

5. Additional Late Comments

From reading the planning officers report prepared for the 22 January Plans Panel West meeting ...

The Roof is Much Higher than Stated

- Ridge 1.1m higher than the pub (**0.7m worse than stated**)
- Eaves 0.1m higher than the pub (**0.4m worse than stated**)
- Ridge only 0.2m below Somerville Terrace (**0.7m worse**)
- Eaves only 1.1m lower than Somerville Terrace (**0.6m worse**)
- **Yet more substantial errors relating to the roof!**

Page 61 of the planning offices report reproduces a previously unseen table of roof heights and levels prepared by the applicant. By scaling off the applicants elevations it can readily be demonstrated that many of the figures tabulated in the report are significantly wrong.

Compared to existing roofs, the new development will be **much higher** than stated in the report.

Because the report only gives a level for one of the ridges on the proposed roof the figures quoted above can only be approximate. See page 6 for further details.

The Report is Biased

Neither the tone nor the content of the planning officers report suggest the degree of impartiality expected. For example:

- Does not address identified errors and discrepancies

(1) That identified in the first paragraph of section (b) on page 1 of this document and illustrated on page 2 (was explicitly included and illustrated in formal comments against the original application).

(2) That identified in the next paragraph on page 1 (should perhaps have been recognised).

(3) The very substantial errors identified above (which were reproduced unquestioningly).

These errors and discrepancies would have been made explicit if definitive roof and eaves levels had been request from the applicant (as requested in formal comments).

- Fails to make the less favourable height comparisons

For example with nearer dwellings, such as Soning and Hollycroft, who's ridges are respectively ~6.6m below and ~7.4m below the highest ridge. Similarly, a table compares the percentage footprint of the proposed development with high density Victorian terraces but omits less favourable comparisons with nearer dwellings on the opposite side of East Busk Lane and to the south east.

- Refers to ongoing engagement with the applicant

There has been no reciprocal engagement with the objectors.

- Ignores evidence submitted by objectors about the pub's viability

Yet it was announced at the previous PPW meeting that the applicant had presented an (unpublished) report about the poor viability of the pub.

Other examples of bias include:

- Much make of the voluntary **community consultation** and the resulting changes (the reality was more a public relations exercise and did not result in any substantial changes).

**STOP
PRESS!**

- Fails to commission a report from **LCC Conservation Offices** (about major changes to a building that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Otley conservation area).
- Makes questionable judgements on **planning policy** e.g. the loss of a community pub not considered a loss of amenity (GP5), building on a large well kept beer garden judged to preserve or enhance the character the area (N19), loss of trees not resisted (N20).
- Makes questionable judgements in the **appraisal** e.g. loss of a community pub will not result in undue harm to the locality (the only pub serving the eastern side of Otley), the loss of a pub within an urban setting is difficult to resist (Bradford Council and the Wheatley pub).
- Acknowledges the **historic importance** of the Summercross (yet recommends undermining this), suggests that the change of use of the land will preserve the character or appearance of the **Otley conservation area** (yet admits on page 61 that it will appear as one of the dominant forms of development in the locality).

6. Further details of the Roof height errors

Very substantial errors and highly misleading aspects of the applicant's drawings have already been identified on pages 1 and 2 of this document. However page 61 of the planning offices report reproduces a previously unseen table of heights and levels (prepared by the applicant) comparing the western aspect of the main three story block with local terraces.

The publically available drawings give no roof levels for the proposed drawing (this in itself is a major concern). Thus we have checked the tabulated figures against levels obtained by simply scaling off the 1:100 elevation drawings from the floor levels (which are specified and shown by a horizontal line). Illustrated on page 3, these estimated levels are key to understanding the complex roof with many areas of flat roof. The estimated levels are not accurate but they should be correct to within 0.2m.

The comparison shows some disturbing **discrepancies** (very much bigger than can be attributed to scaling of the drawings) in the right hand column:

Western Elevation	Value Tabulated in Report	Estimated values for three story extension		Difference (m)
		Sunken Part	Not Sunken	
Ground level	55.450			
Eaves level (page 3)	62.110	59.2	62.0	-2.9 =
Ridge level (page 3)	65.860	63.1→65.8→66.4	65.8→66.4	-2.7 = +0.6
Ground to eaves height	6.360	3.75	6.5	-2.2 =
Eaves to ridge height	3.750	3.9→6.6→7.2	3.8	= +2.8 +3.4
Ground to ridge height	10.110	7.60→10.3→11.0	10.3	-2.7 = +0.7

Thus, for example, the largest ridge to eaves height is ~3.4m more than tabulated while the highest ridge is ~0.7m higher than tabulated. Consequentially the critical comparative heights lines that appear at the end of the table in the report are completely wrong, for example:

- The highest ridge is ~1.1m higher than the pub (~0.7m worse than tabulated) and only ~0.2m below Somerville Terrace (~0.7m worse than tabulated).
- The highest facing eaves is ~0.1m higher than the pub (~0.4m worse than tabulated) and only ~1.1m lower than Somerville Terrace (~0.6m worse than tabulated).

These are further very substantial errors in the application and in the predictions of its consequences. Full disclosure of the proposed roof levels may reveal still more errors!