust and the London Borough of Camden). Although the canal was, in principle, part of Nash’s designs this alignment is not as originally proposed – instead the canal was intended to pass through the heart of the scheme. The present alignment appears to have evolved for financial and pragmatic reasons.

Because of the steepness of the banks Nash undertook extensive planting to stabilise them. Thus, today this part of the canal acts as a pleasant green buffer between Regent’s Park and the surrounding city with grassy banks and naturalised bankside vegetation including trees and scrub, which provide important local wildlife habitat. There are a few areas of ornamental planting. There is a short, non-standard (387m/423 yards) ‘cinders’ running track located south of the canal, which was once overlooked by a pavilion (demolished). The track is used for community events, school sports days and for informal sports training.

The Regent’s Canal is frequented by colourful barge traffic and there is a towpath used by pedestrians and cyclists. There are three bridged crossings – Charlbert Street, Macclesfield and Primrose Hill. The traffic crossing the bridges and travelling around the Outer Circle makes this area somewhat pedestrian-unfriendly at peak times. A Superintendent’s House was once located adjacent to Macclesfield Bridge. The plethora of tall modern and post-war buildings located along Prince Albert Road...
adjacent to the canal compare unfavourably to the sense of unity and grandeur created by the Regency terraces found elsewhere.

**Area 9: The Open Spaces**

The Open Spaces is the largest character area, occupying a large expanse in the northern and central parts of Regent’s Park. The playing fields are bordered by London Zoo, The Broad Walk, Winfield House and The Ornamental Water and Longbridge Sanctuary.

This part of the park was originally intended by John Nash as part of the complex of villas enclosed within screening vegetation, and set within a parkland setting grazed by cattle, punctuated with small artistically-arranged tree groups. It is evident from the Mogg Plan (1828) that although few of the villas were constructed much of the planting was carried out. The present day character results from adoption of the area as open space in the late nineteenth century, when the Prince’s Pavilion (forerunner of the Bernhard Baron Pavilion) was built. Consequently, although conceptually very different and now with fewer dispersed parkland trees, this use of space has resulted in a landscape - with large open grassy fields - similar to that intended by Nash.

The Prince’s Pavilion was replaced by the Bernhard Baron Pavilion, which sustained bomb damage in WW2, was demolished and rebuilt in 1965, and eventually removed in 2003. A parks and open spaces masterplan was published in 2003 which generated the current provision and layout of pitches. The Hub (replacing the Bernhard Baron Pavilion) was opened in 2005 and, along with significant investment to improve the quality of the pitches, has been pivotal in improving both the facilities and use of the pitches. The renovation of the pitches through ameliorated soils, drainage and irrigation has to a large degree overcome the previous problems and this work continues to maintain the pitches to playable standards through the year, despite the inhospitable nature of underlying heavy clay soil and bomb rubble.

Much of the grassland bordering the sports pitches is now managed as conservation/meadow grassland. This management extends to the boundary with ZSL London Zoo. There are opportunities to further enhance the habitat value of the conservation grassland, for instance through limited areas of scrub planting. The path to the south of the Zoo is a popular circular walk route from Primrose Hill. For many years it has been too narrow to accommodate refuse vehicles and volume of visitors and has drainage issues. It has recently been fully reconstructed.

The Winter Garden (identified as Character Area 9a) at the Chalbert Street Bridge entrance was created in the 1970s. The garden provides colour and interest throughout the year, but in particular during the winter months and features heathers and other ericaceous plants, conifers, birch, maples, dogwoods and other trees and shrubs with strong winter colour and attractive bark. Recent improvements at Monkey Gate have also enhanced this entrance to the park from Primrose Hill Bridge. A collection of timber sculptures close to Monkey Gate are an attractive addition to the park.

The south-west boundary (Character 9b) is managed as woodland edge, more densely planted trees in grass.
Character Area 9: The Open Spaces

Character Area 10: The Ornamental Water

Character Area 11: The Longbridge Sanctuary
Area 10: The Ornamental Water

The Ornamental Water (or Boating Lake as it is more commonly known) with its collection of waterfowl, boating and café continues to be one of the most well used areas of the park. The character area borders the park boundary/Outer Circle, the Sports Fields and the boundaries of some of the former villa sites – Regent’s University (formerly known as Bedford College) and Winfield House with stunning views to the Sussex Terraces and the Holme.

The shape of the Ornamental Water appears to have evolved due to the presence of the natural brooks, flanked by a number of small ponds, which flowed from Primrose Hill and Barrow Hill respectively, joining the Tyburn. It appears that Nash exploited the presence of these features to create the sinuous centrepiece for his scheme. It is thought that the metal mushroom-shaped form in the lake is in fact an overflow for the (culverted) Tyburn in times of flood.

Today the Ornamental Water is an attractive feature with a varied bankside character; it is a focal point for visitor pressure. Although finer points of Nash’s original design changed considerably as the scheme developed, for example evolving from a more linear stream-like form to a broader ‘lake’, it retained a general three-spurred shape with islands throughout. The lake was originally much deeper than the current waterbody. It was reduced in depth (to 1.2-1.5m) and the bed subsequently levelled, partly in response to the ice skating tragedy in 1867. The banks, which were originally soft and included stretches of bankside woodland, have now been stabilised to accommodate pedestrian pressure and the erosion caused by wildfowl feeding. These stabilisation works have taken a variety of forms from harsh concrete revetments to less visually intrusive oak revetment. More recently sections of embankment have been extended into the main water body to create reedbeds.

The lake supports a wide species variety and high number of waterfowl. These include the resident waterfowl collection, the heronry and other seasonal populations. The islands (six in total of which five are inaccessible to the public) provide important nesting refuges although the number of birds has led to the loss of much of the understorey vegetation. There is one tern raft. Grazing, in particular by geese, is impacting on the quality of the grassland on the south western and eastern edges of the lake.

Water quality in the lake remains poor due in part to the lack of water flow and largely to the impacts of duck-feeding and run-off which lead to nutrient enrichment. There is currently no long term dredging programme and current aeration practices (floating pumps) are insufficient and this has resulted in blooms of blue green algae in the summer months.

The area around Hanover Gate is a popular spot. There is a children’s playground, which was subject to a major improvement in 2009/10, the popular Boat House Café and a small concrete children’s boating lake. This area has a semi-ornamental character enhanced by the new wooden bridges, the shrubberies near the gate and the elaborate stone drinking fountain. The Nature Study and Waterfowl centre and public conveniences were built in 1995 adjacent to Hanover Island in the style of a Victorian park building. The Centre was home to the ornamental waterfowl...
breeding programme but this has currently ceased due to a reduction in available funding and resources.

The long linear area along the western edge of the park has a particularly strong Regency flavour due to the intact Nash terraces of Hanover Terrace, Sussex Place, Clarence Terrace, Cornwall Terrace and York Terraces. The splendid architectural character of the Central London Mosque complements the Nash terraces. At the south-western corner of the park the lake becomes more linear and takes on an attractive canal-like character with pleasant small trees including flowering cherry. This area is particularly pleasant in the spring when bankside daffodils burst into bloom. The area around Clarence Gate (a busy gate and popular access point for international visitors) has high maintenance ornamental bedding. This theme continues along the boundary with Regent’s College, which has spectacular bedding displays especially in the magnificent area around the bandstand, which was brought from Richmond Park in the 1970s. Hiring a deckchair to sit by the water in this area is a popular pastime.

**Area 11: Longbridge Sanctuary**

The Longbridge Sanctuary occupies a small area west of the Broad Walk and north of The Holme and St John’s Lodge Enclosures. It incorporates the eastern spur of the Ornamental Water.

This is a relatively quiet and low-key area that largely continues to fulfil Nash’s original intended design as a setting for St John’s Lodge and The Holme villas. It is a slightly undulating area with views across the Ornamental Water from the bridge to the southwest, across the Sports Fields to the north and to the Broad Walk Avenue to the east.

The area is dominated by a naturalistic quality with fairly informal grassland and trees including groups of silver birch and larger species. The ‘Longbridge bird sanctuary’ includes a fenced enclosure around the ornamental water, grassed areas managed as meadow with an area grazed by waterfowl, an area previously known to be a habitat for rare bush crickets and the ‘Wetland Pen’ an area of mixed wetland and marsh habitat comprising shallow scrapes and an area of deeper water, colonised with marginal and aquatic vegetation. Two artificial kingfisher banks have also been installed. The sanctuary is an important area for nesting birds and is particularly associated with larger waterfowl such as geese and ducks. There is one path, located outside of the bird sanctuary passing through this area.

The ‘Cricket Pen’ at the northern end of the Longbridge Sanctuary is an enclosed area of mixed native trees, scrub and conservation grassland.

**Area 12: Queen Mary’s Gardens and the Inner Circle**

Queen Mary’s Gardens occupies the distinctive circular enclosure located in the south-centre of the park formed by the Inner Circle, which is bounded by impressive metal gates, railings and hedging. This area is a skeleton of Nash’s original scheme for a Great Circus’ and Inner Circus, which were never built, although the Inner Circle road was constructed.
The existing layout is the result of two schemes; an original layer to an 1840s design by the curator Robert Marnock for the Royal Botanic Society, centred on a conservatory designed by Decimus Burton and a small lake; and a second stage by the Office of Works. The Burton conservatory fell into disrepair and was subsequently demolished such that today the central lawn lacks a grand focus. The only building remaining from the Marnock era is the gardener’s cottage (Nursery Lodge), which is currently used for staff housing and is thought to have once been inhabited by William Robinson, who underwent training at Regent’s Park. In the 1930s the Office of Works set out the current rose garden, created the open-air theatre and rationalised the lake. The rose gardens are of high quality and are popular with the visiting public. The gardens provide for a diverse and interesting display during all seasons, offering, in addition to the rose gardens, a range of other horticultural features: seasonal bedding displays (including sub-tropical and carpet bedding); Mediterranean borders; a national collection of delphiniums; an alpine island; shrubs, trees and lawn.

The impressive entrance via Jubilee Gates is the most elaborate gateway in the entire park. Sigismund Goetze made additional improvements to the gardens and an impressive pool was built in 1939 under his influence. The Triton Fountain was added in the 1950s by his widow to celebrate his contribution to the arts and to Regent’s Park in particular, partly but incompletely remedying the loss of the glasshouse. There are numerous other sculptures in the gardens, making this one of the most publicly accessible of all the permanent sculpture displays (along with the Avenue Gardens).

There have been a number of recent developments throughout Queen Mary’s Gardens. The lake was drained down and the fish removed in late 2011: enhancements were made by improved marginal planting and the addition of a new board walk. The English Rose Border was planted in 2006 and a major renovation of the rose gardens was completed in 2012. The recent additions include a series of workshops that are now in a dilapidated state which provide storage for grounds maintenance contractors and the studio building used by Capel Manor College. The Open Air Theatre has carried out a major refurbishment completed in the summer of 2012.

The Inner Circle is finished in an attractive red coloured tarmac surface. There are few vehicles on the Inner Circle and thus, the area is relatively safe for pedestrians and cyclists. The Inner Circle can be somewhat disorientating, as there are few views of the adjoining parkland (being screened by vegetation and hedges).
Character Area 12: Queen Mary’s Gardens
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**Figure 21: Landscape Character Area Photographs**
Area 13: Marylebone Green

Marylebone Green is located in the south of the Park and is bounded by the Avenue Gardens, the Outer and Inner Circles, The Toxopholite Enclosure and York Bridge. This space was originally intended for a number of Nash villas, none of which were built, within a setting of strategically arranged clumps of trees. Today Marylebone Green is a wide open and gently shelving grassy space which is frequently used by schools, for the recently refurbished children’s playground which is located at the southern end of the area.

Marylebone Green is the principal events space in the Park. The current timing of events restricts the period when renovation work can be carried out and this is leading to compaction and consequent challenges in improving the grassland cover.

Area 14: The Toxopholite Enclosure

The ‘Toxopholite Enclosure’ is located east of York Bridge Road to the south of Queen Mary’s Gardens between the Inner Circle and Marylebone Green. This area, which was the site of White Horse Farm, was originally part of the setting for the circle of terraces at the centre of the park. Numerous woodland blocks were planned and by 1828 this area is shown on the Mogg plan to be relatively densely planted. Interestingly White Horse Farm Pond had been retained although this appears to have been infilled shortly after. In 1832 the Toxopholite Society was granted use of the area, establishing Subscription Archery Rooms located at the eastern extremity of the ornamental water and the current pavilion around 1887-1894. The society vacated the area in 1922 and public tennis courts and a refreshment lodge were established. New Lodge was built in 1879 and is used as staff housing. The area is currently known as The Regent’s Park Tennis Centre operated by ‘Will to Win’. The facility is well used and ‘Will to Win’ are currently developing and extending the number of people playing by the introduction of social tennis in groups and tennis camps.

This area of the park also incorporates a Community Wildlife Garden. The garden was created as a demonstration garden and funded through a partnership between TRP and the RSPB ‘Wild in the Parks’ scheme. The Community Wildlife Garden is now maintained by TRP and is managed, in part, by volunteers who carry out light gardening activities. The area also has the Transport for London Cycle Hire Docking station accessed from the entrance on York Bridge.

Area 15: The Storeyard Enclosure

The Storeyard Enclosure is located north of Chester Road and adjacent to St John’s Lodge.

Today this area is the principal Royal Parks and Contractors compound in the park. It comprises a large assemblage of single-storey buildings of varied quality dating from the 1920s. These include the offices (and associated car parking) of both the TRP Management Staff and the Metropolitan Police. There are also a number of ‘prefab’ type buildings of low visual quality and repair, currently used by the deckchair, grounds maintenance and nursery contractors. In addition some of the accommodation is used by Vinci Facilities (Taylor Woodrow service contractors/
administrators to TRP) and more recently for horticultural training in conjunction with Capel Manor.

The Allotment Garden was created in 2009/10 and is managed by volunteers in partnership with Capital Growth. This new facility has proved very popular for education and volunteering with events including demonstrations, management tasks and harvest days, also serving Capel Manor College.

The shrub belt bordering Chester Road is currently being renovated through a combination of management and re-planting. This has opened up views to Chester Road Lodge which will be retained.

A building formerly used by the St Dunstan’s Society and as an English Heritage picture restoration workshop is also located in this compound. A large area of the enclosure is taken up by glasshouses and external hard standing area, which were once more fully used when the Royal Parks raised their own plants. Today they are used, albeit not at full capacity, by the Nursery contractors as holding areas for incoming plant stock.

Area 16: St. John’s Lodge Enclosure

The St John’s Enclosure is one of the secret hidden gems in the park. It is located around St John’s Lodge, one of the eight Nash villas that were actually constructed. It is bordered by the Inner Circle, the Longbridge Sanctuary and the Storeyard Enclosure.

St John’s Lodge was built in 1817-18 by John Raffield. Charles Tulk, MP, was the original occupant and it remained in private ownership until it became the headquarters of the St. Dunstan’s Organisation, later becoming the headquarters of the Institute of Archaeology. In 1959 it was occupied by Bedford College (now called Regent’s University), who vacated relatively recently. It has now been leased for private residence.

The garden was designed in 1888 by Robert Weir Shultz in the pervading ‘Arts and Crafts’ style of the day and has been restored. It is open to those members of the public inquisitive enough to find it; a small, peaceful and ornate ‘gem’ of domestic scale in contrast to other more gregarious ornamental areas of the park. The garden features a number of sculptures and ornaments including one of the original Tazzas from the Avenue Gardens, The Shepherdess by Ballie Weaver and Hylas and the Nymph by Henry Pegram RA. The ornamental vegetation is well maintained and includes some fine pleached limes. Drainage is poor in some areas.

The Royal Parks Foundation funded through sponsorship the bespoke timber benches in the garden in 2008.

Area 17: Regent’s University Enclosure

Regent’s College Enclosure is a semi-private enclosure that is located to the south of Queen Mary’s Gardens and between the southern arm of the Ornamental Water and Queen Mary’s Gardens. This area approximates to the location of Marylebone Park Farm and was an obvious location for the construction of one of the Nash Villas: South Villa. Designed by Decimus Burton, this became the residence of
George Bishop – a wine merchant. However, in late Victorian times the house was remodelled and leased to Bedford College for Women. Finally, in 1930 South Lodge was demolished in order to make way for new larger premises designed by Basil Champneys – the current Regent’s College buildings. This area is not officially accessible to the general public, although it is possible for the public to enter the area and the college is visible across the Ornamental Water and also from Queen Mary’s Gardens. The boundary with the Ornamental Water is very narrow and ungenerous. Regent’s College enclosure is not maintained to the high horticultural and landscape quality of the remainder of the park, although co-operation between the college and TRP is good.

Area 18: The Holme Enclosure

The Holme Enclosure is sandwiched between the eastern Inner Circle and the Ornamental Water. This is the original (and one of few remaining) Nash Villas and was also the first architectural commission of Decimus Burton, who undertook its design on behalf of his father, the builder James Burton. This villa has stunning lakeside views and is also an attractive sight across the ornamental Water and from the Parkland, particularly from The Longbridge Sanctuary area. As Nash intended, it appears to rest within its own parkland context. However, it can appear somewhat insular and introverted which was not Nash’s intention and there is no access around the lake edge here. The Holme was briefly used, following the war, by Bedford College, but is now in use as a private residence. The Holme gardens are opened to the public on two ‘open days’ each year under the National Gardens Scheme.

Area 19: Winfield House Enclosure

The Winfield House Enclosure is located on the west side of Regent’s Park, to the north of the Ornamental Water and west of the Sports Fields. The Winfield House Enclosure occupies the former extent of Hertford Lodge, which was one of the Nash Villas. Hertford Lodge was designed by Decimus Burton and constructed in 1825 for the Marquess of Hertford who later renamed it St Dunstan’s Lodge when he added a clock brought from St Dunstan’s Church Fleet Street (which was later returned). Between the 1918 and 1921 the house was used by the ‘St Dunstan’s Society’ for the training of blind servicemen. After this time Cary Grant and his wife Barbara Hutton lived here and it was their decision to demolish St Dunstan’s Lodge and construct ‘Winfield House’. This was presented to the United States and is now the London home of the American Ambassador. The shrubbery around the gardens is now so dense that it is virtually impossible to see the house from the park.

