Out Town Hall 197 High Holdown 197 High Holdown Wei Lysten 197 High Holdown Wei Lysten 197 High Holdown 197 Hig	_ondor	n Borough of Camden	CTP 26	
Book 197 High Holborn Group Weit Agender B. Schlaffenberg, Dr. Arch (Rome). Dip, Tf. Planning Officer B. Schlaffenberg, Dr. Arch (Rome). Dip, Tf. Planning Officer C. J. Alloopp, Dag., LUNDOR, M. J. Date July Std. 370 Your references Cryptal/li/2/8670 Dets July Std. 370 Your references Cryptal/li/2/8670 Dets July Std. 370 Your references Cryptal/li/2/8670 Dets Strist, Torm and Country Planning Arcs 1962 to 1968 Dets London Government Arcts 1962 to 1968 Dets Dets Strist, Torm and Country Planning Arcs 1962 to 1968 Dets London Government Arcts 1962 to 1968 Dets Dets Strist, Dets Methy Planning Arcs 1962 to 1968 Dets London Government Arct 1963 Strist, Dets Vour atention is strawn to the Statement of Appliant's Rights set out overlead. Strist, Dets Steep Plans submitted. Store, March, 19770 Date of application: Store, Strist, Stri			Planning Department	
Lichdon, WCi, LZBAII. B. Schlaffentberg, Dr. Arch (Rome). Dip. Tf. Planning Officer Mr. Mr. Data July 3rd.1970 Your reference CEP/011/11/2/8670 Tour reference CEP/011/11/2/8670 Telephone inquiries to Eff. 43 or 105 Dest Sife). Dest Sife). Town and Country Planning Acts 1962 to 1968 London Government Act 1963 EFFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO DEVELOP The Council, in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, the plans stubulited. Your attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rights set out overleat. SCHEDDLE Date of application: <u>2004</u> , Marshy1570 Plans stubulited: Reg. No. <u>6670</u> Your No. Previopment: Ressons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not couply with the Council's dayligiting studiers as for a studio/living roce extension at roof level at No.21, Alma Street,N.W.5. Ressons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not somply with the Council's dayligiting studiers as for a studio/living roce extension at roof level at No.21, Alma Street,N.W.5. Ressons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not couply with the Council's dayligiting studiers as for a study of the terree which is a sub-sect form would spell the schifted tury is council in of the terree which is a placefined proportions. <u>The Council would be prepared to consider favourshy a revised scheme for a catenairo which is scholed within a sameard roof. Yours fainhuly. Planning Officer</u>				
Telephone: 01-A65 311 B. Schäffenberg.Dr.Arch (Rome).Dip.Tf Planning Officer MT C.J. Allsoyp.Esq., LUTPOS.R.J. Date July Jst.1970 Your reference Cgr/M1/11/2/8670 Telephone inquiries to: Ext Dest. Sir(s). Toren and Country Planning Acts 1962 to 1988 Dest. Sir(s). Toren and Country Planning Acts 1962 to 1988 Dest. Sir(s). The Council, in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, thereby refuses to parmit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plane submitted. Your attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rights set out overleaf. SCHEDULE Date of application: 22nd., March, 2970 Plane submitted; Reg. No. Schedule as stown on the plane submitted; Reg. No. Development: Kreetion of a studio/living room extension at roof level at No.21, Alma Street, N.*.5. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed stat the streets. 2. It is considered that the extension in its present form would appliciting standards as far as study affect the streets. 2. It is considered that the extension in its present form sould spoil the architecture locaposition of the terrease which is of sell-defined proportiones.			London, WC1 🚽 🚛	
Planning Office: MTR C.J.411sepp_Seq., LONDOX.N.1. Date July 3rd.1970 C.J.411sepp_Seq., LONDOX.N.1. Date July 3rd.1970 Your reference CTr/m1/11/2/8670 Telephone inquiries to: Ext. 13 or Dear. Sir(s). Town and Country Planning Acts 1982 to 1988 Econdon Government Act 1963 BEFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO DEVELOP The Council, in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted. Your attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rights set out overleaf. SCHEDULE Date of application: 220dy Harshyl970 Plans submitted: Reg. No. BEFUSAL OF a studio/living room extension at roof level at No.21, Alam Street,N.W.5. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting standards as far as they affect the street. 2. It is considered that the extension in its present forw would spoil the architectural composition of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. FUETIVER INFORMATION. The council would her propared to consider favourebly a revised scheme for ar extension which is meloaed within a sameard roof. Yours faithfully. All			Telephone : 01-405 3411	
C.J. Alleopping and, if, Okigay Bood, LOW DOW, W.J. Your reference CTP/B11/11/2/8670 Telephone inquiries to: Ext. 13 or 105 Dest Sir(s), Town and Country Planning Acts 1982 to 1988 Loadon Government Acts 1982 Dest Sir(s), Town and Country Planning Acts 1982 to 1988 Loadon Government Acts 1983 Dest Sir(s), The Council, to pursuance of the powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted. Your attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rights set out overleaf. SCHEDULE Date of application: 2040, "Kareby1970	<u></u> ,		B. Schlaffenberg,Dr.Arch (Rome),Dip.TF Planning Officer MTF	
