

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL

HUBERT BENNETT,
F.R.I.B.A.

Architect to the Council

TELEPHONE WESTMINSTER 5000

EXTENSION **WA.8373 77135/C**

Ref. AR/

Your Ref.



ARCHITECT'S DEPARTMENT
THE COUNTY HALL
WESTMINSTER BRIDGE
LONDON, S.E.1

15 MAY 1962

Dear Sir,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT, 1947.

Refusal of permission to develop

The Council, in pursuance of its powers under the above mentioned Act and the Town and Country Planning General Development Order, 1950, hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted.

In accordance with the provisions of Article 5 of the Order, your attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rights endorsed hereon.

SCHEDULE

Date of application: **4 September 1961**

Plans submitted No. **19011 (your plans Nos. 170/7A)**

Development: **The redevelopment of the sites of Nos. 1-7 Euston Road, St. Pancras by the erection of a six-storey building with basements for use as shops, restaurants and hotel.**

Reasons for refusal

(1) **The bulk of building proposed on the site is in excess of the Council's plot ratio standard for this area, and constitutes over-development of the site.**

(2) **The proposal to extend the upper floors in advance of the line of widening in Euston Road is considered undesirable in that it would create a visual encroachment of a dominant nature by reason of its lack of relationship with the adjoining building to the southwards, Nos. 9-11 Euston Road.**

**Approved by the Council
and authorised by the
LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL
Committee.**

Messrs. Robert J. Wood and Partners
29 Widmore Road
Bromley, KENT.

Copy:— for

District Surveyor	with plan(s) plan requested
Statutory Register	
Land Charges	
Borough Council	

(3) By reason of the absence of loading facilities, and inadequacy of the access to the basement car parking space, there would inevitably be an increase in congestion in the surrounding streets by calling vehicles and those waiting to enter the car park which could have an adverse effect on the amenities at present enjoyed by the neighbouring premises.

(4) The Council's standards in regard to the access of daylight to adjacent premises, particularly at rear, are infringed to the detriment of such premises.

I have to inform you that the Council would consider a further application showing a building set back (in all parts) to the improvement line and satisfactory from plot ratio, daylighting, loading facilities and vehicular access aspects.

Yours faithfully,

HUBERT BENNETT

PER

Architect to the Council
duly authorised by
the Council to sign this
document.