Area 20: The Holford Sanctuary

Holford House (1832) was the largest and grandest of the Nash villas and was the last to be constructed. It was originally owned by the wine merchant James Holford and then became a training centre for Baptist ministers (Baptist Training College). In WW2 Holford House suffered irreparable bomb damage, being demolished in 1947, and was not rebuilt. In 1904 a section of the Holford House site was laid out for sports use including tennis courts, a golf school and archery ground. A maintenance yard for the Royal Parks (known as the Leafyard) was also established and the adjoining wooded gardens (Leafyard Wood) were fenced off as a bird sanctuary. The Golf and Tennis School was demolished in 2011 and the area is currently being
re-instated as parkland incorporating a range of grassland, wetland and scrub habitats.

Grassland between the Leafyard Woodland and the East Wing Meadow Garden is managed on mixed rotations, creating a mosaic of grassland habitats with mown grass paths, which supports a rich invertebrate population.

**Area 21: ZSL London Zoo Enclosure**

ZSL London Zoo occupies a large triangle of land in the north of Regent’s Park, which borders on the eastern side with The Broad Walk and on the southern side with the Sports Fields.

This area is believed to occupy the former site of Rugmore deserted medieval village. The zoo has been a long-standing component of the park being first established in 1828 to a design by Decimus Burton and gradually increasing in size to occupy its current triangular enclosure, which is over five times its original extent. Many of the structures within the zoo are listed buildings, such as the Elephant House by Sir Hugh Casson. There are many views into the zoo from the park, particularly from the northern Broad Walk (discussed earlier) and from the Sports Fields. However the interface of the park and zoo could be enhanced as currently in certain locations the zoo dominates the parkland setting rather than appearing accommodated within it. The zoo is a popular destination, attracting many people to Regent’s Park, although in recent years legislation covering the size of animal enclosures has necessitated the further expansion of the zoo into the park.

An exit was created from the zoo onto the Broad Walk in 2010 along with a small viewing area. The bow top fencing used in this area needs reviewing as it is not contained in the Landscape Design Guide and is not curved to create a pleasing arc.

**Area 22: Outer Circle**

The Outer Circle is a single continuous linear loop that encircles Regent’s Park and borders the remaining Nash Terraces. An outer loop road was always part of Nash’s concept for the site and the Outer Circle has remained in the same location in which it was constructed. The Crown Estate, the Crown Estate Paving Commission and TRP jointly manage The Outer Circle (see Chapter 2 for more details). Accordingly, there is a wide range of signs erected by the various agencies in charge of the area. Originally the Outer Circle was a carriage drive surfaced with gravel and bounded by oak pale. Today the route is surfaced in tarmac with some spur roads of distinctive red colouration that distinguishes it from the surrounding roads. The boundary with the park varies although is unified by a hedge, generally of hawthorn. The road is relatively quiet in relation to the surrounding streets but, nonetheless, it is quite busy and introduces noise and movement, which disturbs the ambience of the park in places at certain times. There are lockable gates that restrict access to the Outer Circle at night. There are almost 1000 parking bays (pay and display) on the Outer Circle.

The boundary of the congestion charge zone currently runs along Marylebone Road, south of Regent’s Park, thus making the roads around Regent’s Park (including the Outer and Inner Circles) a possible target for people evading the central London tariff.
The CEPC manage the lighting along the Outer Circle and have increased the lighting levels from the gas lamps (converted to electricity).

Area 23: The Leafyard & Leafyard Wood

The Leafyard area used to be part of Holford House. The woodland belt around its periphery has a number of ornamental trees dating from that period, hollies, bays and Scots pine. There is evidence of old formal drives and remains of old walls. The leafyard excludes the public, fenced with chain link fencing, topped with barbed wire.

The woodland is managed as a wildlife reserve, formerly known as West Wing Bird Sanctuary. Tawny owls are known to nest here, migratory birds such as fire-crests, wood warblers and spotted fly catchers inhabit the wood. Feeding stations are maintained for the parkland birds.

There is a small wildlife pond and another bird drinking pond. The wood is also host to two areas of bee hives which produce Regent’s Park Honey and are also used for education. The woodland provides an enclosed, quiet space which is ideal for use by local schools and educational groups.

The Leafyard depot area inside the woodland belt is used as the green waste composting area. The compound re-cycles all green waste from the park and produces all the compost and mulch used in the Park (with the exception of imported manure for the rose beds) and is also supplied free of charge to London Zoo and Crown Estates. The depot has concrete flooring; a groundsman’s store shed, with storage for sports turf machinery and equipment.

Area 24: East Wing Meadow

East Wing Meadow, the site of the old Golf and Tennis School, includes a small enclosure. All of the hard standing from the tennis courts has been crushed and retained on site to create a matrix of substrates supporting a variety of plant communities and associated wildlife. The porosity of the rubble is maintained to retain its habitat value by periodic turning to disrupt colonising of over-vigorous plants such as buddleia and bramble. Water run-off gathers in a scape, creating a seasonal pool. The potential drain on moisture from woody vegetation is curtailed by coppicing. Roesel’s crickets grasshoppers and wasp spiders abound. The area is a focused wildlife sanctuary, maintained by the conservation officer.
Figure 22: Landscape Character Area Photographs
9.4 PRIMROSE HILL

Area 25: Primrose Hill South

Primrose Hill South defines the lower lying area of land in the south of Primrose Hill opposite the Zoological Gardens. This was a later addition to the park and Nash played no part in its design. As a consequence it lacks the formality and relationship with the surrounding residential areas which are of mixed age, in contrast to the Regency terraces bordering Regent's Park. Primrose Hill is also separated from Regent's Park physically and visually by the Zoo, roads and The Regent's Canal. Consequently, it assumes more of a local open space character dominated by grass and trees, but with an increasingly semi natural character influenced by the progressive removal of non-native trees and shrubs from the main areas of the hill and new areas of meadow grassland and native scrub.

The entrance to The Primrose Hill is rather unimpressive – the gates were removed for safety reasons in the 1970s and have not been replaced. Primrose Hill Lodge is an attractive building used by the Royal Parks (let to the Metropolitan Police) for staff housing, but seems to ‘turn its back’ on the park. The lower, southern, area of Primrose Hill comprises a rather flat area, which is criss-crossed by a network of tarmac paths and punctuated with black lampposts (former gas lamps) and small groups of thorn trees. The lampposts, bins and furniture create a rather cluttered appearance. There is a small enclave of facilities in this area, in the location of the former public gymnasium along the southern boundary with Prince Albert Road. This includes toilets, a playground, and one boules/petanque court, and a refurbished outdoor gym/trim trail.

The shrubberies on the western boundary are being progressively renovated through a combination of management and new planting. In contrast to the rest of Primrose Hill these borders are ornamental in character and are being re-planted with an attractive mix of shrubs reminiscent of late 19th/early 20th century styles. The hill has a strong influence on the character of this area, its steep landform dominating views northwards. There are also indications of lynchets (medieval fields) here, one of the few archaeological features known to remain within the park.

Area 26: Primrose Hill Summit

The Primrose Hill Summit is the large area of Primrose Hill covering the central and northern part of the park, including the viewpoint. This area shares the informal qualities of Primrose Hill South and Regent's Park. In WW2 this area was used for dig-for victory allotments, air raid shelters and for strategic equipment. The enhancement proposals to the viewpoint and surrounding slopes have been completed.

There are spectacular views south-east across London over Regent’s Park, which appears as a wooded oasis, and to St Paul’s Cathedral, Westminster and the City of London beyond. Northwards views are also possible to Hampstead Heath.

The open, steep grassy banks of the south facing slopes include a significant area of acid grassland. The northern slopes have more of a parkland character with widely spaced groups of trees (mainly of oak) and areas of conservation grassland. Clumps of native scrub have been established on the northern slopes of the summit. There
are strong avenues of plane trees following the northern and eastern boundaries of the summit. To the north the thorns and other trees are much thicker creating an attractive wooded appearance. This area feels much more local in use and many visitors are unaware of the spectacular view from this area.

In July 2012 the redevelopment of the summit was completed after 5 years of consultation. The area was reconfigured from a circle to an ellipse; two additional benches were added to make 4 in total – constructed from Richmond Park Oak. The grassland areas were improved along with better drainage – through a gulley and soakaway arrangement. A York stone kerb was installed and has been inscribed with a William Blake quote. Walk England managed the design and installation of an update orientation panel in consultation with the Friends of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill and Primrose Hill Community Association.

**Area 27: Primrose Hill West**

Primrose Hill West is a gently sloping area lying to the west of Primrose Hill. It is an open grassy space, which is partly used for softball pitches, although its sloping nature makes it less than ideal for sport. The lower slopes also suffer from waterlogging compounding the suitability problem. The perimeter areas of grassland are managed as conservation grassland and a native species hedge has been planted along the boundary with Barrow Hill Reservoir. The transition with the adjoining residential areas is weak – generally related to the back walls of the adjoining properties, some of which have gated access. There is an important avenue of boundary London plane trees in the north and western parts of the area.
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9.5 HISTORIC EXTENT

The following descriptions apply to areas outside of the direct control of TRP. They therefore deal only to the relationship between the public park and its historic context, excluding other matters (such as structural or tenure considerations), which are outside the remit of care of TRP.

Area A: Park Square Gardens

Nash originally designed the area of Park Square Gardens and Park Crescent as a circus of terraces. However the current solution, which was overseen by Nash fulfills a similar function representing a point of repose at the end of the Regent Street - Portland Place routeway before the grand entry into Regent’s Park (and, at least in conception, to the Guingette). In part this role is still fulfilled and architecturally pure comprising a central interconnected private greenspace surrounded by the classic Nash terraces of: Park Crescent East (1819/21) and Park Crescent West (1819/21) - which were the first buildings designed for the park by John Nash; St Andrews Place (1823/26); Park Square East (1823) where the remains of the Diorama lie; Park Square West (1824); and Albany Terrace (1820/23).

Following bomb damage to some of these terraces – particularly the crescents, these were rebuilt and restored in 1963-65. However, this landscape has subsequently become visually and physically severed from the park due to the presence of the busy Marylebone Road and the physical barriers and visual impenetrability of the open spaces, which together serve to diminish the perceived interconnection between the three spaces. In part, the physical aspect is dealt with by a pedestrian underpass but this cannot replace the ‘ceremonial’ aspect of passing through the space. From inside The Regent’s Park the intended relationship to inner London is obscure.

Area B: East Terraces

The East Terraces area includes Gloucester Gate (1827), Park Village East, Park Village West, St Katharine’s Royal Hospital (1828), Cumberland Terrace (1826), Cumberland Place (1826), Chester Place (1825/26), Chester Terrace (1825), Cambridge Terrace (1825) Cambridge Gate (1876/80) and the more recent Royal College of Physicians (1964) by Sir Denys Lasdun. Cumberland Terrace, intended originally to face the guingette proposed for the Prince Regent, is deemed to be the grandest of the Nash terraces with impressive statues by George Bubb. This side of the park is remarkably complete and creates the proper context to the park, with all being restored following war damage. In parts this positive relationship has become (reversibly) weakened by maturation of large trees, both within the park and in the Terrace gardens, which have obscured views between the park and terraces.

Area C: South Terraces

The South Terraces Area includes York Terraces East and West (1822), Ulster Terrace and Place (1824) and, beyond this, St Marylebone Church (1817). This was a new church at the time of the scheme whose location was expertly exploited by Nash who created York Gate in response as a fine ‘set piece’ composition. This was
restored following almost complete destruction between 1940 and 1941. This area originally also incorporated Doric Villa.

Today this area is important in providing a suitable backdrop to the Ornamental Water from the south of the park and is also particularly important in providing a built buffer to the park from the noisy Marylebone Road. Again, there are some problems with trees obscuring buildings.

**Area D: West Terraces**

This area comprises Cornwall Terrace (1821), Clarence Terrace (1823), Sussex Place (1822), Kent Terrace (1827) and Hanover Terrace (1822) including Clarence Gate Lodge and Hanover Gate Lodge.

Cornwall Terrace was designed by Decimus Burton. Sussex Place exploits views over the Ornamental Water and is currently used by the London Graduate School of Business Studies. These were all restored following war damage with the exception of the façade of Clarence Terrace, which was in such bad condition it had to be replaced. These are all important in defining views over the southwest of the park, particularly across the Ornamental Water.

**Area E: Regent’s Lodge Canal**

There are no formal terraces in this area, although this does include Grove House, one of the original Nash Villas, located north of the Canal, which now appears somewhat detached from the parkland setting being dominated by the adjoining tall and modern buildings on Park Road. Another Nash Villa - North Villa (Albany Cottage) made way for the Central London Mosque, although the fine Islamic architecture including the magnificent large copper dome of this building complements rather than detracts from the Nash terraces, perhaps with echoes of other Nash schemes such as the Brighton pavilion. Hanover Lodge is also one of the original Nash conceptions. It is considered that the more recent ‘villas’ - Ionic Villa (1990), Veneto Villa (1991) and Gothick Villa (1992) – created in the grounds of Hanover Lodge are less positive, having neither the elegance of the terraces nor the spacious setting of the villas. Three further villas – Corinthian, Regency and Tuscan Villas have been recently constructed. The continuation of the canal through this area is an important connection between TRP-controlled land and the wider area.

**Area F: St. Pancras Residential**

This area now predominantly comprises a dense residential area of modern buildings, tower blocks and social housing, following the demolition of the Nash Market Places (Cumberland Market, Clarence Market and York Square). Furthermore, the collateral cut of the canal, which once passed through this area to culminate in a small basin, has been filled in, although its line can be discerned by the arrangement of the streets and the alignment of the allotment gardens. However, it does still retain the historic and picturesque Park Village. Being located behind the East Terraces the (generally poor) visual quality of this area does not impact considerably upon the park. However much of this area is devoid of positive greenspace which reinforces the important role that Regent’s Park plays in providing greenspace for local residents.
Character Area A: Park Square Gardens
Character Area B: East Terraces
Character Area C: South Terraces
Character Area D: West Terraces
Character Area E: St Pancras Residential

Figure 24: Historic Context Area Photographs
Management Issues: **Character Areas**

- Broad Walk border with London Zoo draws footfall through the shrub planting area which need management.
- Gloucester Green play area needs improvements to its infrastructure to raise its play value.
- Gloucester Slips car park is poorly presented and would benefit from improvement.
- Cyclical (non-routine) maintenance on sports pitches.
- Uncertain future for use of the Nature Study and Waterfowl centre.
- A review needed of park buildings and functions.
- High proportion of traffic using park as cut through, exacerbated by persistent speeding.
- Requirement to generate more income in a manner that is sensitive to the park, its residents, visitors and ecology.
- Diverse range of landscape characters each with its own ambience and uses, creates a need to employ a wide range of different management techniques.
PART 3: LANDSCAPE STRATEGY

10. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Statement of Significance

The statement of significance explains what matters and why it matters. It sets out why the site is unique and what is important or ‘significant’ about it. It is the basis for developing policies, management guidelines and identifying projects to ensure that positive aspects of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill are conserved in perpetuity whilst weak or declining aspects or features can be enhanced in the most appropriate manner.

Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill are individually and collectively highly valued by many people (over eight million visitors a year). Their prime significance is due to their:

- Internationally renowned historic landscape (recognised in numerous national historic and landscape designations including the Grade I listing of Regent’s Park on the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens and the presence of several listed buildings);
- Royal origin and connections (from Marylebone Park and the Prince Regent to Queen Mary and The Royal Parks);
- Grand and elegant early nineteenth century design by John Nash with Regency terraces and villas, set around and within a spacious picturesque parkland.
- Later design layers such as the Avenue Gardens, English Gardens, Queen Mary’s Gardens and associations with ZSL London Zoo, which are all now important historic features in their own right: distinctive character areas within the park, supported with intentionally differentiated furniture.
- Large number of high quality sculptures and artefacts that enrich the visual quality and intimacy of the parkland landscape without cluttering it.
- Historically important intervisibility between the Nash terraces and the historic parkland; important internal views over the Ornamental Water, Queen Mary’s Gardens, and key Broad Walk vista; and the contrasting characters between the refined ambience of Regent’s Park with the naturalistic landscape of Primrose Hill, with its panoramic views over the city of London, St Paul’s Cathedral and Westminster Abbey that are protected by statute.
- Importance as a formal and informal public recreational landscape, including children’s play, with extensive provision for many sports (including football, rugby, cricket, softball and tennis).
- Established events programme providing seasonal interest and variety.
- Diversity, quality, size, and value as greenspace providing respite from the urban environment of Inner London and contributing its cooling effect to the urban heat island.
- Confirmed communal value from visitor surveys.
- A wildlife refuge offering habitats and night time darkness within the wider city.
- Acclaim as a centre for horticultural excellence.
- The value of many fine species of trees, their diversity and maturity; and the subsequent improved air quality.
- The importance of the lakes, water and their role in providing habitat for many specialist birds and waterfowl.
11. KEY MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Introduction

The previous sections have described and identified a wide number of elements and features within Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill that are of significance to the essential character and genius loci of the park and have set out the reasons they are considered important. Throughout the document, numerous issues-based and area-specific management issues, which currently affect the quality and appropriateness of the landscape experience for visitors, have been identified.

Key management issues which the management plan policies must address are identified below.

Key Issues

Appreciation of management responsibilities and respect for the strategic context.

- Complexity and overlap of landscape management responsibilities within the park and the wider historic extent – i.e. The Royal Parks, TRP contractors, Crown Estate, The Crown Estate Paving Commission, London Borough of Camden, The City of Westminster, private interests, Canal and River Trust, creating a need to ensure clarity of roles and responsibilities and co-ordination of management.

- Role and jurisdiction of management plan with regard to leased areas, particularly ZSL London Zoo, and need/compatibility of management plans for areas within historic extent but outside of TRP control.

- Extensive legislation and local planning policy relating to the park and with which the management plan should comply, and the on-going need to respond to new legislation and initiatives.

Conservation, enhancement and respect for the historic landscape.

- Multiple layers of history – medieval deer park, the Regency ‘Nash’ framework, and features of the public park (including some by renowned designers and horticulturalists), creating difficulty of establishing hierarchy of importance and requiring conservation and interpretation.

- Loss of key historic buildings from within and around the park including Decimus Burton’s conservatory from Queen Mary’s Gardens, loss of several Nash villas, and the Colosseum from the Outer Circle.

- Loss of intended spatial relationships - e.g. connectivity of Regent’s Park to Regents Street.

- Large areas of the historic estate that are not in the control of TRP including the Nash Terraces and Villas.
• Need to maintain and where opportunities arise, restore the character and presence of views between historic buildings and surrounding parkland including Nash terraces and villas.

• Importance of the contribution and association with eminent garden designers such as the Nesfields and Robinson.

**Physical Context**

• Poor drainage associated with underling clay substrate and localised bomb rubble.