Lingbors, r.1. Your reference Dur reference CTP/B11/11/2/6670 Telephone inquiries to: Ext. 13 or 105 Dear SI(s), Town and Country Planning Acts 1982 to 1988 London Government Act 1983 EFFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO DEVELOP The Council, in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted: Your attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rights set out overleat. SCHEDULE Date of application: 2nd, March, 12770 Plans submitted: Reg. No. After of a studio/living roca extension at roof level at No.21, Alme Street, N.V.5. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not scorply with the Council's daylighting extenders in a street, N.V.5. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. FUETHER INFORMATION. The Council would be prepared to consider favourably a revised scheme for an extension which is associated within a measured roof. Yours faithfully. Planning Officer		•	Date July 3rd_1970	
LUNDON, N. 1. Dur reference CTP/B11/J1/2/8670 Telephone inquiries to: Losson Government Acts 1962 to 1968 Losson Government Acts 1962 PERVISENON TO DEVELOP The Council, in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted. To council, in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted. To council, in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted. To council, in pursuance of its powers under the strends of a studio/living room extension at roof level at No.21, Almos Strends, N. W.5. Reasons for refusal Reasons for refusal Reasons for refusal Reasons for refusal The Council would here they atfract the strends. Lift is considered that the extension in its present form would applie the architecturel composition of the terrease which is of well-defined proportions. <u>Pursting Throphymetter. </u> The Council would here prepared to consider favourably a revised scheme for an extension which is emblosed within a mansard roof. Yours faithfuly.			•. •	
The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting standards as far as they affect the street. Reasons for refusal Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting standards as far as they affect the street. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting standards as far as they affect the street. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting the architecturel composition of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. Intermediation: 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting architecturel composition of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. Intermediation: 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting architecturel composition of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. Intermediation: 1. The proposed extension would not comply after the council's dayligiting architecturel composition of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. Intermediation: 1. The considered that the extension in its present form would spell the architecturel composition of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. Intermediation: Intermediation: Planning Officer		LONDON.N.1.	TOUL TELEVELICE	
The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting standards as far as they affect the street. Reasons for refusal Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting standards as far as they affect the street. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting standards as far as they affect the street. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting the architecturel composition of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. Intermediation: 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting architecturel composition of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. Intermediation: 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting architecturel composition of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. Intermediation: 1. The proposed extension would not comply after the council's dayligiting architecturel composition of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. Intermediation: 1. The considered that the extension in its present form would spell the architecturel composition of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. Intermediation: Intermediation: Planning Officer			Our reference CTP/G11/11/2/8670	
Dear Sir(8), Town and Country Planning Acts 1962 to 1968 Loadon Government Act 1963 REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO DEVELOP The Council, in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, hereby releases to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted. Your attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rights set out overleaf. SCHEDULE Date of application: 201				
Dear Sir(s). Town and Country Planning Acts 1962 to 1968 London Government Act 1963 DEFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO DEVELOP The Council, in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted. Your attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rights set out overleaf. SCHEDULE Date of application: <u>22nd</u> , March,1970 Plans submitted: Reg. No. <u>8670</u> Your No. Development: Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's dayligiting standards as far as they affect the street. 2. It is considered that the extension in its present form would spell the architectural composition of the terrese which is of well-defined proportions. <u>FURTIER INFORMATIOF</u> . The Council would be prepared to consider favourably a revised scheme for an extension which is enclosed within a manaard roof. Yours faithfully.				
