

## Planning Application 08/06122/FU (Summercross) Comments on late-submitted revised plans

This is an extract from hurried comments submitted to LCC on 11 January 2009:

“The comments below should be read in conjunction with my earlier comments submitted for the 11 December deadline:

- The revised drawings appear to have been received by LCC on 18 December, presumably after the applicant had sight of the comments received up to the original deadline. No formal notification of these revised plans has been received by myself or others who commented on the applications. Thus these late comments are hurried and only cover the most obvious aspects. This situation clearly favours the applicant, I must question if due process has been correctly followed in this respect.
  - Car parking spaces 5 and 17 have been deleted (the practical viability of both these spaces had been challenged in earlier comments). As commented previously, the original 20 spaces were grossly inadequate and would have resulted in parking and traffic chaos in the locality. Provision has now been reduced to 18 spaces.
  - The building footprint appears to be unchanged but in an attempt to reduce the mass of the building, a further lowering of roof appears to have taken place (still no roof levels are specified. Two second floor rooms (44 and 45) have been deleted as a result.
  - As represented on the drawings these changes appear to be quite extensive. However, closer inspection shows that overall effect on the mass and the skyline of the building is limited. This is because the roof features two ridges and, excluding the two story link-block to the existing pub building, it is only the eaves and the ridge on the west (park side) elevation that has been lowered.
  - By the simple device of omitting from the elevations things that will be visible, the revised drawings substantially miss-represented the effect of these changes on the park-side elevations. The same device was employed on the previous application drawings but the revised geometry makes the impact is significantly greater on the revised drawings. For example:
    - The **west elevation** does not show the second ridge (which is unchanged in height) to the main three story block. This will project substantially above the first ridge, extending from the chimney stack to the left and extend to the right, well past the second chimney stack, only starting to slope down at about where the tree is shown in the background. The skyline of the bulk of the development is unchanged!
- To omit part of the (foreground) building structure from the drawing and yet still draw a background feature (the tree) completely violates all normal rules of graphic projection. This suggests that the fidelity of all the application drawings should be questioned!
- Similarly the **north west** elevation completely omits the upper roof to the main three story block together with part of the supporting gable end wall which will be visible above the two story link block.
  - The **south east elevation** does not show either the projecting section of now intermediate level flat roof (to the main three story block) or the chimney stack at its left hand end that will be visible above the twin cable ends.