• Need for ongoing management of the tree resource (including many mature specimens) including the need for reconciliation and long-term strategy of disposition of trees and parkland in relation to Nash’s philosophy and ultimate layout.

• Water quality, supply and storage issues associated with the borehole supply, the water bodies and the park water management systems.

• Ecological and wildlife conservation and management. The park now benefits from good baseline information on ecology and wildlife. Ongoing management is seeking to enhance and manage a network of habitats throughout the park.

• Importance of ornamental horticultural displays and shrubberies in latter-day history of park e.g. Avenue Gardens, Queen Mary’s Gardens etc. and the need to maintain these to a high standard.

• Specific area-based problems such as spacing/succession of trees in Broad Walk avenue – informal, poor quality, mixed species, inconsistent and ‘squeezed’ by ZSL London Zoo in north and Storeyard near Chester Gate.

• Maintenance of the visual quality and physical repair of buildings and hard landscape fabric.

• Presence of derelict and disused /under-utilised buildings including workshops, glasshouses and toilets.

• Character and quality of the Inner and Outer Circles including raising awareness of their location within a Royal Park, traffic calming, control of parking and pedestrian/vehicular safety.

• Backlog of repairs to paths, bridges, edging, drainage, fences and other structural elements.

• Need to continue to work towards parkland furniture coordination including benches, bins, signage and lighting in accordance with TRP Landscape Design Guide.

• Boundary treatments and gateways – which require improvements to increase ambience.

• Importance of localised features - such as sculpture displays.
**Public use and enjoyment**

- To promote the park and encourage visitors whilst protecting the park heritage and the special characteristics which are valued by visitors.
- To promote sustainable forms of transport and outreach to under-represented groups and sectors of the community.
- Maintaining the range of visitor experiences to appeal to different audiences.
- Health and safety issues including minimising traffic impacts upon the wider parkland landscape (as well as noise, signage and pedestrian crossing points), crime issues on Primrose Hill, and control of dogs, and cycling.
- User conflicts including visitor pressure for cycle and roller blade use within the park.
- Importance and frequency of events to attract visitors and provide income needs to be balanced against impacts on the park infrastructure.
- Potential to continue to expand interpretation opportunities including historic landscape, ecology and horticulture.

**Management and enhancement of landscape character and quality**

- Overriding importance of the park as a Grade I Historic Landscape.
- Weak relationship between Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill – including aspects related to severance by ZSL London Zoo, Primrose Hill Bridge and Prince Albert Road.
- Impact of surrounding areas – the need to recognise the impact of the visual character of these areas upon the park and, where possible, resist negative impacts and promote a positive interface.
- Important views including the strategic views from Primrose Hill and others, some of which have been marred by recent unsympathetic buildings outside the park.
- Variety of landscape character – need to ensure continued balance and good presentation of character across the whole of the parkland.
- Poor presentation and lack of distinctiveness in some areas – (e.g. poor quality of lawns to the west of the Ornamental Water) requiring consideration and thought in relation to character.
The management plan strategy emerges from an understanding of the important qualities of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill, the review of the baseline conditions, and the management issues identified. It defines the long-term vision for the parks in order to target the most important and worthy areas of conservation and enhancement and to ensure the most effective use of resources.

The current character and qualities of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill are much loved by the visiting public and are of such strength and recognised importance that the vision is essentially grounded in conservation and enhancement of the existing framework. However, within this there is a need for flexibility - recognising that some change is inevitable due to wear and tear on fabric and facilities, the need for renewal of the living components of the parkland as they reach the end of their natural lives, and responding to new pressures and demands placed upon the park by the public - which are sometimes at odds with the historic fabric. In addition to this there is also an aspiration for park improvement including the desirability of outreach to local and wider communities, including the need for wider social inclusiveness and the engagement of new audiences. The vision strives for balance between conserving the historic landscape and meeting the needs and demands of current and potential users.

### The Vision for The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill

- The vision is to conserve the interrelationship of historic parkland with its unique setting offering a broad range of opportunities for active and passive recreation.

- To conserve and enhance the green and built environment and infrastructure and to manage all aspects of The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill to exemplary standards.

- To work closely with those responsible for managing areas of the historic estate not managed by TRP.

- Together with these objectives, the significance of The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill as a resource for wildlife at the heart of a leading global city means that both quality and diversity of habitat are of primary importance.
Specific Objectives

12.3 In summary the specific objectives for future landscape management are to:

- Maintain the current variety and quality of landscape character and individual features in Regent's Park and Primrose Hill including preserving the parks' separate identities and complimentary qualities.

- Recognise, respect and restore/reinforce the elements of the early nineteenth century historic Nash layout and positive later nineteenth century and twentieth century additions within Regent’s Park and support appropriate management of the surviving elements outside of the park including the Nash Terraces.

- Strive for the highest standards of environmentally sustainable management and maximise the contribution of the park to wider urban quality of life objectives.

- Conserve and enhance the existing nature conservation value of the park and encourage enhancements of the park's biodiversity in line with ongoing local and city-wide biodiversity initiatives.

- Continue to provide and maintain high quality infrastructure, buildings, landscape and horticulture and promote high standards of cleanliness and visitor safety throughout the park, working with other managing bodies within the park in its widest sense.

- Continue to provide a wide range of recreational opportunities and settings within the park, particularly the informal recreational value of the park and its importance as a sports venue.

- Realise the full value of the park as an educational resource.

- Manage Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill in an open and transparent manner, for and on behalf of its users and visitors and, where appropriate, ensure consultation about major proposals or changes in management with stakeholders.
PART 4: MANAGEMENT POLICIES

13. GUIDING POLICIES FOR CONSERVATION

Policy CON1: Landscape Character

**CON1:** Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill will be managed to conserve and enhance their separate and distinct characters whilst maintaining and complementing their diversity of historical, natural and recreational settings. The key views and vistas to, from, and within the Parks, will be protected and, where necessary, strengthened. Built features contributing positively to landscape character will be conserved, and the introduction of new features will be carefully considered in relation to impact on the historic character of Regent’s Park and the informal qualities of Primrose Hill.

Management Guidelines: Landscape Character

Most policies relate to a greater or lesser extent to landscape character and therefore specific management guidelines are not presented here.


Policy CON2: Historic Landscape

**CON2:** The implemented layout of Regent’s Park at its period of greatest significance – the early Nineteenth century design by John Nash – will be conserved and, where appropriate, restored, whilst respecting and enhancing positive contributions to the park landscape, principally those made by later practitioners such as Decimus Burton, Markham Nesfield, William Andrews Nesfield, Robert Marnock and Sigismund Goetz. In contrast the continuity of naturalness and openness that has formed the essential character of Primrose Hill will be conserved.

Management Guidelines: Historic Landscape

**CON2.1:** Parkland layout
Preserve the broad spatial arrangement of Regent’s Park established by the mid-nineteenth century layout including tree disposition and the distribution of buildings. Preserve the openness and naturalness of Primrose Hill and its contrast to Regent’s Park.

**CON2.2:** Terraces
Conserve and strengthen the relationship between Regent’s Park and the surrounding terraces through control of visually intrusive vegetation within the park.
or terrace gardens (in cooperation with the Crown Estate and CEPC) and through liaison with adjacent planning authorities to discourage construction of tall buildings within the view shed of Regent’s Park.

CON2.3: Villas and gate lodges.
Conserve and, where possible, encourage reinstatement of Nash’s intended relationship between the villas (or buildings occupying former villa sites) and the wider parkland landscape i.e. of a villa set within its own parkland and with views to/from the villas to the wider landscape.

CON2.4: Circulation
Retain the key vehicular (carriage drive) and pedestrian circulation elements of the Nash scheme, including the Inner and Outer Circles, Chester Road and the Cumberland Green Path, and other early additions such as the Broad Walk Avenue and seek to conserve their historic integrity through the control of surfacing, street furniture and views.

CON2.4: Lake
Ensure that the lake and its setting are conserved to reflect the nineteenth century character, including preservation of views across the lake towards the terraces.

CON2.5: Later Additions
Where possible, seek to remove later structures or buildings that adversely affect the setting or historic integrity of the Nash/Burton villas or lodges or other areas of historic importance. This is a long-term aim, which can be phased as structures reach the end of their viable life.

CON2.6: Lost Features
Seek to restore some lost features of the Nash layout, or positive later contributions, where these would make a positive contribution to the character or use of the modern park. The level of ‘honesty’ of restoration will need to be determined by the specific circumstances but must maintain the integrity of the historic setting. For example it may be more appropriate to restore the spirit or ambience of a lost feature rather than a strict replica for practical or safety reasons or to reflect changing public needs, whereas in some cases restoration will need to be true to the original. This is illustrated by the successful introduction of fountains contemporaneous to but not originally forming part of the original design by Nesfield for the Avenue Gardens.

CON2.7: Heritage Impact Assessment
Heritage Impact Assessments will be carried out in order to assess the potential effects of proposed changes to the layout, design, management and use of the park.

Policy CON3: Archaeology

**CON3:** Known archaeological remains will be conserved and protect in situ and the potential for archaeological remains will be considered in any future subsurface works.

Management Guidelines: Archaeology

**CON3.1: Archaeological watching briefs**
Although English Heritage advise that there are few archaeological remains of significance known on the site a watching brief will be prepared for any new works, particularly in the vicinity of known former buildings and settlements such as the zoo (site of Rugmore medieval village) or Holford House (in relation to Sports facilities).


Policy CON4: Biodiversity

**CON4:** The existing natural assets of the parkland will be conserved, enhanced and be managed to realise their biodiversity potential within the constraints of the historic landscape and public use. The aim will be to create an appropriate mosaic of habitats (grassland, trees, freshwater, woodland, etc.) and within these to encourage as much structural and species diversity as possible and to maintain the balance of succession. TRP will continue to contribute to national, regional and local biodiversity targets and records.

Management Guidelines: Biodiversity

**CON4.1: Ecological survey**
The 2013 Phase 1 Species and Habitat and NVC Communities survey will be updated every five years. The Hedgehog Research project indicated a viable but vulnerable population of hedgehogs. Recommendations will be set out to protect this species and to manage habitats vital to their longevity. Other specialist surveys will be undertaken or updated as required or when funding permits.

**CON4.2: Recording**
TRP will continue to contribute to national and regional biodiversity recording databases including BARs and GiGL. TRP are working with LISI (London Invasive Species Initiative) to record non-native invasive plant species in the Royal Parks. TRP Ecology Unit will continue to collate biological information for all the Royal Parks and this information will be used to inform management and as a baseline for monitoring the changes in the biodiversity of the park.

**CON4.3: Monitoring**
Ecological monitoring will be carried out in order to monitor and inform habitat and species management in the park.
**CON4.4: Habitat support**
Habitat remediation (e.g. acid grassland) and support (e.g. bat boxes) will be carried out in order to protect specific UK BAP species in the park.


**Policy CON5: Sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CON5:</strong> Sustainability sits at the heart of everything TRP does and is one of the key corporate aims; “To conserve and enhance sustainably, for the enjoyment of this and future generations, our world class natural and built historic environment and our biodiversity”. The 2015 Sustainability Strategy will highlight TRP’s vision and approach over the next 10 years. It will link with other existing plans and policies on topics such as sustainable procurement, sustainable events, biodiversity, stakeholder engagement, water, waste and other areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Management Guidelines: Sustainability**

**CON5.1: Use of Chemicals**
The use of chemicals – insecticides, molluscicides, herbicides, etc. will continue to be kept to the minimum necessary, in compliance with good horticultural standards and requirements for public health and safety.

**CON5.2: Water Management**
The use of water for irrigation will be kept to the minimum possible within the constraints of maintaining high horticultural standards. The capacity for water storage will be improved and irrigation systems improved across the park. The potential for SUDS (sustainable urban drainage systems) will be considered in all new built development.

**CON5.3: Energy and recycling**
On-site and off-site energy consumption and emissions will be minimised to the greatest extent possible through encouraging sustainable forms of transportation within the park, encouraging public transport to reach the park in accordance with TRP Green Travel Plan (2009), and minimising the need for transport of goods and waste to/from the site, for example through on site recycling.

14. PHYSICAL CONTEXT

Policy PHY1: Geology and topography

**PHY1:** The constraints and opportunities created by the physical nature of the landscape around Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill will be respected and exploited.

Management Guidelines: Geology and Topography
There are no specific management issues, except in relation to particular aspects such as views and drainage, detailed elsewhere.


Policy PHY2: Soils

**PHY2:** The soil environment will be managed in order to sustain the character and qualities of the park landscape and gardens and the current levels of use for sports and events.

Management Guidelines: Soils
These are covered elsewhere as set out below:


Policy PHY3: Hydrology, Drainage and Conduits

**PHY3:** Park drainage systems for both hard and soft landscape areas will improve areas of poor drainage and be managed to ensure that any discharge from site meets any requirements under statute or licence.

Management Guidelines: Hydrology, Drainage and Conduits

**PHY3.1: The River Tyburn**
Consider the presence of the former River Tyburn and its tributaries in drainage works and to consider long-term opportunities for investigating the source and potential flows of the Tyburn with a view to de-culverting this watercourse and increasing water supply/through flow.
PHY3.2: Management Objectives

- Continue to review and renew defective foul drains and upgrade path drainage
- Continue improvements to park Drainage systems
- Continue to maintain and improve irrigation systems

Related Policies: PHY4: Water

Policy PHY4: Water

PHY4: Water Management throughout the park will seek to improve water quality and the efficient management of water in order to maintain and enhance the character and biodiversity of the parkland landscape.

Management Guidelines: Water

PHY4.1: Water Quality
Continue to monitor and take action to reduce water pollution, including dredging and sediment control operations, control of wildfowl fouling, and establishment of macrophytes and ecological systems.

PHY4.2: Water Storage and Management

Improve the capacity for water storage in order to enable more efficient use of the borehole supply.

PHY 4.3: Management Objectives

- Continue with water quality enhancements to control nutrient levels seeking ecological solutions in preference to further aeration and establishment of a more varied shoreline supporting macrophytes.

- Continue with wildfowl control programme and public education to discourage feeding with bread.

- Develop and improve sediment control and utilisation with innovative habitat creation schemes (requires removal cycle of c.20 years).

- Continue co-operation with other agencies such as Canal and River Trust and Environment Agency (LEAP) for London-wide water quality objectives and London Boroughs of Camden and City of Westminster in respect of local BAP target habitat.

- Improve water management in accordance with TRP Sustainable Development Action Plan.

15. NATURAL FABRIC

Policy NAT1: Trees and Woodland

**NAT1:** The general informal structure of tree planting with informal groups and only one formal avenue, and the ratio of trees to open space within the parklands will be maintained through an ongoing planting and tree renewal programme.

Management Guidelines: Trees and Woodland

NAT1.1: Tree Survey and Database
Trees throughout the park will be inspected in accordance with the Tree Risk Management Policy and agreed risk zoning for the park. The existing tree survey database will be maintained and updated as surveys and inspections are carried out.

NAT1.2: Tree Management
A detailed tree strategy has been produced alongside this management plan. Annual programmes of tree works will be agreed between TRP Arboricultural Manager and the Park Manager in order to conserve the tree population. Tree management will also be assessed against historical data/views in order to conserve the historic character of the park through the retention of key views and planting to re-establish or maintain the tree structure of the park. Current priorities include the rejuvenation of the Broad Walk Avenue, distribution of parkland trees according to Nash’s principle’s, maintain views to the historic terraces and within the park prolonging the age of trees to encourage the development of a veteran tree resource and woodland management for biodiversity.

NAT1.3: Pests and Diseases
TRP will continue to monitor for the presence of pests and diseases affecting trees throughout the park and will work with other agencies and organisations to work towards effective controls and eradication.

NAT1.4 Management Objectives
- Continue to develop the Arbortrack and tree risk management approach across the park.
- Maintain and plan for the replacement of specimen and groups of trees to retain the parkland structure and heritage of the park.
- Maintain the current levels of inspections and remedial works to address current major pest and disease threats to the tree population Develop and agree a strategy for the rationalisation and rejuvenation of the Broad Walk avenue to the north of Chester Road.
- Woodland management in the Leafyard Woodland and the embankments to The Regent’s Canal to enhance the biodiversity value of the woodlands and involve local volunteers.
- Management of trees to re-establish and maintain views in/out of the park as identified on the Key Views Plan (Figure 16).


**Policy NAT2: Grassland**

**NAT2:** Grassland will be managed to ensure that it continues to contribute positively to the appearance, biodiversity and use of the park for sports, events and recreation.

**Management Guidelines: Grassland**

**NAT2.1: Grassland Management**

Grassland management regimes will be devised in order to meet the purpose and level of use for each area throughout the park. The condition and quality of each area will be monitored and regimes adapted to suit each area. Grassland mosaics will be created to provide wildlife habitat in perimeter areas, as conservation headlands and larger meadow areas in appropriate locations (see Figure 18 overleaf).

**NAT 2.2 Management Objectives**

- Maintain and expand the matrix of grassland types for visual amenity and biodiversity.
- Amelioration of sward conditions to achieve the high standard required in horticultural areas.
- Continued maintenance and enhancement of sports turf to a level appropriate for use.
- Improvement of the ecological quality of meadowland areas including reducing or addressing the impacts of dog fouling.
- Explore options to reduce shading and grassland erosion in locations such as the Broad Walk as part of the overall Strategy for the Broad Walk.
- Seek to achieve a balance between events use and protection and renovation of grass swards.

Figure 25: Grassland Management
Policy NAT3: Horticultural Display Areas

NAT3: The current flowerbeds and ornamental shrubberies will continue be maintained to a very high horticultural standard and design quality. The distinct characters and qualities of the main horticultural areas will be emphasised i.e. the Avenue Gardens, Queen Mary’s Gardens, St John’s Lodge Garden, the entrances, the English Gardens, and the area beside the Ornamental Water around the bandstand.

Management Guidelines: Horticultural Display Area

NAT3.1: Management of seasonal interest
The horticultural areas will be maintained to provide seasonal interest and variation for the delight of visitors. Accordingly, the condition and nature of the planting will be regularly reviewed and rejuvenated, recognising that plants are subject to growth and aging. The colour of annual bedding schemes will be carefully designed and controlled.

NAT3.2: New Horticultural Areas
There will be a presumption against the creation of new areas of horticultural display and against their encroachment into areas of informal character or (non-ornamental) historic landscape. New areas may be considered where there is a historic precedent or where such treatments would support visitor education and enjoyment. It must be ensured that any new horticultural areas can be sustainably maintained to give high visual and experiential quality, sympathetic to the characters of the park.

