

From: Murray, Vincent

Sent: 20 August 2009 18:18

To: McSevich, Erin

Subject: FW: 60 Charlotte St - additional/revised drawings requested

Attachments: 511-016 Elevations as proposed.pdf; 511-007b exterior feature - site plan + visual.pdf; 511-015 Elevations as existing.pdf; 511-005e exterior projecting feature - details.pdf

Dear Mr. Murray,

Please find attached additional / revised drawings as requested.

Thankyou for acknowledging the contents of my letter including confirming that the fee has in fact been received. It is very disappointing however that you have not offered to back-date the validation. Of your reasons for not validating, 1. no fee you have acknowledged was incorrect, 2. location plan change is a matter of interpretation and your interpretation is not the same as that used by some other boroughs and indeed by the planning inspectorate in at least some cases, 3. elevations – the part elevations initially submitted did not provide ability to scale height above street level. The latter point is acknowledged although it can be estimated to an order of magnitude from the visual supplied – ie. It is clearly more than 3m!

Nevertheless the point is valid but in view of the 21 days that it has taken to reach this point and the 2-3 hours within which it could be cleared up by a phone call, it would be reasonable to provide some assistance to the client in this application who will be in difficulty if the process will take 8 weeks from today. My understanding of the process is that had you judged the submission valid then it would have been backdated to the date of submission – please correct me if I am mistaken on that point. But if I am not then back-dating is possible and it would appear to be only your judgement that stands in the way of it. Which in light of the delay and the incorrectness of half of it could and should be applied with more 'benefit of the doubt'. I do not accept your assertion that it would be somehow contrary to statutory requirement to apply such discretion although as I requested in our telephone discussion, please forward the reference and text of the applicable statute if you are right. In my experience there are frequently additional elements of information requested by Officers in the course of an application and this could have been treated in that way. It seems to me that it would be entirely reasonable for the sake of efficiency at your end to be hard line if the judgement is returned in 6 days but to continue thus in the present circumstances seems to make no attempt to restore a situation which you acknowledge to have been handled badly. I would ask that you double check with Ms. Redfern and if necessary Ms. Stopard as to whether they would be able to find a way to restore the process somewhat toward where it would have been had it been processed in 6 days – ie. 7 days behind submission not 21.

Thankyou and regards,

Peter Fennell

GEBLER TOOTH ARCHITECTS

0208 600 2805

07899 865 444