

# Comments for Planning Application 23/01979/FUL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01979/FUL

Address: Corinthian Court Cross Street Shanklin Isle Of Wight PO37 6BU

Proposal: Proposed ramp and retention of white cladding to entrance porch

Case Officer: Victoria Taylor

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Jonathan Platt

Address: Barnsley House, Eddington Road, Nettlestone Seaview, Isle Of Wight PO34 5EB

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Again, reluctant to respond but, here goes (exacerbated)!

1. The law firm, instructed by the board to advise members, prepared detailed advice in writing and in person to the members at an AGM. Mr Harcourt did not attend but wants to engage in endless correspondence with said law firm on points that had been clarified beyond debate. The board (with the support of a majority of members) decided that we can't allow ONE member to engage in endless correspondence with that law firm because the cost of their provision of those legal services is paid for by ALL members. Mr Harcourt was told that if he simply undertook to pay the cost of his correspondence with said law firm, then I would instruct them to engage with him. He chose not to do so. He simply wants to argue about things he does not understand at significant cost to other members and, I think quite rightly, that is unreasonable.

2. The shortcomings in the 'historic' Fire Reports were not something I was aware of until I became the de facto managing agent for the building. Mr Harcourt was a director when these were delivered to the company and the then Managing Agents. The Fire Safety Inspection is required annually so when it came up for re-inspection, it was only then apparent to me that we had significant issues. I then looked through the mountain of paperwork I have for the company, going back some 30+ years, to find the old reports. I discovered that these failings were NOT new, they had been reported every year by Wight Fire for as many years as I have reports.

3. Mr Harcourt repeats the water 'cut off' allegation again but refuses to acknowledge that it was NOT cut off by me or my contractors. If he so alleges, let him say it clearly and unambiguously and we will ask a District Judge if that amounts to a defamatory statement. The common thread with Mr Harcourt is that he confuses correlation with causation. Just because some of these things

happened DURING the year long ground floor re-development, does not mean they were CAUSED by the re-development.

4. On the electricity Mr Harcourt now acknowledges that this was NOT cut off by me or my contractors, having insinuated otherwise in previous comments. He is silent on who specifically he accuses of being the cause of the interruption of supply? His statement that EVERY flat in Corinthian Court isn't wired for WightFibre broadband is utter nonsense. They certainly ARE and I can't be any clearer than that! The WightFibre website does inaccurately records that flats 1 - 9 are not yet connected, that is simply an error on their part. In early 2023 WightFibre contacted me, as Director of the company that owns the freehold, asking to wire the building, just as they have EVERY building on the Island. Not only did I agree to allow them permission to wire flats 1 - 9, I asked them to wire flats 10 - 13 before construction began on those units. We actually held up work on the ground floor to allow WightFibre time to install the cables to the upper floors. Mr Harcourt didn't think to double check with WightFibre by making a simple call to 01983 240240. I have done just that tonight. Their website will be updated imminently, it was simply an oversight!

5. 'Broadband being cut off' is another statement without meaning but let me clarify based on what I think Mr Harcourt is alleging. BT, many years ago, put a number of cables into this building and ran them through the ground floor in a way that made it difficult for us to redevelop our own property. There was no easement (legal permission) in our lease indicating that these cables were anywhere in our property. We knocked down a small section of wall and discovered these cables. I could have told BT to remove them. Instead, and within a few hours, they re-routed the cables in a way we could work around and for those few hours while that work was done (by BT and at their cost) a few residents lost broadband. Had I not allowed the re-routing, they would have been off for days or weeks.

6. Dilution: This is PERFECTLY legal if the shareholders vote for it, which they did. So it makes absolutely no difference whatsoever if Mr Harcourt is arguing about a dilution of his stake in the freehold (it wasn't) or a dilution of his share of the voting rights, it was done properly and legally and he would know that had he appeared at the meeting where this was explained. Most UK companies Articles and Memorandum of Association do not provide protection from dilution for a very good reason but if Mr Harcourt wants that explained (again) he should seek his own legal advice.

7. I did not attend meetings for the first 8 years I owned a flat in this building, Mr Harcourt is absolutely right on that point. That said, I would say that indicates that I was relaxed (too relaxed) about his stewardship of the building. I only got involved when I realised the danger we all as leaseholders were being put in by Mr Harcourt's actions. I'd prefer to have a VERY much lighter workload but the actions of Mr Harcourt forced my involvement.

I don't address ALL of Mr Harcourt's comments because:

a) I have absolutely no idea what I am supposed to say to some of the statements he makes such

as 'issues of financial statements'?

b) I have neither the time nor the inclination to educate a man determined to argue that black is white.

That said, if he makes a clear and unambiguous allegation (as opposed to insinuation) that I (or ANY of my contractors) are responsible for the utilities in this building being cut off at any time, he will get all the answers he requires before a District Judge (again).