NAT3 Management Objectives

- TRP continues to support horticultural excellence and the maintenance of all horticultural display areas to a very high standard.
- Conserve the distinctive heritage, character and individuality of different areas of planting.
- Sustain the regeneration of shrub beds through re-planting and management.
- Explore opportunities to improve the sustainable management of the horticultural display areas in accordance with TRP Sustainable Development Action Plan and DCMS Sustainable Development Action Plan 2008.

Policy NAT4: Ecology and Wildlife

NAT4: In accordance with guiding principle CON4 the ecology of the park will be conserved and enhanced through the creation of new wildlife habitat and the sensitive management of existing habitat.

Management Guidelines: Ecology and Wildlife

NAT4.1: Habitat management and enhancement
Areas of existing habitat value, particularly those that are subject to specific BAP initiatives, shall continue to be managed in accordance with existing management plans and in partnership with organisations such as TCV.

Trees: The current tree resource shall be managed to create structural and species diversity, in appropriate areas of the park. The long term strategy for Primrose Hill is to progressively replace all ornamental species with natives, and replant the London planes on the perimeter. The longevity of individual specimens shall be encouraged and, where possible, areas of dead wood will be left in situ to benefit invertebrate communities.

Woodland: There is very little woodland in the park. The contribution of woodland to the park will be increased through appropriate management of the tree, scrub and ground layer within existing areas such as Leafyard Wood, the canal banks and new areas of scrub planting. This will involve the use of traditional woodland management techniques to create structural and age diversity within the woodlands, creating open glades and native tree and shrub planting. Where practicable and appropriate, dead wood and leaf litter will be retained throughout the park.

Hedgerows: The wildlife value of the hawthorn hedgerows within the park shall be managed by laying. Wherever possible, an over wintering grass field margin or 'headland' to the hedges will be created, approximately 1 metre wide along the entire length of the hedgerow. The Outer Circle Hedgerow demands a higher level of formality so will be cut biannually with the density encouraged by maintaining a 5˚ batter on both faces.

Meadowland: A co-ordinated approach to grassland management has been established throughout the park that aims to achieve a balance between sporting and recreational interests and nature conservation. Wildlife shall be considered in the management of all grassland areas, for example through allowing clippings of longer grass cuts to stand for 24 hours prior to removal, wherever possible. Appropriate mowing regimes have been devised to encourage floristic diversity throughout the existing meadows and create a mosaic of habitats (see Figure 18). In particular the habitat value of the bush cricket/Longbridge Sanctuary shall be maintained.

Wetland Ecology: Wetland and bankside areas (including the Ornamental Water, Queen Mary's Gardens Lake and the Canal) shall be managed to improve their value for wildlife, particularly that of the waterfowl collection and wildfowl, whilst
respecting their historic and design values. In particular targeted improvements should be made to the marginal vegetation/macrophytes communities and reedbeds and through the introduction of soft un-engineered bankside edges.

**NAT4.2: Habitat Creation**

Viable opportunities for habitat creation shall be taken, with particular emphasis placed upon developing connectivity and creating ‘wildlife corridors’. A range of opportunities for grassland diversification may be explored including: rotovation and reseeding with a seed mix of wild flowers, of local provenance, including hardy and competitive herbs such as red clover, ox eye daisy and hard head; over-sowing recently short cut meadow grass with yellow rattle, a herb semi-parasitic on grasses; and cutting and removal of arisings within grasslands containing a high proportion of ruderals, before the ruderals set seed.

**NAT4.3: Control of Invasive Species**

Flora: TRP will comply with current legislation to control the spread of invasive plant species. Invasive species will be sensitively controlled, using hand and mechanical methods instead of chemical methods wherever possible.

Fauna: The populations of invasive species of common fauna (such as Canada Geese) shall be humanely controlled, through egg pricking or measures to decrease the attractiveness of the waterbodies to transient populations, to prevent species dominance threatening populations of more ecologically valuable species. Where, appropriate, this will be supported by visitor education initiatives. Refer to Pest Control document.

**NAT4.4 Management Objectives**

- Maintain ecological baseline survey data and undertake repeat surveys and subsequent monitoring. Liaise with London Zoo to incorporate their survey data.

- Develop opportunities for community engagement through volunteering and education throughout the park.

- Greater emphasis on specific interpretation including static display/signage, educational visits and interactive maps, etc.

- Need for careful and appropriate management of key habitats such as the acid grassland at Primrose Hill.

- Undertake a re-appraisal of the options to enhance habitat and water quality in the Ornamental Water, based on a comprehensive survey.

- Continue to enhance the wider ecological interest of the grassland seeding or spreading hay from forb-rich areas and adopt structured meadow cutting regimes that relate directly to NVC recommendations, and also through introducing greater habitat diversity e.g. through scrub planting.

- Continue to monitor the impact of bird populations in the park, in particular pest species such as Ring Necked Parakeet, Canada Geese and Egyptian Geese and review potential for management and controls.
• Management of existing bird boxes and bat boxes and creation of new opportunities to increase the use of bird boxes in the park, e.g. cleaning out existing bird boxes each January, appropriate siting of new boxes.

• Reduction in the level of ‘manicured’ maintenance in some areas (where appropriate) for example reduction of the clearance of leaf litter from shrubberies and retention of standing deadwood and logpiles where safe to do so.

• Avoiding use of molluscicides, herbicides, insecticides and fertilizers to encourage wildlife.

• Continue management to eradicate injurious weeds.

• Continue on-going woodland management.

• Continue to increase the habitat interest of the Leafyard Wood and East Wing Meadow through establishment and enhancement of woodland – meadow transition zones including restrictions on dog walking.

• Review of habitat on islands to introduce young tree stock and ensure a sustainable provision of mature trees for the herons’ nesting sites: also redress the lack of understorey planting; and include open glades. Consider integration of scrub planting to meadow/long-grass areas to support a wider range of invertebrates.

16. BUILT FABRIC

Policy BUIL1: Buildings and Structures

**BUIL1:** The importance of buildings to the character and historic ambience of the park will be respected and all buildings, particularly listed buildings, will be maintained to a high standard of physical repair, visual quality and usability. There will be a general presumption against the construction of new buildings, and use of buildings should relate strongly to park visitor or staff needs.

Management Guidelines: Buildings and Structures

**BUIL1.1: Existing Buildings**
The existing buildings will be used and maintained in a manner appropriate to the Royal Park and occupation of as many park lodges as practicable by key staff will be encouraged.

**BUIL1.2: New Buildings**
Generally there will be a presumption against the construction of additional new buildings in either Regent’s Park or Primrose Hill and this will only be contemplated when considered operationally essential or for public use and enjoyment and no existing building can be used. The notable exception is the potential to create a new conservatory on the historic site of the Burton and Turner conservatory in Queen Mary’s Gardens. A number of schemes have been proposed but the challenges to such a scheme are enormous. There are no current plans to explore such a project but it is likely to remain as the germ of an idea, particularly given the loss of focus to Queen Mary’s Gardens since the demolition of the conservatory in 1931.

**BUIL1.3: Historic buildings and lodges**
The historic lodges within the control of TRP – Hanover Gate, Gloucester Gate, Clarence Gate and Chester Gate – will be maintained to a high standard and their setting managed to retain an appropriate relationship to the park. A cyclical programme of external decorations will be regularly undertaken in order to maintain these standards. Where other buildings of historical importance (villas and terraces) surviving from the Nash layout are managed by other agencies TRP will continue to encourage their proper conservation.

**BUIL1.4: Later buildings**
Later buildings or structures that make a positive and historically appropriate visual contribution to the parks shall be maintained and refurbished (if necessary) and new uses found as appropriate. Buildings in a good state of repair and use but which do not fulfil these criteria will be maintained and phased out when they reach the end of their viable life. The park services’ buildings are neither efficient nor elegant.

**BUIL1.5: Derelict or superfluous buildings**
Existing buildings that are in poor structural repair and/or no longer fulfil their function and which are not of historic or visual significance will, wherever possible,
be removed or replaced with more appropriate high quality structures, following full and thorough consultation with all interested stakeholders.

**BUIL1.6: Setting of Buildings**
The setting of buildings will be designed and managed to create an historically and visually appropriate relationship with the park.


**Policy BUIL2: Roads, Paths and Hard Surfaces**

**BUIL2:** The extent of hard surfacing within the parks shall be controlled and where possible rationalised. All hard surfacing shall be maintained to a high standard of physical repair and will be sympathetically assimilated into the parkland setting.

**Management Guidelines: Roads, Paths and Hard Surfaces**

**BUIL2.1: Existing roads, paths and hard surfaces**
The existing surfaces shall be maintained to a high standard, particularly those of historic significance, such as the Inner and Outer Circle, the Cumberland Green Path and the Broad Walk. Use of appropriate surfacing which reflects the historic character and distinctiveness will be used in preference to standard highways treatments.

**BUIL2.2: New Roads, Paths and Hard Surfaces**
Generally there will be a presumption against increases in the extent of hard surfacing and this will only be permitted where there are specific tangible benefits for public access, safety or needs.


**Policy BUIL3: Boundary Treatments and entrances**

**BUIL3:** The Royal Parks will promote a high quality image and sense of entry through the provision of high quality boundaries and gateways that are functional and reflect the historic character and ambience of the parks.
Management Guidelines: Boundary Treatments and Entrances

BUIL3.1: Existing boundary gateways and fencing
The number and security of the existing gateways and boundaries is broadly speaking adequate, although it is in need of repair in places. However, there is an opportunity to consider improvements to the nature and quality of the finish, including erection of more appropriate boundary fencing to replace the remaining chainlink fencing along the Outer Circle and Prince Albert Road.

BUIL3.2: Internal fencing
Internal fencing should be maintained to a high visual and functional standard, replacing inappropriate or ineffective barriers. Appropriate transitions should be made with villa sites and other such enclaves, for example encouraging the illusion of subtle vegetative enclosure and preventing or screening harsh security fencing.

BUIL3.3: Bridges
All bridges shall be maintained to a very high standard of physical repair and safety. The role of the bridges in linking important areas will be respected and their characters enhanced accordingly.


Policy BUIL4: Artefacts and Monuments

BUIL4: The number and current disposition of artefacts and monuments within the park shall be retained and these will be maintained to a high physical and visual standard, particularly those that have listed building status.

Management Guidelines: Artefacts and Monuments

BUIL4.1: New Sculptures and temporary displays
Additional or replacement sculptures, including temporary displays, shall only be introduced when they make a positive contribution to the park landscape.

Policy BUIL5: Parkland Furniture

**BUIL5:** All furniture and signage shall be in accordance with TRP Landscape Design Guide, designed and located to meet visitor needs and will be maintained to a high standard and make a positive visual contribution to the park landscape.

Management Guidelines: Parkland Furniture

**BUIL5.1: Existing Furniture**
The existing level of parkland furniture is thought to be sufficient. However, there are localised areas that may benefit from additional benches, dog bins etc. Broken or vandalised furniture will be repaired with speed.

The introduction of recycling bins for public use to be considered.

Policy BUIL6: Lighting

**BUIL6:** The current level of lighting on The Outer and Inner Circle, Chester Road and York Bridge and on Primrose Hill will be maintained and, potentially, rationalised. Any proposals to introduce artificial lighting either within or bordering the park will be assessed against TRP Position Statement on Lighting (2009).

Management Guidelines: Lighting

**BUIL6.1: Additional Lighting**
No additional lighting will be introduced to Regent’s Park or Primrose Hill. Lighting may need to be upgraded to provide energy savings or better quality of light. Any proposals for lighting should refer to the policy/or position statement.

**BUIL6.2: Existing Lighting**
The level of lighting on Primrose Hill will be considered to determine the feasibility of rationalisation or redistribution in order to minimise its daytime impact whilst reducing night-time crime and maintaining visitor safety. The Georgian quality of the lampposts will be retained.

**Related Policies:** PUB3; Visitor Safety/ CHA23: Primrose Hill South/ CHA24: Primrose Hill Summit.
17. PUBLIC ACCESS AND ENJOYMENT

Policy PUB1: Visitor Experience

PUB1: Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill shall continue to offer visitors the ability to enjoy, experience and learn about this nationally important park. Management of the park will continue to meet the differing needs of visitors providing access to a peaceful, beautiful park with opportunities for ‘a breath of fresh air’ and passive recreation. Where compatible, within this overall framework a diversity of local more formal experiences will continue to be provided to meet the requirements of specific user groups, for example for sport, theatre, education, children’s play etc. All facilities shall be safe for use and compatible with the historic setting of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill.

Management Guidelines: Visitor Experience

PUB1.1: Visitor survey
TRP will continue to carry out visitor surveys of park use and satisfaction and will feedback these findings into park management. Visitor Surveys should extend beyond the park boundary to consider the needs of potential users currently not making use of the park.


Policy PUB2: Public Access

PUB2: Free and open access will continue to be provided during the current opening hours to all areas of Regent’s Park within control of TRP, except where this would present a risk to safety, would conflict with current lease arrangements, cause damage to the wildlife resource or where areas are required for park management purposes. Similar constraints shall apply to Primrose Hill except that public access will continue to be provided throughout the day and night. There will be a presumption against further encroachment or enclosures by special interest groups.

Management Guidelines: Public Access

PUB2.1: Community Engagement
The Park Management, Education and Community Engagement team (through the Field Studies Council) and Sports teams will continue to build on existing initiatives to involve the local community in sports, education and volunteering in the park. In addition, initiatives will reach out to under-represented groups and sectors of the community; and will attend to a range of activities to appeal to different audiences.

PUB2.2: Access for all
Access for all will be a priority throughout the park and the needs of physically and visually impaired visitors shall be taken into account in any review of the current infrastructure or new schemes.

### Policy PUB3: Visitor Safety

**PUB3:** TRP will continue to provide an environment in which visitors can enjoy the park and its facilities in safety.

### Management Guidelines: Visitor Safety

**PUB3.1: Health and safety standards**  
All applicable UK and European health and safety standards shall be enforced throughout the parks, including inspections and condition surveys, the repair of infrastructure, water quality, play areas, events control, food standards etc.

**PUB3.2: Crime**  
TRP will work with the TRP OCU to sensitively maintain the low levels of crime currently enjoyed and to seek opportunities for the further reduction of crime on Primrose Hill. A policy of community policing shall continue to be pursued.

**PUB3.3: Vandalism**  
TRP shall ensure that vandalism is kept to the minimum through consideration of potential vandalism in new developments and provision of infrastructure, although this will not be allowed to unbalance other aspects relating to visitor comfort, historical considerations, or visual quality. The removal of visible signs of vandalism will be a priority. Graffiti will be removed within 48 hours (24 for particularly offensive cases) and other infrastructure repaired at the earliest practicable opportunity.


### Policy PUB4: Control of Animals

**PUB4:** TRP will cooperate with owners to ensure that no animal brought to the park represents a direct or indirect safety hazard for other visitors.

### Management Guidelines: Control of Animals

**PUB4.1: Type and number of animals permitted**  
Only safe, domestic, animals may be brought to the park by visitors - horses, for example, will not be allowed in Regent’s Park or Primrose Hill, except those of the MPS, or by special arrangement. Horses are, however, permitted on the park roads. Dogs will be permitted within the conditions imposed by the Dog Walkers Code of Conduct/Royal Parks Regulations, which limits number of dogs per visitor etc.

**PUB4.2: Control of Dogs**  
Dogs shall be kept under the control of owners and a series of dog-free and dog-leash zones will continue to be enforced to reduce conflict between different park users. Dogs shall be kept within sight and under control at all times and shall
continue to be excluded from the children’s playgrounds and ornamental gardens. Leashes will be enforced in the public tennis courts area.

**PUB4.3: Dog Faeces**

TRP will seek to work with owners to reduce and ultimately eliminate dog faeces within the park. To this end TRP will continue to provide an adequate, suitably located number of bins. Use of these will be encouraged by a combination of visitor education and enforcement by the MPS.

**Related Policies:** PUB3: Visitor Safety.

---

**Policy PUB5: Visitor Circulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUB5: Pedestrian priority will continue to apply throughout the parks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Management Guidelines: Visitor Circulation**

**PUB5.1: Pedestrian circulation**

Peaceful pedestrian enjoyment of the park and as a pleasant short cut between destinations shall be encouraged ranging from the use of formal pedestrian paths and routes to informal jogging around the perimeter. The use of rollerblades, scooters, skateboards etc. will be tolerated on park roads but are forbidden on footpaths. Appropriate safety improvements shall be made to road crossings etc.

**PUB5.2 Vehicular traffic**

Vehicular traffic (with the exception of TRP maintenance vehicles) shall be confined to the carriage drive areas – Outer Circle, Inner Circle, Chester Road and York Bridge Road. TRP will work with Contractors to reduce vehicular traffic within the park and to explore opportunities to use low carbon emission vehicles. TRP will work with local stakeholders towards a hierarchy that puts pedestrians before cyclists and cyclists before motor vehicles.

**PUB5.3: Cycling**

TRP will maintain the current shared pedestrian/cycle route along the Broad Walk with cycling permitted on all the roads within the park. The Aiming High Project encourages and supports cycling, and with three TfL cycle hire docking stations cycling is a very popular use of the park.

Policy PUB6: Roads and Traffic

PUB6: TRP will work with other agencies to seek to reduce the speed, dominance and intrusiveness of traffic in and around the park.

Management Guidelines: Roads and Traffic

PUB6.1: Roads within the Outer Circle
TRP will consider long-term options for improving the ambience of the park by restricting the use of roads within the park.


Policy PUB7: Car Parking

PUB7: There shall be no extension of car parking at the expense of the landscape of the park.

Management Guidelines: Car Parking

PUB7.1: Gloucester Slips
Opportunities to enhance the appearance of the Zoo Car Park and to improve the links between the Gloucester Slips car park area and the remainder of the park shall be considered.

PUB7.2: Green Travel Plan
TRP will continue to promote the use of public transport, cycle and pedestrian travel to the park in accordance with TRP Green Travel Plan, in order to reduce the need for car parking.


Policy PUB8: Facilities

PUB8: TRP will ensure that all facilities provided within the parks are of appropriate capacity, are suitably located, of a high standard and cater for a wide range of visitors and provide ‘access for all’ to the greatest extent possible. Facilities should conform to all relevant health and safety legislation.

Management Guidelines: Facilities

PUB8.1: Provision of additional facilities
There will be general presumption against the provision of additional facilities except where need is clearly demonstrated and is related to facilitating enjoyment of the
parks. New facilities will be accommodated within existing structures where possible and will not detract from the essential character of the parks.

**PUB8.2: Toilets**
The current provision and maintenance of toilets, attendants and opportunities to introduce charging will be reviewed.