Town and Country Planning Acts 1962 to 1968 London Government Act 1963 DEFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO DEVELOP The Council, in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted. Your attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rights set out overleat. SCHEDULE Date of application:	···· =··=			
London Government Act 1963 REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO DEVELOP The Council, in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted. Vour attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rights set out overleaf. SCHEDULE Date of application:				
The Council, in pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Acts and Orders made hereunder, hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted. Your attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rights set out overleaf. SCHEDULE Date of application:22nd., March.,1970 Plans submitted: Reg. No3670				
hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in the undermentioned Schedule as shown on the plans submitted. Your attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rights set out overleaf. SCHEDULE Date of application: Plans submitted: Reg. No. 22nd		REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO DEVELOP	• • · · ·	
SCHEDULE Date of application: 22ndMarsh.1970 Plans submitted: Reg.No. 6670 Your No. Development: Screetion of a studio/living room extension at roof level at No.21, Alma Street,N.W.5. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not somply with the Council's daylighting standards as far as they affect the street. 2. It is considered that the extension in its present form would speil the architectural composed within a manaeri roof. FURTHER INFORMATION. The Council would is enclosed within a manaeri roof. Yours faithfully. Planning Officer		hereby refuses to permit the development referred to in th		
Date of application: 22ndMarch.,1970		Your attention is drawn to the Statement of Applicant's Rig	hts set out overleaf.	
Plans submitted: Reg. No. Your No. Development: Erection of a studio/living room extension at roof level at No.21, Alma Street,N.W.5. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's daylighting standards as far as they affect the street. 2. It is considered that the extension in its present form would spell the architectural composition of the terrace which is of well-defined proportions. FURTHER INFORMATION. The Council would be prepared to consider favourably a revised scheme for an extension which is enclosed within a mensard roof. Your No. Planning Officer		SCHEDULE		
Plans submitted: Reg. No. Your No. Development: Erection of a studio/living room extension at roof level at No.21, Alma Street,N.W.5. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's daylighting standards as far as they affect the street. 2. It is considered that the extension in its present form would spell the architectural composition of the terrace which is of well-defined proportions. FURTHER INFORMATION. The Council would be prepared to consider favourably a revised scheme for an extension which is enclosed within a mensard roof. Your No. Planning Officer		Date of application:		
Development: Erection of a studic/living room extension at roof level at No.21, Alma Street,N.W.5. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's daylighting standards as far as they affect the street. 2. It is considered that the extension in its present form would speil the architectural composition of the terrace which is of well-defined proportions. <u>FURTHER INFORMATION.</u> The Council would be prepared to consider favourably a revised scheme for an extension which is enclosed within a mensard roof. Yours faithfully. Planning Officer		Plans submitted: Reg. No.	Your No.	
Alma Street,N.W.5. Reasons for refusal 1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's daylighting standards as far as they affect the street. 2. It is considered that the extension in its present form would speil the architectural composition of the terrace which is of well-defined proportions. <u>FURTHER INFORMATION</u> . The Council would be prepared to consider favourably a revised scheme for an extension which is enclosed within a mensard roof. Yours faithfully. Planning Officer				
1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's daylighting standards as far as they affect the street. 2. It is considered that the extension in its present form would speil the architectural composition of the terrace which is of well-defined proportions. FURTHER INFORMATION. The Council would be prepared to consider favourably a revised scheme for an extension which is enclosed within a manaard roof. Yours faithfully, Planning Officer			at roof level at No.21,	
1. The proposed extension would not comply with the Council's daylighting standards as far as they affect the street. 2. It is considered that the extension in its present form would speil the architectural composition of the terrace which is of well-defined proportions. FURTHER INFORMATION. The Council would be prepared to consider favourably a revised scheme for an extension which is enclosed within a manaard roof. Yours faithfully, Planning Officer				
standards as far as they affect the street. 2. It is considered that the extension in its present form would speil the architectural composition of the terrace which is of well-defined proportions. FURTHER INFORMATION. The Council would be prepared to consider favourably a revised scheme for an extension which is enclosed within a manaard roof. Yours faithfully. Planning Officer All correspondence to be addressed to the Planning Officer		Reasons for refusal		
2. It is considered that the extension in its present form would speil the architectural composition of the terrace which is of well-defined proportions. FURTHER INFORMATION. The Council would be prepared to consider favourably a revised scheme for an extension which is enclosed within a manaard roof. Yours faithfully, Planning Officer All correspondence to be addressed to the Planning Officer				
The Council would be prepared to consider favourably a revised scheme for an extension which is enclosed within a mansard roof. Yours faithfully, Planning Officer All correspondence to be addressed to the Planning Officer B 7				
Planning Officer All correspondence to be addressed		The Council would be prepared to consider f		
Planning Officer B.		Yours faithfully,		
Planning Officer		Blanning Officer	All correspondence to be addressed	
			•	
