671/40620/3931

White thealt, S. but

Victoria Souc Surphiack

Notes 17/4

wir,

## Term and Country Planuing Act, 1947; Section 16 Appeal relating to No. 52 St. Giles's High Street, Holbern

- I am directed by the stimister of Bousing and Local Government to refer to the appeal made by Mr. M. Mousource against the refusal of the London County Council to permit the change of use of the two front rooms of the flat on the first moor at Fo. 52 St. Giles's High Street, Holborn, from residential to restaurant gargo.ss.
- No. 52 is situated on the west side of St. Giles's High Street and comes part of a block of flats known as Clifferd Hereiens extending over the shops at New. 52-55 with a separate entrance at No. 54. The two first floor front rooms, the subject of the appeal, are the living-rooms of a self-contained flat comprising four rouns, a kitchen and a bathreen. The flat is partly over the look-up restaurant of which your client is the properties; and the vacant shop. The flat is occupied at present by took up the state of the properties.
- The main points made in support of your client's appeal were that; -
  - (1) The restaurant was too small to accommodate all the customers. ment offered no room for extension and he had been ansuccessive to acquiring the next door shop, which is at present was ant.
  - $\chi \lambda_{x,y}$  Hs proposed, therefore, to remove the partition between the  $a_{x,y}$  and  $a_{x,y}$ rooms immediately above the restaurant and to construct a state and loading directly from the restaurant to these rooms, which could thou be used as part of the restaurant.
  - (iii), He would continue to live in the flat and would occupy the front round in the evenings as the extension to the restaurant was needed unity at the lunch-time rush heur. It was submitted that the proposal would not involve any less of regidential accommedation.
    - (iv) He would agree to reinstate the flat as now existing should be decide not to continue to reside on the premises.
- for the London County Council it was stated that:-
  - (i) The premises were mitnated in the Central Zene defined in the Administrative County of London Development Plan.
  - (ii) The Council had consulted the Holborn Metropolitan Borough Council on the application and they had offered no objection to the proposal sale-Ject to permission being restricted to the applicant only, and may structural work necessary to reinstate the rooms for residential use being cerried out on the consution of the rentaurant use by the propert occupier.
  - (111) The County Council had refused permission, however, because the proposal conflicted with their Development Plan, which sought to proset we rest. dential uses.
    - (iv) In the Council's view the only relevant consideration was which is the rooms in question sould still be used residentially and they have tablefied that they could be.

/(**∀**)

Association available in the Tlat, leaving a less satisfactory and compared to be builtimes, a billion out a satisfactory and

injuster his schedored the report of his Inspector, Mr. C. P. C. hitaker, following his inspection of the promises and is satisfied that the promise is the two from the continues are no special circumstances which sould recribe permission for the extension of a business use into this fiet.

. occardingly, the Minister hereby dismisses your client's appeal, and this other as his formal decision.

I am, Sir, Your obedient Servant.

A. 2. NICKINGO MAM

Authorised by the simister to sign in that behalf.