**PUB8.3: Catering**
It is anticipated that the current level of provision will be broadly speaking adequate but that the structure of the buildings will need significant investment. The reintroduction of a permanent catering facility on Primrose Hill will be considered within the existing buildings.

**PUB8.4: Children's playgrounds**
The existing number and location of playgrounds (four located in readily accessible locations) are considered adequate. The quality and condition of these will continue to be monitored and upgrading carried out to meet demand and provide new and exciting play opportunities for all ages and provide play and learning opportunities for all groups including physically and visually impaired children. In accordance with the Play Strategy 2015-2020


**Policy PUB9: Sport**

**PUB9:** Regent's Park and Primrose Hill will continue to provide a large number and wide range of outdoor opportunities for formal and informal sports and leisure activities which will be of high quality and contribute to the needs of the wider community.

**Management Guidelines: Sport**

**PUB9.1: The Hub and Sports Development**
The Hub has created a focus for community sport in the park and a high quality facility. The range of organised sports available in the park will continue to be promoted through The Hub and the sports ‘offer’ reviewed as necessary, in order to ensure this continues to meet the needs of the local community and user groups. Sports development in the park will continue in accordance with TRP Health, Well-being and Sports Strategy (2010-15).

**PUB9.2: Location of Sports facilities**
The sports facilities will continue to be organised spatially to ensure the most effective use of the area devoted to sport whilst promoting flexibility and improving access to facilities, whilst at the same time ensuring that adequate provision for passive recreation is maintained.

**PUB9.3: Management of Sports Facilities**
All sports facilities will continue to be managed to a high standard. The recent improvements to the drainage and quality of the sports pitches will be continued to extend and improve playability. The Hub is also managed to be more financially sustainable while maintaining the community facilities for local people and outreach work where possible.
**PUB9.4: Sports Development**

TRP recognise the importance of Regent’s Park as a major outdoor sports provider in London and will continue to work, in liaison with other sports bodies, the GLA and adjacent local authorities, to continue to promote The Hub, the sports events calendar and opportunities to get involved in sport in the park.


**Policy PUB10: Events, Filming and Entertainment**

**PUB10:** Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill shall continue to promote and facilitate a programme of annual and smaller scale events whilst ensuring that these are relevant to the park context and physically integrate into the parkland setting without long-term impacts or significant visitor conflict.

The principles of holding events in the park are set out in The Royal Parks Hosting Major Events (2014), Small Events in The Royal Parks (2010) and Guidelines for Events Organisers (2010) This identifies, in strategic terms, what sorts of events might be held, how possibilities should be assessed and managed. The Strategy also provides Programming Principles for Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill.

**Management Guidelines: Events and Entertainment**

**PUB 10.1: Events Strategy**

The priorities for events and entertainment in TRPs is set out in ‘The Guidelines for Events Organisers (2010):

- Are “world class” and contribute to the promotion of London as a world cultural and sporting capital.
- Fit our “brand” – events that are free or offer affordable public access.
- Predominantly outdoor, that encourage physical and mental well-being, and that promote an appreciation of the value of the Royal Parks to Londoners.
- Enable us to meet our income targets.
- Are low impact on the park fabric, neighbours, park users, and park ecology.
- Are culturally diverse and celebrate cultural diversity.
- Are environmentally sustainable.
PUB10.2 Events Management
The Park Manager and Sports Team will work with TRP Events, Filming & Arts Team to develop a diverse range of events and activities and to ensure that terms and conditions for the events organisers are enforced to minimise potential impacts on the park infrastructure.

PUB10.3 Filming
The Park Manager and Events Team to manage filming activities in the parks. The Royal Parks provide world class locations for major films as well as small scale activities. The landscape is managed to show off the parks to the best and filming licences help generate income for the parks to keep the maintenance to a high standard. Filming can restrict use of the parks a times and needs to be managed strategically.


Policy PUB11: Orientation

PUB11: Visitor orientation within the parks shall be of a high quality and effective and will seek to coordinate and complement the orientation signage and provision around the park.

Management Guidelines: Orientation

PUB11.1: Signage within the parks
The level of signage shall be kept to the minimum required to orientate new visitors to the park. All proposals for new signage (for example for commemorative walkways or trails) within the park shall be considered by the Park Management and shall not be provided except where deemed to be in the interest of the wider visiting public. Signage across the parks should have a coherent hierarchy, be clearly visible, and be in standard TRP colours, with minimal impact on the landscape.

BUIL11.2: Signage along the park boundaries
Signage in areas controlled or managed jointly by other authorities shall be carefully managed to avoid a plethora of contradictory or uncoordinated signage.


Policy PUB12: Education and Interpretation

PUB12: The Park Management Team will continue to work with local groups, partners and schools to organise activities, events and interpretation which promote education and an understanding of the historic, horticultural and ecological significance of the park. The provision of education and interpretation will not have a detrimental impact on the landscape character or ecology of the park.
Management Guidelines: Education and Interpretation

PUB12.1: Education and Community
TRP will continue to explore and improve opportunities and facilities for educational visits by schools and other groups. TRP will work in partnership with the Field Studies Council to develop new activities and teaching resources.

PUB12.2 Interpretative material
TRP will continue to develop interpretation to enhance visitor appreciation and enjoyment of the parks. This shall encompass provision of themed leaflets, potentially associated with trails; information displays on signboards and sensitively sited and designed in situ interpretation boards.

PUB12.3: Visitor Centre and archive
TRP have explored opportunities for the creation of a visitor centre for Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill, in engagement with stakeholders and communities. Resources remain the greatest challenge but TRP remain aware of the value such a facility would bring to the park.

PUB12.4: Horticultural training
TRP will continue to encourage the development of Regent’s Park as a centre for ‘training excellence in horticulture’. This will include continued development of the partnership with Capel Manor and Capital Growth in the Garden Allotment. Development of themed horticultural interpretation and will also be explored, for example drawing upon the connections with historical figures (the Nesfields, Shultz, Robinson etc.) or horticultural themes (the roses, bedding, Mediterranean Garden etc.).

PUB12.5: Volunteering and Habitat Management
TRP will continue to develop the partnership with TCV and other groups to provide opportunities for volunteering and education in nature conservation. Volunteer groups will operate in accordance with TRP Volunteer Strategy.

PUB12.6: TRP website
The development of The Royal Parks website offering a wealth of interpretation and information supports the avoidance of physical interpretative clutter within the parks. The website is an opportunity to provide better and easily updated information for the parks as well as a marketing/income generating opportunity. Links to other parks and gardens of note could be incorporated. This could be through the DCMS Culture on-line website.

PUB12.7: Guided interpretation walks
Small-scale interpretative events and guided walks should be developed. Volunteers and friends could support their resourcing.

PUB12.8 Education to minimise management conflict
Information shall be used to inform visitors in order to minimise conflict with management objectives. This will include explaining potentially controversial management decisions (e.g. tree removal) and explaining to the public why actions may create issues and management problems such as nutrient enrichment problems associated with duck-feeding or dog fouling in the meadows.

Policy PUB13: Park Management and Consultation

PUB13: The Royal Parks will continue to pursue its management of Regent's Park and Primrose Hill in an open and transparent way for and on behalf of its users and visitors and in accordance with its status as a park of national significance.

Management Guidelines: Park Management and Consultation

PUB13.1: Staffing resources
TRP will seek to ensure that staffing resources are sufficient to meet the objectives of the published management plan and obligations set out in other key documents such as the corporate plan. Where appropriate or necessary, staffing resources should continue to be shared between the Royal Parks. Where additional staffing resources are required or desired TRP will seek to fill these vacancies with appropriately competent personnel.

PUB13.2: Training
TRP will continue to support staff and contractor training programmes. This will ensure effective succession planning and also provide new opportunities through apprenticeships. TRP will continue to host seminars and other training events in the park.

PUB13.3: Grounds maintenance, hardworks and specialist contractors
Contractors will be hired as appropriate to fulfil day-to-day and specific projects demanded by the management plan. All contractors shall work in accordance with the plan and shall be answerable to the Park Manager. Contractors must be aware of the Park Conservation Management Plan and shall maintain a high standard of behaviour and conduct and achieve the quality of work specified in their contract.

PUB13.4: Partnership
The role of partnership and the need for coordinated approaches to management are of particular importance for Regent's Park and Primrose Hill due to the wide variety of interests, areas of significance and government bodies involved in their management. TRP will continue to work and develop links with all stakeholders including user groups, specialist interest groups, licensees, lessees, the local authorities (Camden and Westminster) and other managing bodies (particularly the Crown Estate, Crown Estate Paving Commission and Canal & River Trust). New partnerships, such as with the Field Studies Council, and existing local partnerships with TCV, Capel Manor and Capital Growth will continue to be developed.

PUB13.5: Stakeholder engagement
TRP will facilitate the participation of stakeholders and interest groups in determining park management objectives and in the consideration of any significant specific projects to enable all groups to work together for the benefit of the parks. Accordingly, regular liaison meetings will be held with key stakeholders.

18. LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AND VIEWS

Policy VIE1: Views

VIE1: Understanding, protecting and managing important historic views within and from the park is one of the most important aspects of the heritage of the park. Important views from, within, and to the park (as shown on the Key Views Plan – Figure 16) will be protected, enhanced and maintained.

Management Guidelines: Views

VIE1.1: Tree and View Management Strategy
A Tree and View Management Strategy has been prepared which builds on the existing protected views and identifies the key historic and present day views to and from the park to guide future management.

VIE1.2: Views of the Regent's Park and Primrose Hill
Protect views of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill from the surrounding landscape, particularly from the surrounding Nash Terraces by encouraging appropriate boundary treatments. Strive to establish a visual connection between Regent’s Park, Park Square and Park Crescent to encourage appreciation of Nash’s intended relationship of Regent’s Park to Regent Street and beyond.

VIE1.3: Views within and between Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill
Conserve views within the parks particularly views over the ornamental water and views along the Broad Walk to the Ready Money Fountain and encourage further appreciation of the links between Regent's Park and Primrose Hill.

VIE1.4: Views from Regent's Park
Protect and enhance views from The Regent’s Park particularly to the surrounding Nash terraces and strategic landmarks. Seek to strengthen the character of these views through strategic removal of vegetation and long-term cooperation with local authorities to discourage construction of intrusive buildings beyond the park boundary.

VIE1.5: Views from Primrose Hill
Protect the views from Primrose Hill, in particular conserve the integrity of the statutorily protected panoramic view, its foreground, middleground and background, encompassing St Paul’s Cathedral from the Primrose Hill summit and promote its enjoyment.

Management Objectives

- Review key views to, from and within the park as part of the planned View Management Strategy and develop an annual work programme to re-establish and manage views.
Related Policies:

Policy CHA1: Area 1-The Avenue Gardens

**CHA1:** The Avenue Gardens will be conserved and maintained with their current historic and restored design to the very high standard of maintenance and horticultural excellence demanded.

Management Guidelines: The Avenue Gardens

**CHA1.1: Management objectives**

- Management of the shrub and tree planting to ensure that it remains in scale and does not become over-mature.
- Careful control of the design and colour-schemes of the bedding to ensure the gardens retain a consistently high quality whilst allowing for seasonal variation and development to maintain visitor interest and delight.
- Maintain the axial relationship of Broad Walk and Park Square.
- Liaise with the Crown Estate Paving Commission to establish a visual connection between the park, Park Square and Park Crescent.

**CHA1.2: Specific enhancement opportunities**

- The avenue of Limes and American Tulip trees may require thinning to prevent shading of bedding and retain form as they approach maturity.
- Need to refrain from inappropriate or garish colour-schemes within the ornamental bedding.
- Need to maintain the (small) scale of the planting and manage maturity.
- Develop proposals to re-establish Nash’s intended grand entry to The Regent’s Park from Portland Place via the Broad Walk/Avenue Gardens.

Policy CHA2: Area 2-The Broad Walk

**CHA2:** The historic character of the Broad Walk will be re-established and maintained and the quality of finish enhanced to increase the perception of formality and the contrast of this area with other areas of the park.

Management Guidelines: The Broad Walk

**CHA2.1: Management objectives**
• Review the avenue planting and prepare and consult on an avenue thinning, renewal and enhancement programme.

• Review the ‘nursery complex’ boundary and consider rationalisation to reinstate the avenue quality along the southern section.

• Liaise with ZSL London Zoo to finesse the presentation of the realignment of our common boundary.

• Monitor shared cycle route.

**CHA2.2: Specific Enhancement Opportunities**

• Implement strategy to re-establish the grandeur and formality of the Broad Walk.

• Improve the landscaping around the Broad Walk Café and Chester Lodge.

• Extend the golden surfacing around the Ready Money drinking fountain north and south to improve the quality of the path surfacing.

• Continue improvements to planting to enhance the setting of Chester Lodge.

• Address continued damage to the shrub borders adjacent to London Zoo and at the Ready Money Drinking Fountain.

**Policy CHA3: Area 3 - The English Gardens**

**CHA3: The English Gardens will be maintained with their current design to the high standard of maintenance and horticultural excellence demanded.**

**Management Guidelines: The English Gardens**

**CHA3.1: Management objectives**

• Management of the shrubberies to ensure that they do not encroach on the grassy open space and to direct and filter views within the gardens and from the gardens to adjoining areas.

• Management of the tree resource to allow for renewal.

• Careful control of temporary fixtures/sculptures to ensure that they do not ‘clutter’ the landscape.

**CHA3.2: Specific Enhancement Opportunities**

• Enhance the sense of arrival in the park through more positive treatment of the much-used south-eastern gateway into the park, St Andrew’s Gate.
- Maturity and renewal of trees and retaining the integrity of Nesfield’s vision, requires management by annual pruning and thinning of shrubberies, to allow views and entice and encourage the public to roam the area.
- Introduce new specimen and groups of trees in accordance with agreed species list to the English Garden providing long term tree succession.
- Improve the boundary treatment to screen traffic along Outer Circle.

**Policy CHA4: Area 4 - Cumberland Green**

**CHA4: The character of Cumberland Green will be maintained and strengthened through the re-establishment and preservation of views and enhancement of the quality of the area’s presentation and infrastructure.**

**Management Guidelines: Cumberland Green**

**CHA4.1: Management objectives**
- Tree management in order to re-establish and maintain carefully filtered views to Cumberland Terrace to maintain the Regency character.
- Maintenance of the setting of the adjacent Broad Walk avenues.
- Cooperation with Crown Estate Paving Commission to ensure that the important visual connection and historic quality of the views between Cumberland Terrace and Cumberland Green are maintained.

**CHA4.2: Specific Enhancement Opportunities**
- Do not replace specific trees that limit historic views between the terraces and park.
- Enhance the ecological contribution of this area, for example through the creation of meadow areas and conservation headlands along the hedge line.

**Policy CHA5: Area 5 - St Katharine’s Glade**

**CHA5: The informal character of St Katharine’s Glade shall be maintained whilst also implementing enhancements that will increase the contribution this area makes to the park’s diversity and interest.**

**Management Guidelines: St Katharine’s Glade**

**CHA5.1: Management objectives**
- Explore opportunities for ecological enhancement of this area, for example through management to increase the biodiversity of the meadow.
• Explore opportunities for low-key enhancements to visitor comfort in this area.

CHA5.2: Specific Enhancement Opportunities

• Monitor and review grassland management regimes.

• Provide additional seating, where this is compatible with safety objectives, and maintenance requirements. Seating to follow aims for coherence and park character.

Policy CHA6: Area 6 - Gloucester Green

CHA6: Maintain the current character whilst exploring opportunities to enhance visitor use, for instance through more low key events and improvements to the play area.

Management Guidelines: Gloucester Green

CHA6.1: Management objectives

• Review the design and use of the play area and explore opportunities to achieve better integration of this facility in the park.

• Explore opportunities to increase the number of low key events.

• Liaise with an adjacent school which brings c.150 children per day to play on the green to minimise concerns over possible damage and litter.

CHA6.2: Specific Enhancement Opportunities

• Provide additional seating, where this is compatible with safety objectives.

• Upgrade and improve the children’s play area to incorporate more natural play and explore opportunities to remove the boundary fencing.

• Enhance the ecological contribution of this area, for example through the creation of meadows and conservation headlands along the boundary hedge line.

Policy CHA7: Area 7 - Gloucester Slips

CHA7: The character of the Gloucester Slips area will be improved to address the connectivity between the park and this area and reduce the impact of car parking.

Management Guidelines: Gloucester Slips

CHA7.1: Management objectives
• Seek to ensure better integration of the Slips as part of the park.

• Retain the parking space but redesign and rationalise to soften the impact of the parking.

• Retain the informal character of this area with meadow grassland and scrub and conserve the important trees.

**CHA7.2: Specific Enhancement Opportunities**

• Improve the contribution this area makes as an ‘entrance’ to Regent’s Park from Prince Albert Road.

• Screen planting, for instance in the form of a native species hedge planting, around the car park.

• Improve the safety of the pedestrian access across this area.

• Review access issues via gate north east of Cumberland Basin.

• Liaison with ZSL is key to all of these.

• Matilda Fountain, listed railings and bridge area; implement required maintenance.

**Policy CHA8: Area 8 - The Regent’s Canal**

**CHA8: The woodland character of this area will be maintained and the role of the canal as a green corridor, recreational routeway and wildlife resource will be enhanced.**

**Management Guidelines: The Regent’s Canal**

**CHA8.1: Management objectives**

• Work with other agencies and organisations to promote the canal as a green transport corridor and address issues such as litter.

• Continue the management of the woodland embankments to maintain stability and enhance character and wildlife interest in accordance with the Canal Banks Maintenance Strategy.

• Continue to support use of the running track by local schools and groups: programme re-sizing running track to current standard prior to re-surfacing.

**CHA8.2: Specific enhancement opportunities**

• Continued management of the woodland with TCV.

• Improve the usability of the running track through redesign to a standard length and surface.
Policy CHA9: Area 9 - The Open Spaces

CHA9: This area will continue to be the focus of sports in the park and improvements will continue to be made in order to enhance and maintain the quality of the facilities and also to retain the pastoral character that is important for non-sports users and the wider landscape of the park.

Management Guidelines: The Open Spaces

CHA9.1: Management objectives

- Continued growth of the popularity of The Hub provides a focus for sports and community involvement through the various home leagues, teams and clubs based in the park.

- Continue improvements to the sports facilities and activities offered in accordance with the Health, Well-being and Sports Strategy.

- Continue to enhance the contribution that this area makes to the visual and ecological character of the park.

- Continue to control unauthorised use of pitches which causes additional wear and tear over and above that which is deemed appropriate for the pitches and degrades playing surfaces.

CHA9.2: Specific enhancement opportunities

- Continue to enhance the surface quality and drainage to extend playability and capacity of sports pitches.

- Continue to manage the meadow grasslands and undertake further habitat enhancements such as the planting of scrub.

Policy CHA 9a: Area 9a – The Winter Garden

CHA9a: The winter garden will continue to be managed to retain its individual character and qualities providing colour and interest, in particular during the winter months.

Management Guidelines: The Winter Garden

CHA9a.1: Management objectives

- Conserve and enhance the winter character of the gardens.

CHA9a.2: Specific enhancement opportunities

- Review opportunities to increase public access to the gardens.
Policy CHA10: Area 10 - The Ornamental Water

CHA10: The Ornamental Water will be conserved to maintain and enhance the attractive Regency character of this area in the spirit of Nash and to ensure that this area continues to make a positive contribution to the visual, recreational and ecological character of the park.

Management Guidelines: The Ornamental Water

CHA10.1: Management objectives

- Maintain views over the lake and to and from the Nash terraces and the Central London Mosque.
- Develop overall long term strategy for the Ornamental Water, building on recent improvements to continue to improve and sustain the water quality of the lake.
- Manage the built infrastructure of, and around, the lake to a high standard including furnishings, path surfaces, lake revetments, the bandstand, toilets, children’s play area, children’s boating lake and Boathouse Café.
- Continue to enhance and manage the lake habitat to improve water quality and provide nesting and cover.
- Control pest or invasive species of flora and fauna.

CHA10.2: Specific enhancement opportunities

- Manage views towards the Holme, the Nash terraces and the Central London Mosque.
- Continued reedbed marginal and edge planting to enhance the character, water quality and biodiversity of the Ornamental Water.
- Continue with current programmes of egg pricking and review other opportunities to deter seasonal populations of Canada geese.
- Continue to educate the public on feeding the waterfowl.
- Improve the character and quality of the grassed areas mainly by seeking to reduce grazing by geese and other waterfowl, particularly on the western side of the lake, in front of Sussex Terrace.
- Implement measures to enhance water quality, oxygenation and macrophytes in the lake.
- Improve nesting habitat on islands through selective thinning or removal of trees and improvement of understorey and island margins.
- Implement measures to discourage high numbers of populations of pest species such as Canada, Greylag or Egyptian geese e.g. fencing.
Policy CHA11: Area 11 - Longbridge Sanctuary

CHA11: The Longbridge Sanctuary area will continue to be managed to encourage its development as a tranquil area providing valuable wildlife habitat and views over the lake to the Nash villas.

Management Guidelines: Longbridge Sanctuary

CHA11.1: Management objectives

- Continue habitat management of the Wetland and Cricket pens to create grassland, wetland and scrub habitat.
- Develop opportunities to increase use of the area by local schools and community groups for education and volunteering.
- Cooperate with the Crown Estate and villa lessees to ensure that key views of the villas from the park are retained.

CHA11.2: Specific enhancement opportunities

- Continue management of the Wetland pen in accordance with the management principles set out in the Wetland Pen Improvements Report (2009).
- Increase the areas of native scrub within the Cricket pen.
- Increase the use of this area for education and conservation management tasks.
- Improve interpretation and provide other educational resources.
- Continue management of key views to the Nash Villas – the Holme and St John’s Lodge.

Policy CHA12: Area 12 - Queen Mary’s Gardens and the Inner Circle

CHA12: Maintain the gardens as a focus of horticultural excellence and enjoyment.

Management Guidelines: Queen Mary’s Gardens and the Inner Circle

CHA12.1: Management objectives

- Continue to maintain and enhance the horticultural interest and status of the whole gardens collection.
- Explore options to restore the axial focus of the garden as well as the individual garden spaces.

- Continue to promote the Open Air Theatre and ensure its upkeep.

- Seek to manage traffic on the Inner Circle with priority for pedestrian movement.

- Ensure the successful integration of the restored lake as part of the gardens.

**CHA12.2: Specific enhancement opportunities**

- Complete the improvements to the lake to provide a significant enhancement to the gardens providing new wildlife habitat, improved water quality and horticultural interest.

- Review the planting and management of the Dell and the Alpine Island. Look to re-establish views from the Mound over the Gardens.

- Plan for the replacement of the Lombardy poplars.

- Work with the Open Air Theatre on the integration of the theatre improvements as part of the park.

- Continue to explore other opportunities for variation to the character of planting such as the use of herbaceous perennials in temporary or permanent beds.

- Liaise with Regent’s University to soften the visual impact of their building on the Gardens.

**Policy CHA13: Area 13 - Marylebone Green**

**CHA13: The long-term objectives for Marylebone Green are to maintain it as an informal grassy open space that provides a suitable transition between the more ornamental and active landscapes of the Avenue Gardens, Queen Mary’s Gardens and the Ornamental Water and a focus for events in the park.**

**Management Guidelines: Marylebone Green**

**CHA13.1: Management objectives**

- Monitor impact of events such as Frieze Art and work with events managers to ensure that the event site reduces adverse impact on the area (particularly trees and grassland) and the site has time to recover between events and activities.

**CHA13.2: Specific enhancement opportunities**

- Identify remedial works to de-compact and renovate the grassed areas and identify a period to implement.
• Manage newly renovated play area.

Policy CHA14: Area 14 - Toxopholite Enclosure

CHA14: The Toxopholite Enclosure will continue to provide the main tennis facility in the park and other low key projects such as the Community Wildlife Garden.

CHA14.1: Management objectives

• To continue to support the tennis concessionaire in improving the tennis facilities.
• To review long term options for the management of the Wildlife Garden by volunteers.
• Retain the presence of TRP staff including the Park Manager’s Lodge within this area.

CHA14.2: Specific enhancement opportunities

• Seek to reinvigorate community involvement in the Community Wildlife Garden.
• Improve weak planting on the boundary with the inner circle through management and planting.

Policy CHA15: Area 15 - The Storeyard Enclosure

CHA15: The Storeyard Enclosure will continue to provide the main facility for the park Management staff and Contractors. The use of this area for education will continue to be developed through the links with Capel Manor, Capital Growth in the Allotment Garden and the Field Studies Council.

Management Guidelines: Storeyard Enclosure

CHA15.1: Management objectives

• Increase the range of activities offered in the allotments and within the Storeyard enclosure for education.
• Find alternative uses for under-utilised buildings, such as the former EH workshops and glasshouses.
• Consider part of this area as the ‘public face’ of the park with clear TRP and MPS links.

CHA15.2: Specific enhancement opportunities

• Continue to work with Capital Growth and Capel Manor in promoting the community involvement in the allotments and other educational opportunities offered by Capel Manor.
• Replace ugly, dilapidated and dysfunctional collection of buildings with high quality facilities which sit well in the landscape and add public engagement to the operational functions currently provided.

**Policy CHA16: Area 16 - St John’s Enclosure**

**CHA16**: The privacy and quietness of St John’s Lodge Enclosure will be conserved whilst ensuring that St John’s Lodge retains an appropriate relationship to the wider parkland.

**Management Guidelines: St John’s Enclosure**

**CHA16.1: Management objectives**

• Co-operate with St John’s Lodge residents/Crown Estate to ensure that positive views are maintained from and to St John’s Lodge from the adjoining public parkland (including St John’s Lodge Garden).

• Continue to maintain St John’s Lodge Garden to a high standard of design and horticultural maintenance.

• Conserve the high quality sculptures within the garden.

• Retain the intimate and small-scale quality of the garden.

• Ensure that the garden remains free of standard issue park furniture.

**CHA16.2: Specific enhancement opportunities**

• Continue to monitor and improve drainage in the gardens.

• Garden retained as a secretive ‘hidden gem’ with high maintenance standards.

**Policy CHA 17: Area17 - Regent’s University Enclosure**

**CHA17**: The privacy of Regent’s University Enclosure for college staff and students will be maintained whilst ensuring that the area maintains an appropriate relationship to the wider parkland.

**Management Guidelines: Regent’s College Enclosure**

**CHA17.1: Management objectives**

• Co-operate with Regent’s College/Crown Estate to ensure that positive views are maintained from and to Regent’s College from the adjoining public parkland.
• Seek to maintain the relationship between the landscape around the college to the parkland context including consideration of establishing a new relationship in the manner of Nash.

CHA17.2: Specific enhancement opportunities
• Work with the College to manage views between Regent’s College and the adjoining public parkland in accordance with the original Nash design.
• Increase the width of the boundary planting and enhance the transition between the park and college.

Policy CHA18: Area 18 - The Holme Enclosure

CHA18: The privacy of the residents of The Holme Enclosure will be maintained, whilst ensuring that the area maintains an appropriate relationship to the wider parkland.

Management Guidelines: The Holme Enclosure

CHA18.1: Management objectives
• Co-operate with residents/Crown Estate to ensure that positive views are maintained between The Holme and from the adjoining public parkland.
• Review opportunities to permit public access to the lakeside around the Holme.

CHA.18.2: Specific enhancement opportunities
• Need to maintain and enhance the historic view between The Holme and adjoining public parkland, in particular those across the Ornamental Water and manage vegetation to retain views.

Policy CHA19: Area 19 - Winfield House Enclosure

CHA19: The privacy and security of the area for residents of Winfield House Enclosure will be retained and a positive relationship with the park will be promoted.

Management Guidelines: Winfield House Enclosure

CHA19.1: Management objectives
• Co-operate with Winfield House residents/Crown Estate/MPS to maintain security and privacy and also to conserve and enhance the character of the park.
CHA19.2: Specific enhancement opportunities

- Manage the park boundary to enhance the interface between the Winfield Enclosure and the park.
- Work with Winfield House to plan for and minimise the impact on the park when high security visitors are in residence.

Policy CHA20: Area 20 - The Holford Sanctuary

CHA20: The Holford Sanctuary will be managed to create and maintain a range of wildlife habitats and provide opportunities for education and community involvement in habitat management.

Management Guidelines: The Holford Sanctuary

CHA20.1: Management objectives

- To establish and integrate the new wildlife areas as part of the park.

CHA.20.2: Specific enhancement opportunities

- Continue with the creation of grassland mosaics to provide invertebrate habitat and monitor the success of different regimes.
- Establish informal picnic areas within wildflower meadows.

Policy CHA21: Area 21 - ZSL London Zoo Enclosure

CHA21: The relationship between the ZSL London Zoo Enclosure and the wider parkland will continue to be enhanced to improve intervisibility where appropriate and reduce the impact of the zoo on the character of the park.

Management Guidelines: ZSL London Zoo Enclosure

CHA21.1: Management objectives

- Liaise with ZSL to improve the character and management of the boundaries between the zoo and the park.
- Co-operate with ZSL London Zoo management on issues affecting the relationship between the zoo and the park, such as the landscape management of the car park.

CHA21.2: Specific enhancement opportunities

- To replace the Broad Walk Avenue north of the Ready Money Fountain with ‘plantation’ like trees as per Nash’s original intentions.
• Need to manage interface between the park and the zoo, in particular issues such as damage to shrub planting bordering the zoo along the northern Broad Walk.

• Review opportunities to create additional ‘viewing area’ on the zoo boundary with the Broad Walk to reduce damage to shrub planting.

Policy CHA22: Area 22 - Outer Circle

CHA22: the character of The Outer Circle will be conserved and initiatives taken to reduce the impact of the traffic (noise, movement and barriers) upon Regent’s Park.

Management Guidelines: Outer Circle

CHA22.1: Management objectives

• Co-operate and coordinate activity with the Crown Estate Paving Commission and the Crown Estate to ensure that the Outer Circle retains its ‘special quality’ and is maintained to a high standard with co-ordinated signage.

• Monitor and where appropriate rationalise car parking spaces, and signage.

• Support the retention of the historic lighting.

• Monitor and continue to review opportunities to improve safety through undertaking traffic calming measures and enhancement of pedestrian priority.

CHA22.2: Specific enhancement opportunities

• Continue with improvement programme for Outer Circle Hedgerow.

Policy CHA23: Area 23 – The Leafyard and Leafyard Wood

CHA23.1: Management objectives

• Continue to attract corporate and other volunteers whose work on periodic habitat management tasks forms an essential resource for maintaining the Leafyard Wood as a wildlife sanctuary.

• Need to maintain staff levels to resource the regular maintenance of the area.

• To continue the management of Leafyard Wood in accordance with the Management Plan.

• To make the area available as an educational resource for schools and other interest groups.
To maintain the Leafyard Depot as the centre for green waste recycling.

**CHA23.2: Specific enhancement opportunities**

- Continue the creation of glades as potential teaching areas within the woodland.
- Continue to support bee-keeping within Leafyard Wood.

**Policy CHA24: Area 24 – East Wing meadow**

**CHA24.1: Management objectives**

- Continue to engage the Foundation in their work to attract corporate volunteers for regular maintenance work.
- To ensure continuity of the differentiated plant communities.

**CHA24.2: Specific enhancement opportunities**

- Review approaches to curtail rough sleeping in the enclosure.
- Provide interpretation to the East Wing Enclosure.
- Continued monitoring of invertebrate and bird populations to guide management.

**PRIMROSE HILL**

**Policy CHA25: Area 23 - Primrose Hill South**

**CHA23**: The informal and grassy character of Primrose Hill South will be conserved and the formal recreational opportunities maintained to a high standard.

**Management Guidelines: Primrose Hill South**

**CHA23.1: Management objectives**

- Continue to manage the southern-most sections of the area for play and low key sports (play area, trim trail and petanque).
- Continue to manage and allow for renewal of the small clumps of hawthorns but avoid introduction of tall trees that will block views from or to the summit.
- Avoid activities that will disrupt or obscure the lynchets.
CHA.23.2: Specific enhancement opportunities

- Increase the sense of entrance into the park (within the constraints of safety) e.g. through gates or other landscape enhancement.
- Complete the planting improvements on the western park boundary.
- Consider opportunities to minimise the cluttered appearance of the furniture in the landscape.
- Rationalise the path layout and upgrade the path surfacing.

Policy CHA26: Area 24-Primrose Hill Summit

**CHA24: The informal character of Primrose Hill Summit will be conserved and the high quality views from the summit to the London skyline will be maintained and the experience enhanced.**

Management Guidelines: Primrose Hill Summit

CHA24.1: Management objectives

- Continue to manage the trees, particularly south of the summit, to ensure that they do not obscure views from the hill.
- Continue to consolidate management approaches that support the special experience of Primrose Hill and its distinct peaceful character.
- Continue to create and enhance wildlife habitat around the summit, in particular the management of the acid grassland.

CHA24.2: Specific enhancement opportunities

- Restore and manage an additional 1.6 hectares of extent and ecology of the acid grassland: continue to enhance the ecology of the grassland.
- Continue to enhance wildlife habitat and the semi-natural character around the summit through management of meadow grassland and other enhancements such as scrub planting.
- Continued safety and maintenance of the Trim Trail facilities and children’s playground.
- Review opportunities to further improve sense of entrance or arrival into the park due to lack of gates and perceived orientation of Primrose Hill Gate Lodge.
- Consider opportunities to minimise the cluttered appearance of the furniture in the landscape and path layout.
Policy CHA25: Area 27 - Primrose Hill West

**CHA25:** The openness of Primrose Hill West will be maintained and enhanced to continue the development of a semi-natural character.

Management Guidelines: Primrose Hill West

**CHA25.1: Management objectives**
- Management of the boundary trees.
- Address issues concerning the relationship between the park and boundary properties.
- Maintenance for informal sports use.

**CHA25.2: Specific enhancement opportunities**
- To continue to manage the perimeter grassland areas as meadow and maintain other features such as the new boundary native hedge.
- Seek to improve the relationship between the area and surrounding residential properties with direct access to Primrose Hill.
- Continue management of the boundary trees.

Policy: Historic Extent

*TRP will continue to strive to ensure that the historic extent of the Marylebone Park is conserved and enhanced and that the character of the Nash terraces and their importance as an integral part the park is understood and forms part of the experience of Regent’s Park.*

Management Guidelines: Historic Extent

**Management objectives**
- Co-operate with and coordinate the management activities of the Crown Estate, Crown Estate Paving Commission and TRP to ensure the upkeep of the terraces in a manner sympathetic to the Nash landscape and to ensure that positive and open views and vistas between the terraces and the parkland are maintained.
- Co-operate with surrounding landowners to explore enhancement works that will re-establish visual (and where possible physical) links with the Nash vision and views.
- Co-ordinate and cooperate with the London Borough of Camden and City of Westminster to ensure that tall buildings are not allowed to encroach upon the setting of the terraces or, by default, the park and, in particular, to maintain the quality of strategic and statutory views.

- Reinforce and/or re-establish use and social links between the park and residents of the surrounding terraces and former areas of Marylebone Park (and the wider landscape), in particular socially deprived (SRB) zones such as St Pancras Residential and Church Street.

**Specific enhancement opportunities**

- Identify opportunities to re-establish the visual relationships from The Regent's Street through Park Crescent and Park Square to Regent's Park.

- Work towards re-establishment and maintenance of views to and from the Terraces and the park with neighbours.
PART 5. IMPLEMENTATION

19. MONITORING AND REVIEW

This section describes a framework for monitoring the success of the management plan in meeting the requirements of policies; establishes opportunities to review the management plan and sets out a mechanism for implementing specific projects within the context of the management plan and wider Royal Parks policies.

Implementation of the Management Plan

This Management Plan sets out a ten year vision for the management of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill. It is intended that the Management Plan will be seen as a source of information and guidance for the future development of the park.

In the short-term it is intended that the Management Plan will:

- Ensure transparency of and achieve consensus around the management of The Regent’s Park & Primrose Hill.
- Inform the day-to-day management of The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill.
- Provide a baseline for assessing the suitability of planned projects.

Over the longer term it is hoped that it will:

- Encourage and support co-operation and co-ordination between different groups with an interest in the park including TRP, Crown Estate, Crown Estate Paving Commission, London Borough of Camden, Westminster City Council, The Canal and River Trust and interested private landowners and local interest groups.
- Inform the preparation and development of detailed studies for the restoration, maintenance and enhancement of the park.

Consultation and Adoption of the Plan


Monitoring

Monitoring the effects of the management policies and projects is fundamental to the successful use and implementation of the plan. This should relate achievements to policies and provide information on which to base future amendments to the management plan or management policies.
Successful monitoring is supported by the availability of up to date tree survey information. The Phase 1 Species and Habitat survey of 2008 will need updating by 2018 to support monitoring going forward to the latter years of this management plan.

The key areas for monitoring at Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill are:

- Faithfulness to the ideal level of ‘Nash’ landscape identified;
- Condition of trees, pattern, condition and success of the renewal strategy;
- Social inclusiveness;
- Ecological enhancements;
- Improvements to the sports facilities.
- Horticultural standards.

**Review**

The whole management plan should be reviewed at the end of the first five year period in 2018. The purpose of this review is specifically to:

- Incorporate information newly available (e.g. visitor surveys, ecological surveys, tree surveys);
- Take changing circumstances into account (such as impact of congestion charging, budgetary issues);
- Include the results of monitoring with fine-tuning of projects where necessary;
- Assess achievements over the first five years in terms of (a) policy (successes and failures) and (b) projects.

The review should set out a further detailed schedule of works and a timetable for future plan review. A ten-year review programme may be sufficient in the longer term.

It is fundamental that this management plan is seen as ‘dynamic’ and is flexible and responsive to change. As new information becomes available consideration may need to be given to modifying or changing prescriptions. Such changes should always be assessed in the light of the management plan framework and the key objectives and strategy established within this management plan, and should not have an adverse impact upon the essential genius loci of Regent’s Park or Primrose Hill. In keeping with best practice significant changes of direction should be widely consulted to gain consensus before adoption.
20. NEXT STEPS – THE PROJECT REGISTER

A. Projects completed in previous Management Plan Period (2004-2014)

Construction and Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Broad Walk</td>
<td>Trial of shared use cycleway Creation of viewing area overlooking the Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The English Gardens</td>
<td>Improvements to the shrubberies and replacement of the bog garden and with new planting of Dawn redwoods Annual free access to Contemporary Sculpture Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester Green</td>
<td>Increased use as events site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent’s Canal</td>
<td>Improvements to Primrose Hill Bridge and Monkey Gate entrance Management plan for the woodland embankments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Open Spaces</td>
<td>Construction of The Hub Renovation of the sports pitches Grassland and scrub habitat creation and management New timber sculptures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ornamental Water</td>
<td>Installation of borehole water supply Improved marginal habitat Improvements to Hanover Gate play area Renovation of Clarence Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longbridge Sanctuary</td>
<td>Creation of the Wetland Pen habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Mary's Gardens</td>
<td>Renovation and enhancement of the lake Renovation of rose borders Re-development of the Open Air Theatre National Collection status for Delphinium Border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxopholite Enclosure</td>
<td>Creation of Community Wildlife Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Storeyard Enclosure</td>
<td>Creation of The Allotment Garden Renovation of planting on Chester Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wing Meadow</td>
<td>Removal of golf and tennis school and its return to parkland Management of Leafyard Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primrose Hill South</td>
<td>Improvements to the play area Renovation of shrub beds on western boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primrose Hill Summit</td>
<td>Viewpoint improvements Habitat creation and management Three mixed native scrub plantations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primrose Hill West</td>
<td>Habitat creation and management Mixed species native hedgerow adjacent to Barrow Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Park Wide Projects, Surveys and Community Projects

- Ongoing repair, management and replacement of paths and furniture
- Installation of new TRP orientation panels and finger posts
- Traffic calming measures on the Outer Circle
- Phase 1 Habitat Survey and other specialist ecology surveys
B. Projects proposed for new Plan period (2012-22)
Construction and Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Gardens</td>
<td>Crown thinning and management of avenue trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Broad Walk</td>
<td>Develop Management Strategy for the thinning, renovation and management of avenue trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extend golden surfacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The English Gardens</td>
<td>Improvements to the park entrance from Portland Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-going management and planting of new specimen and groups of trees to ensure succession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Green</td>
<td>Management of views between the park and Cumberland Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance habitat interest through small meadows and conservation headlands along the boundary hedge lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Katharine’s Glade</td>
<td>Management of views between the park and Cumberland Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester Green</td>
<td>Upgrade and improve the children’s play area to diversify play offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance habitat interest through small meadows and conservation headlands along the boundary hedge lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester Slips</td>
<td>Improved screening of car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regent’s Canal</td>
<td>Re-design and re-surfacing of the running track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Open Spaces</td>
<td>Continued improvements to the pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved management of boundary with the Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of more scrub habitat in perimeter areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Winter Gardens</td>
<td>Renovation and renewal planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review opportunities for increased access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ornamental Water</td>
<td>Develop strategy to improve and manage water quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secure external funding for the exotic Waterfowl Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management of views between the park and Terraces and to the Holme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continued enhancement and management of marginal planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring and management of geese and other waterfowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Mary’s Gardens</td>
<td>Phased removal (and replacement) of the Lombardy poplars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renovation of the Dell and Alpine Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylebone Green and Gloucester Green</td>
<td>Renovation and improved management of turf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxopholite Enclosure</td>
<td>Establish long term strategy for community management of the Wildlife Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and enhance the Community Wildlife Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolve the underuse of the Ironwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Storeyard Enclosure</td>
<td>Continue to explore opportunities to improve facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Holme Enclosure</td>
<td>Review opportunities for occasional public access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wing Meadow</td>
<td>Develop management plan for the new Enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continued management of Leafyard Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primrose Hill South | Improved entrances and possible rationalisation of path layout and park furniture
---|---
Primrose Hill South | Improvements to Trim Trail
Primrose Hill Summit | Acid grassland enhancement and management
Primrose Hill West | Continued habitat creation and management
Barrow Hill | Support application to create green roof as part of re-commissioning

### Park Wide Surveys and Community Projects

- Repeat Phase 1 Habitat Survey and other specialist ecology surveys
- Repeat Tree Condition Survey and continued park wide Tree Risk Management Strategy
- Preparation of Park wide Heritage Tree and View Management Strategy
- Develop partnership with the Field Studies Council in education and engagement
- Review options for improved water storage
- Increase community involvement and educational opportunities in relation to Leafyard Wood, Wetland Pen and the East Wing Meadow and Toxopholite Enclosure Meadow
- Wildlife Gardens
APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1. REGISTER OF PARKS AND GARDENS OF SPECIAL HISTORIC INTEREST

This garden or other land is registered under the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 within the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens by English Heritage for its special historic interest.

Name: REGENT'S PARK
List entry Number: 1000246

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>London Borough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>London Borough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade: I

Date first registered: 01-Oct-1987

Details

Early C19 landscape park designed by John Nash as a setting for villa residences and subsequently, from 1835 onwards, opened as a public park. The grounds have seen continuous development into the late C20.

NOTE This entry is a summary. Because of the complexity of this site, the standard Register entry format would convey neither an adequate description nor a satisfactory account of the development of the landscape. The user is advised to consult the references given below for more detailed accounts. Many Listed Buildings exist within the site, not all of which have been here referred to. Descriptions of these are to be found in the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest produced by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport.

HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT

Having been a Crown estate since 1539, the area of Regent's Park, then known as Marylebone Park, was by the end of C18 largely farmland (Richardson, 1794). Schemes to develop the area, including an unsuccessful design competition, were considered from c 1809. It was decided that the Commissioners of Woods, Forests, Parks and Chases should put forward alternative proposals which were required to include the creation of a new street linking the park with the city. John Nash (1752-1835) had been appointed as their architect in 1806 and, together with his partner James Morgan, produced the favoured solution (Nash, 1812) which included proposals for Regent Street (built between 1814 and 1819). The character of Nash's design was essentially one of villas in a parkland setting. Space was to be provided for barracks and other major features including the Prince Regent's Palace, a huge basin of ornamental...
water, and an informal lake. A large central double circus of houses, the Great Circus and the Inner Circus, was intended as the focal point for the scheme with a new branch of the Grand Union Canal, called the Regent's Canal, passing through the park. Nash had worked closely with Humphry Repton (1752-1818) between 1795 and 1802 and the influence of this association is reflected in the design for Regent's Park, especially in the positioning of groups of trees and the use of ornamental water running through parkland. Regent's Park and its buildings took seventeen years to construct, work having started in 1811. The first operations consisted planting as well as excavations for the lake and ground modelling, Nash arguing that planting in advance of building gave a maturity to the site (Summerson 1980). The park, as it was completed by 1827 (Nash, 1827), was developed from the 1812 proposals with a number of alterations and omissions. The Prince's Palace, the basin, some of the terraces and crescents of houses, and the Great Circus were not built, and the canal was re-routed to the north of the Outer Circle. The forty villas Nash had proposed to be sited within the park were reduced to eight in number. Regent's Park as built was largely a fashionable residential estate set in extensive private parkland and occupied by wealthy merchants and professional people. In 1828 however the Royal Zoological Society (founded in 1824) acquired 8ha of land in the northern part of the site. Four years later a further 7ha was leased to the Toxophilite Society and in 1838 the 7ha of land within the Inner Circle was leased to the then newly formed Royal Botanic Society.

Recommendations for opening part of the park to the public were recorded in 1834 (Barnett and Britton, 1834). The addition of fence lines and footpaths to a slightly later plan of 1850 (Crown plan, 1850) illustrates the extent to which public access had increased by this date.

Primrose Hill (qv) to the north of Regent's Park became Crown property in 1841 and in 1842, after an Act was passed securing the land as public open space, the public were freely admitted. A year later the bridge connecting Regent's Park with Primrose Hill was completed and opened.

In 1851 the parkland of Regent's Park was transferred by means of the Crown Land Act from the management of the Commissioners of Woods, Forests, Parks and Chases, to the newly formed Ministry of Works. Pressure from the public for further access to the park continued and several alterations to private fence lines and public footpaths are related to this. The image of Regent's Park was being transformed and the park was no longer one of the more fashionable areas of London, the ground being used increasingly for recreation. Extensions to the Zoological Gardens were undertaken in 1905 and again in 1908.
Replacement of the wooden railings around the park was started in 1906 and largely completed by 1931 using iron railings.

During the First World War the park was requisitioned by the Ministry of Defence, land to the north-west and along the east side being used as a military camp and drill ground. At the end of the war the buildings in these areas were demolished and replaced with sports fields. By the 1920s the remaining villas in the park were too large and expensive to be maintained as private dwellings and were taken over by public institutions. Consequently it became the policy for the Ministry of Works that as properties became vacant their land, where ever possible, should be transferred to parkland. In 1932 the land within the Inner Circle, which had until that date been leased by the Royal Botanic Society, reverted to the Ministry of Works. Duncan Campbell, the then Parks Superintendent, was largely responsible for redesigning the gardens. The offices of the Botanic Society were converted into a tea house and the museum closed. An open-air theatre was given premises on the north side of the garden.

The park and its surroundings, particularly Nash's terrace and villas, were severely damaged during the Second World War and rubble from damaged buildings was used to fill in the eastern arm of the Regent's Canal, the reclaimed land later being made into a car park for the Zoological Gardens. Iron railings from around the park were largely removed as part of the war and its alternative chainlink fencing has been progressively replaced. By 1970 almost 121ha of the 147ha of Regent's Park were open to the public and managed by the Ministry of Works, the remainder of the site staying under the control of the Crown Estates Commission. Today (2000) Regent's Park remains a public park managed by the Royal Parks Authority.

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION
Regent's Park is situated to the west of London, c 1km west of Euston station and c 2km north of Green Park.

The c 147ha of Regent's Park slopes gently to the south and is largely enclosed within a major road, the Outer Circle, this being separated from the park by chain-link fencing and privet hedges. The boundary to the north is made up from that part of Prince Albert Road which runs between the London Central Mosque to the west, and Gloucester Gate to the east. Between Chalbert Street bridge to the west, and St Mark's Bridge to the east, the strip of land between the Outer Circle and Prince Albert Road is principally taken up with Regent's Canal.
Regent’s Park is largely laid to grass, much of which is set aside for recreational sports. The Bernard Baron sports pavilion situated in the centre of the park is a 1938 replacement for the one demolished in 1911. Since the early 1900s enclosures for children’s playgrounds have been provided and these were added to in the 1930s.

A number of tarmaced paths which radiate from the entrances and from points within the site, cut across the grass. The most significant and widest of these is the Broad Walk. Set to the east of the Zoological Gardens, the walk passes over the Grand Union Canal, then runs south from the Outer Circle. After c 500m the walk divides around an ornate marble and granite drinking fountain (1896, listed grade II) before continuing for a further c 500m where it is crossed by Chester Road, which leads west to the Inner Circle. The final c 400m of the walk runs through the formal Italian Garden. Created in 1864 by William A Nesfield, at the direction of Prince Albert, the Garden had become grassed over by the late C20. By the 1990s proposals were in hand to restore both the Italian Garden and the informal English Garden to the east, the English Garden having been made at around the same time by Nesfield’s son Markham, who used mounded grass and planting to create informal glades. The restoration of the Italian Garden was completed in 1996; the renewal of planting in the English Garden is (2000) ongoing.

To the north of the site, housing a collection of exotic animals and birds, are the Zoological Gardens (c 17ha). In 1828 the Royal Zoological Society rented a triangular plot of land of c 8ha to the north of the site. Few examples of the original animal buildings by Decimus Burton (1800-81) survive; those that do include the former Camel House, the Raven House (both listed grade II), and the Giraffe and Hippopotamus House (1830-1, listed grade II). The Zoological Gardens grew rapidly in popularity, expanding to the north of the canal and, in order to accommodate the ever-increasing collection of birds and animals, new buildings were made, one of the latest (1961-5) being the walk-in aviary by Lord Snowdon (listed grade II*). Other listed buildings within the Zoological Gardens include the Mappin Terrace (Belcher and Joass, 1913-14, listed grade I), and the Penguin Pool (Tecton 1934, listed grade I).

To the south-west of the Zoological Gardens is the Boating Lake. The c 8ha Y-shaped lake, situated to the south-west side of the park, is decorated with a number of islands, including two to the north-east arm, one to the north of the west arm, and two towards the centre. The east and west arms of the lake are crossed by ornamental footbridges, the southern arm being crossed by York
Bridge (listed grade II) which carries cars between the Outer and Inner Circle. In 1930 a small children's boating pool was added c 50m to the west of the western arm of the lake.

Some 100m to the east of the Boating Lake and set within the Inner Circle are Queen Mary's Gardens (c 7ha). To the south and south-west the ornamental gardens, largely laid out with roses introduced by Duncan Campbell c 1932, run east to a miniature lake with an island and a bridge. A central path leads north from ornamental gates (listed grade II), erected to commemorate King George V and Queen Mary's Jubilee in 1935, to a pool and fountain (listed grade II). The pool and fountain replaced the Royal Botanic Society's C19 conservatory which was demolished c 1932 as part of the work undertaken by Campbell. To the north-east and east of the central path the garden is decorated with an extensive rockery and water features. To the north-west is the open-air theatre and cafe. The latter, opened in 1932, was made on the site of the Royal Botanic Society's museum and secretary's house. Two sets of heavily gilded gates decorate the entrances to the gardens. The eastern gates, from Chester Road, were provided by Sigismund Goetze, a wealthy local artist, in 1932. Goetze also funded the Jubilee Gates which guard the entrance from south side of the Inner Circle and provided trees, hedging, and advice for Campbell's new design. Between 1838 and 1932 the gardens within the Inner Circle were leased to the Royal Botanic Society and laid out to demonstrate the visual qualities of plants. The plants were grouped according to their uses in medicine, agriculture, or manufacturing processes. In 1935 the gardens were re-opened as Queen Mary’s Gardens.

OTHER LAND

Nash's original grand vision included a full circus to provide a grand entrance to the new Crown Estate at its south-east corner, but in the event only the southern semi-circle, Park Crescent, was realised. Work began in 1812 but the builder, Charles Mayor, went bankrupt when only six houses had been completed in the south-eastern quadrant. Work only recommenced in 1818. Map evidence indicates that the early layout of Park Crescent Gardens comprised a perimeter planting belt with inner path, with a statue of the Duke of Kent (d.1829; listed Grade II) at the centre of the south side of the gardens, terminating the vista down Portland Place. There are small lodges in the Greek Doric style at the north-east and north-west corners of the Garden matched, across Marylebone Road (beneath which runs a curving underpass, connecting the two Gardens), by identical lodges at the top corners of Park Square Gardens. All are of 1823-5 and by John Nash, and all are listed Grade II.
Ventilating shafts of 1976 for the Fleet Line just inside the north edge of the Gardens are disguised as summer houses. The landscaping is informal, with shrubberies and mature trees around the perimeter, broad gravel paths, and a lawned interior.

The northern half of the planned circus was replaced by Park Square, with two terraces designed by Nash and built by William Mountford Nurse in 1823-5 facing each other across a grass square defined by iron railings of 1823-5 (listed Grade II) designed by John Nash. Map evidence shows that in the early C19 there was a narrow belt of planting around the edge of Park Square Gardens with a perimeter path around its inner edge. A path curved into the park joining the north-east and north-west gates, with a similar path linking the south-west and south-east gates. A further curving path linked the north and south paths, and there was some informal planting in the interior. The present path layout and planting, with shrubberies, a number of mature trees, and a lawned interior, is little if any different to this (the early mapping is too small-scale for detailed analysis) although a circular path had been added within the arc of the south path by the later C19. Two small lodges in the style of John Nash were built in the north-west and north-east corners of Park Square Gardens in the later C20 (pre-1968).

Both Gardens are private.

REASONS FOR DESIGNATION DECISION: Regent's Park is included on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens for the following principal reasons:

* as a key element of John Nash's major improvement scheme of 1811-28 for north-west London which also included Regent Street; * as one of the most ambitious urban parks of the early C19; * for the specific interest of some of its designed landscape elements such as WA Nesfield's Italian Garden of 1864 and the near-contemporary English Garden by his son Markham; * as the setting for a large number of listed structures within it including early C19 villas and those of the Zoological Gardens, and the surrounding terraces.

REFERENCES


OS 25” to 1 mile: 1st edition published 1870 2nd edition published 1895
Description written: September 2000 Register Inspector: LCH Edited: January 2002 Amended: No

PRIMROSE HILL
This garden or other land is registered under the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 within the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens by English Heritage for its special historic interest.
Name: PRIMROSE HILL
List entry Number: 1001526

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>London Borough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grade: II
Date first registered: 02-May-2001

Details
Mid-C19 public park added to Regent’s Park in 1841.

HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT
Until mid-C 19 Primrose Hill was farmland with hedgerow boundaries and a few tree surviving from the ancient Middlesex Forest (William Gillespie and Partners p18). However since 1822 the owners, Eton College, had been planning to divide the hill into building plots. In 1829 plans were drawn up to develop the whole of the hill, the plans included new road links to the north but no offers were made for them. In 1831 a private individual leased the hill intending to sub-let it to the Royal Botanical Society and, in 1836, the London Cemetery Company made an application for land for a burial ground. Neither of these proposals was approved. Following a recommendation from the government, the Crown Commissioners, in 1838, offered to buy Primrose Hill from Eton College in order to form an extension of Regent’s Park and the site became Crown property in 1841. In the following year, after an Act had been passed securing the land as public open space, the public was freely admitted. The boundaries were marked by an oak fence and hedgerows were removed, a year later the bridge connecting Regent’s Park with Primrose Hill was completed and opened. A Gymnasium was built near to the southern boundary c1847.

In 1851 Primrose Hill, along with the parkland of Regent’s Park, was transferred, by means of the Crown Land Act, from the management of the Commissioners of Woods, Forests and Chases, to the newly formed Ministry of Works. The new management soon tackled the problems of drainage and levels, especially in the north and west where ponds and hollows were considered dangerous to the public. The improvement work was carried out intermittently between 1851 and 1900 and included the laying of an extensive footpath system with lamps along the main routes and some new planting.

By the 1860s Primrose Hill had become a popular place for public meetings, demonstrations and rallies and, around this time, an area to the east was set aside as a Guards Drill Ground and a Refreshment Lodge was built to the west. By the turn of the century buildings surrounded Primrose Hill on three sides.

In the year 2000 Primrose Hill remains the property of the Crown, and, along
with Regent's Park, is managed by the Royal Parks Authority as public park.

SITE DESCRIPTION

LOCATION, AREA, BOUNDARIES AND LANDFORM Primrose Hill is situated to the west of London, immediately to the north of Regent's Park (qv GD1156) and c1km west of Euston Station. Green Park (qv GD1799) lies c3km to the south and Hampstead Heath c3km to the north. The 25ha of Primrose Hill rise steeply to a northern plateau before dropping down to the northern boundary. To the south, Primrose Hill is separated from Regent's Park by Prince Albert Road and is bounded to the north by the backs of houses and school buildings in Elsworthy Road, with Primrose Hill Road, Regent's Park Road and Albert Terrace making for the eastern boundary. The boundary to the south-west is largely made up from Barrow Hill, a covered reservoir made to supply water to the villas in and around Regent's Park in 1828. The boundary to the north-west is made up from the backs of houses on Avenue Road. The site is enclosed with various materials including railings, brick wall, clipped hedges and shrubberies.

ENTRANCES AND APPROACHES Primrose Hill is entered from a number of points around the site. The entrance to the south-west, from Prince Albert Road, is guarded by brick built Primrose Hill Lodge (c1870). After standing empty for a number of years the Lodge was refurbished in the late C20. The grounds around the lodge are separated from the park by C20 iron railings.

THE PARK The steeply rising hill is laid to grass and cut by tarred paths which radiate across from points on the east and west perimeter paths and from the south-west and south-eastern corners. The paths to the south are largely decorated with ornamental trees, Primrose Hill lost many of its mature trees during the storms of 1987 and 1990. A path runs north-west from the south-eastern corner and continues, slightly to the east of centre, to the circular hard surfaced view point at the summit of the hill. From this point, which in the late C20 was marked with the points of the compass, the panorama of the city of London can be viewed. To the west, the roofs of the covered structures of Barrow Hill Reservoir are partially screened by trees as are the C19 housing developments on the northern and eastern boundaries. To the north-west, below the western slopes of the hill sports pitches have been made. Below the southern slopes is a late C20 children's recreation ground, built near the site of the gymnasium made in 1847.

REFERENCES
Printed material William Gillespie and Partners, The Regent’s Park; Royal Parks Survey, 1981. (This report contains numerous references and maps. The Royal Parks Review Group, Royal Parks Review, St James and Green Parks, Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill, 1993, pp41-84

National Grid Reference: TQ 27594 83909
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APPENDIX 2 EXTRACT FROM THE NATIONAL HERITAGE LIST FOR ENGLAND

There are a large number of listed buildings and monuments within and surrounding the park, some of which are managed by TRP. The appendix includes extract summaries from the National Heritage List for England.

List Entry Summaries
The following buildings/monuments are listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for their special architectural or historic interest.

© Crown Copyright and database right 2012. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100019088.
© British Crown and SeaZone Solutions Limited 2011. All rights reserved. Licence number 102006.006.

Reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO. © Crown copyright and database right 2008. All rights reserved (L/N: 100019769).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/Monument</th>
<th>Listing status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: <strong>JUBILEE GATES, QUEEN MARYS GARDENS</strong></td>
<td>Grade: II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Entry Number: 1375642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Jubilee Gates, Queen Mary’s Gardens, Regent’s Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date first listed: 09-Jul-1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for Designation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ 2882 SW REGENT’S PARK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900/35/10128 Jubilee Gates, Queen Mary’s Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main, formal entrance gates to Queen Mary’s Gardens from York Bridge. Dated 6th May 1935 being the day Queen Mary officially re-opened the gardens following remodelling. The gates were commissioned for the Silver Jubilee of King George V and presented to the park by Sigismund Goetze. Cast and wrought iron, partly gilded, Portland stone pillars. Symmetrical design of concave plan. Central barred carriage gates are hung from an open-work acanthus leaf and scroll frame supported by fluted pillars with enriched capitals and finials. The acanthus and scroll work overthrow contains the royal cypher of George V. Similar but smaller pedestrian entrances flank the pillars and are themselves flanked by tall stone pillars having entablatures and crowned with flaming urns. Curved plan railings with pillars having torche flambe finials link the gates to similar stone pillars on the road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: <strong>CHESTER ROAD GATES, QUEEN MARYS GARDENS</strong></th>
<th>Grade: II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List Entry Number: 1375641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Chester Road gates, Queen Mary's Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date first listed: 09-July-1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for Designation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ 2882 NW REGENT'S PARK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900/25/10127 Chester Road Gates, Queen Mary's Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal entrance gates to Queen Mary's Gardens at the western end of Chester Road. Dated 1933. Presented to the park in 1932 by Sigismund Goetze. Cast iron with wrought iron enrichment which is partly gilded. Symmetrical design of central carriage entrance with openwork box pillars, crowned by acanthus leaf and scroll finials, and linked by an acanthus leaf and scroll work overthrow with a central radiating sun. Flanking this and linked by panels of plain cast iron bars, are similar but smaller pedestrian entrances with plain cast iron gates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing NGR: TQ2833082630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: <strong>YORK BRIDGE OVER LAKE, YORK BRIDGE NW1</strong></th>
<th>Grade II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List Entry Number: 1066065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Jubilee Gates, Queen Mary's Gardens, Regent's Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date first listed: 01-Dec-1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for Designation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ 2882 SW CITY OF WESTMINSTER YORK BRIDGE, 35/47 REGENT'S PARK, NW1 York Bridge over Lake G.V. II Bridge. c1818-20, as part of Nash's Regent's Park landscaping and providing access to the Inner Circle and its villas. Brick with rendered faces. Segmental arch and small flanking arches, finished off with block cornice and cast iron Grecian guard rail following curve of crown.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Reference - Title: Part 17 Greater London - Journal Title: Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Name:** HANOVER GATE LODGE  
**List Entry Number:** 1066689  
**Location:** Hanover Gate Lodge  
**Date first listed:** 13-Jul-1965  

**Reasons for Designation**

TQ 2782 NW CITY OF WESTMINSTER HANOVER GATE, 23/13 REGENT'S PARK, NW1 13.1.65

Hanover Gate Lodge G.V. II*

Regent's Park gate lodge on island site. c.1822 - 23, by John Nash as part of his Regent's Park Crown Estate development. Channelled stucco and painted stone; leaded pyramidal roof rising to central chimney stack. Square plan with chamfered corners, Unusual and picturesquely monumental lodge design. 2 storeys. A doorway and one window to each face (2 blind); the chamfered corners built out on ground floor to firm semi-circular arched niches, 2 of them with statues; above each projection pairs of boldly scrolled inverted stone consoles, set on blocking course, rise to buttress the 1st floor with swag between. Crowning dentil cornice. Octagonal chimney stack. Gates removed.

Listing NGR: TQ2735982645

**Article Reference** - Title: Part 17 Greater London - Journal Title: Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England

---

**Name:** CLARENCE GATE LODGE  
**List Entry Number:** 1291503  
**Location:** Clarence Gate Lodge, Clarence Gate NW1  
**Date first listed:** 09-Jul-1998  

**Grade II**
Reasons for Designation

TQ 2782 SE CITY OF WESTMINSTER CLARENCE GATE, REGENT'S PARK, NW1 34/27 13.1.65 Clarence Gate Lodge

Park gate lodge. c.1823, by Burton or Nash as gate keeper's lodge to Regent's Park entrance from Park Road, on Baker Street axis. Stucco; slate roof. One storey. 3 windows wide. East end porch with cornice and blocking course. Semicircular windows, recessed for one order; glazing bar sashes.

Listing NGR: TQ2782182239

Article Reference - Title: Part 17 Greater London - Journal Title: Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England

Name: GLOUCESTER GATE LODGE

List entry Number: 1078330

Location: Gloucester Gate Lodge

Date first listed: 01-Dec-1987

Reasons for Designation

Lodge house. c1830, altered. Rusticated stucco with slate roofs. Single storey 2 windows. Single window left hand return. Entrance portico on garden front. Main facade, narrow recessed central bay with shallow round-arched niche flanked by bays with single round-arched sash each, Doric mutule entablature (continuing around the building) and pediments. Rectangular chimney-stack and pots appears between the pediments. INTERIOR: not inspected. HISTORICAL NOTE: in its original form, the 2 bays of the lodge separately flanked the entrance screen which formed the East Gate to Regent's Park. (Survey of London: Vol. XIX, Old St Pancras and Kentish Town (St Pancras II): London: -1938: 96).

Listing NGR: TQ2855283452

Article Reference - Title: Volume 19 Old St Pancras and Kentish Town The Parish of St Pancras Part 2 -
TQ2883SE GLOUCESTER GATE 798-1/82/576 Garden railings to Gloucester Gate 14/05/74 Lodge Grade II Railings to rear garden. c1830. Cast-iron with ball and spike finials.

Name: STATUE OF A SHEPHERDESS, ST JOHN'S LODGE GARDEN, NORTH OF HYLAS FOUNTAIN

List entry Number: 1231648

Date first listed : 01-Dec-1987

Reasons for Designation

TQ 2882 NW CITY OF WESTMINSTER INNER CIRCLE, 25/3 REGENT'S PARK NW1

Statue of st John the Baptist, St John's Lodge Garden, on edge of Rond Point, north of 'Hylas' fountain GV II the address shall be amended to read "statue of a shepherdess, St John's Lodge Garden, north of 'Hylas' fountain" and the description shall be amended to read as follows:- Statue of a woman carrying a lamb and staff 1931 by C L Hartwell R A, signed. Bronze, on Portland stone base with granite plinth. Inscription reads: "Erected in honour of Gertrude and Harold Baillie Weaver by the National Council for Animals' Welfare with the generous co-operation of the sculptor, 1931." Located at the north point of the circular garden laid out round the 'Hylas' fountain (q.v.)

Listing NGR: TQ2832282785

Article Reference - Title: Part 17 Greater London - Journal Title: Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: <strong>THE HYLAS FOUNTAIN IN FORMAL GARDEN TO EAST OF AND ON AXIS OF ENTRANCE FRONT OF ST JOHN'S LODGE</strong></th>
<th>Grade II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List entry Number: 1277418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date first listed:</strong> 01-Dec-1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for Designation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ 2882 NW CITY OF WESTMINSTER INNER CIRCLE, 25/6 REGENT'S PARK, NW1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 'Hylas' Fountain in formal Garden to East of and on Axis of Entrance Front of St John's Lodge G.V. II Fountain sculpture. Executed 1894 and elaborated at R A 1895, by Henry A Pegram. Bronze figure of standing youth with legs clasped by mermaid, on stone base set in centre of circular pool. Originally known as &quot;The Bather&quot;. Part of the formal &quot;Dutch&quot; or &quot;Old English&quot; garden extending and framing entrance front axis of St John's Lodge. Presented in 1933.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing NGR: TQ2831882768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: <strong>ST JOHN'S LODGE GARDEN, 2 PIERS LINKED BY STEPS AT HYLAS FOUNTAIN RONDPOINT</strong></th>
<th>Grade II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List entry Number: 1277479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date first listed:</strong> 01-Dec-1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQ 2882 NW CITY OF WESTMINSTER INNER CIRCLE, 25/4 REGENT'S PARK, NW1 St John's Lodge Garden: 2 Piers linked by Steps at Hylas Fountain Rondpoint. G.V. II Piers. c1846 as part of Barry's enlargement programme for the villa, possibly reset in 1890s landscaping or later. Stone. Same design as forecourt gate piers. Channelled with escutcheon-surmounted cornice caps (added by Lord Bute?), and set flanking formal axis linked by curved stone steps with console parapets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name: PAIR OF GATE PIERS ON NORTH SIDE OF ST JOHN'S LODGE FORECOURT

List entry Number: 1231646

Date first listed: 01-Dec-1987

TQ 2882 NW CITY OF WESTMINSTER INNER CIRCLE, 25/2 REGENT'S PARK, NW1 Pair of Gate Piers on North Side of St John's Lodge Forecourt G.V. II Gate piers. c1846 as part of Barry's enlargement of the villa. Stone. Channelled square section piers with prominent cornice-caps, surmounted by Baroque escutcheons supported by boys (added by Lord Bute?).

Listing NGR: TQ2826482792

Article Reference - Title: Part 17 Greater London - Journal Title: Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England

Name: PAIR OF GATE PIERS ON SOUTH SIDE OF ST JOHN'S LODGE FORECOURT

List entry Number: 1231856

Date first listed: 01-Dec-1987

TQ 2882 NW CITY OF WESTMINSTER INNER CIRCLE, 25/5 REGENT'S PARK, NW1 Pair of Gate Piers on South Side of St John's Lodge Forecourt G.V. II Gate piers. c1846 as part of Barry's enlargement of the villa. Stone. Channelled square section piers with prominent cornice caps, surmounted by Baroque escutcheons supported by boys (added by Lord Bute?).

Listing NGR: TQ2826082776

Article Reference - Title: Part 17 Greater London - Journal Title: Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England
| Name: DRINKING FOUNTAIN SOUTH EAST OF ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS, BROAD WALK - "READY MONEY DRINKING FOUNTAIN" |
| Date first listed: 05-Feb-1970 |
| Drinking fountain. 1896. White marble and pink and grey granite. Gothic pavilion with clustered colonettes carrying low spire and 4 pinnacles. 4 arched faces with basins to fountain proper. Inscription: Gift of Sir Cowasjee Jehangir, a wealthy Parsee; inaugurated by Princess Mary, Duchess of Teck; erected by the Metropolitan Drinking Fountain and Cattle Trough Association. Part in London Borough of Camden. |
| Article Reference - Title: Part 17 Greater London - Journal Title: Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England |

| Grade II |
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### APPENDIX 5. TABLE OF SIGNIFICANCE

**Summary Table of Significance with Graded Importance of the Key features.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key features by main value</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Supporting notes/other key values.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General values and parkland character</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Park with mosaic of historic, natural and recreational</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Local, regional, national and international visitor destination/All values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>features.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varied character within and between Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeological features/potential.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>RCHME survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topographic variety with important views and vistas to, from and within park including to City of London.</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>View from Primrose Hill protected by statute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The value of the historic landscape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important historic landscape.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>English Heritage Grade I. (The Regent’s Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Built Landscape</td>
<td>Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important historic landscape.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment as medieval Royal deer park - Marylebone Park.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surviving nineteenth century parkland framework of roads (Inner and Outer Circle) and spaces established to an existing masterplan by John Nash.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The surviving Regency context of Nash terraces and villas.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regent’s Canal (Grand Union Canal)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ornamental Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Mary’s Gardens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue and English Gardens (by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English Heritage Grade II. (Primrose Hill) Recreational, aesthetic, cultural, educational.

Cultural, educational.

Cultural, spiritual, recreational, natural, educational, built landscape.


Key element of Nash design Cultural, spiritual, built landscape, wider setting, educational, natural.

Key element of Nash design Cultural, spiritual, aesthetic, built landscape, educational, natural, ecological.

Important landscape feature. Cultural, spiritual, aesthetic, built landscape, wider setting, educational, recreational, natural.

Early features of public
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>William Andrews /Markham Nesfield)</th>
<th>park. Cultural, recreational, spiritual, aesthetic, built landscape, wider setting, educational, natural.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The value of the wider setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important area of open space in busy urban Central London location</td>
<td>✔ ✔ Metropolitan Open Space. Recreational, spiritual, aesthetic, economic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of green link between north and central London</td>
<td>✔ ✔ Natural, ecological.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Links’ to Regent’s Street and Carlton House.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ Historic, cultural, spiritual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and ecological value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse species and structural framework of over 6,000 trees.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ Historic (distribution), aesthetic, recreational, educational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of largest areas of habitats in Central London including important wood pasture, grassland and wetland.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ Designated as Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. Recreational, aesthetic, educational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively high species diversity.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ Presence of UK and local BAP species. Recreational, aesthetic, economic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The value of the built infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good network of paths and park furnishings.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On site staff housing.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide range of nineteenth and twentieth century statues and sculptures.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational, social and educational value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationally renowned site and recreational venue attracting large number of visitors</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good public transport links, so readily accessible to all.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide range of opportunities for passive and active recreation.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide range of sporting facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide range of visitor amenities including children’s’ play areas,</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toilets and refreshments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic, built infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive horticultural areas.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic, natural, ecological, spiritual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting for Open Air Theatre</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual, cultural, built infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting for ZSL London Zoo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual, cultural, built infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events and Activities Programme</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual, aesthetic, built infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic and spiritual value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of 'lost' river Tyburn beneath the park.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Escape' from the city environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineteenth century ambience.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational, historic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting of the terraces</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational, historic, heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with historic and/or cultural events or people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association with John Nash and the Prince Regent (George IV).</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eminent designer/association. Educational.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Royal Park not built associated with historic palace.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First building by Decimus Burton (The Holme)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Public Park.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection with Sigismund Goetze</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Economic Value                                           |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| Positive impacts on local and regional economy.         | ✓ | ✓ | Contributes to attractiveness of London for visitors and residents. |
| Setting for numerous commercial venues and value of ‘Royal’ status on these. | ✓ | ✓ | Sports Clubs, theatre and zoo benefit from connection with well-known location. |
| High cost of maintenance and conservation.              | ✓ | ✓ | Financial constraint exacerbated by perception as ‘Royal’. |