

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 Ashley Harcourt

Address: Flat 1, Corinthian Court, Cross Street Shanklin, Isle Of Wight PO37 6BU

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The stated deadline for submitting comments on this Application was 03rd Jan.

Clearly there is little in the Applicants latest comments that are directly relevant to the Application itself but as I am being attacked in those comments then I exercise my right to reply.

Shares/Support - J Platt does indeed now hold 6 votes but only three Leases. Contrary to PreEmption rights he converted 1x £1.00 1x Vote Share he held into 4x £0.25 4x Vote Share whilst leaving every other Leaseholder with 1x £1.00 Share 1x vote each. This granting to himself an extra three votes has been very effective at meetings when voting on his own proposals to the disadvantage of other Leaseholders who each remained with 1x vote.

Regarding the support of 'a number of other Shareholders for this work', there are three and none reside at the property and none have submitted support to either Application.

Directorship/Duties - Indeed J Platt is the sole Director of the shared freehold Company and that is because the previous Board would not work with him and no other Shareholder chooses to be on the Board, not even amongst his aforementioned supporters, all showing a similar lack of interest that J Platt gave for some eight years of his holding of the Lease to flat 9.

The Fire Safety report J Platt has acted on is a recent one he commissioned which identified him personally as the 'responsible person'. Prior to that a report commissioned by our then Managing Agents was already being addressed when J Platt took over as Director, then all remedial work ceased.

Oddly enough nor is any mention made of repeated disregard for residents right to peaceful enjoyment of their properties. As a direct result of this ongoing development residents have had their electric cut off, access to car spaces cut off, water cut off and interfered with, broadband services cut off, television services cut off, fire escapes blocked, and pedestrian accesses cut off.

Directors do have responsibility and duty when it comes to self-interest and/or conflict of interest.

Temporary ramp - As for the now claimed 'temporary' ramp being built without applying for planning permission, well that seems a strange oversight from an experienced developer. Even more so to build one not within required specifications. One wonders why such a ramp was needed at all so was it perhaps only to facilitate off road parking for the in-situ mobility scooter and installed electric charging point, again not part of the Applicants demised premises or linked Application? Certainly one of the flats (#13, the one still NOT shown in its now substantially expanded form on the IWC Planning Portal re the Ground floor development '22/01920/FUL') is far from mobility impaired friendly, having many stepped levels within it.

I also note that on Rightmove that a car space is now being offered with flat 13. The Ground Floor property does not have vehicular rights to the car park, no Shareholders have been informed of (or voted for) this new space and it was stated very clearly on the Planning Application that no car spaces were being created/sought, hence no site survey for additional parking and associated impact on the public highway. Do we yet again have a substantial deviation from an approved Planning Application that the IWC will do nothing about?

Is it too much to ask for a statutory body to visit the projects they conditionally sanction, particularly when linked applications have flagged numerous issues?

Notice Board - Regarding the supposed notice being served, I never saw such a notice and clearly others have recorded here that they did not see one either. If we assume such a notice was created at all one would have to wonder as to the suitability of placing it on a floor that has no apartments and is far less used than the car park exit? Placing any Notice would require physically being in the building so why not simply put a copy through peoples now extensively worked doors, though only three out of the ten Leaseholders live in the building? Also it is interesting that no mention of this Notice was given at the Company's AGM the very next day after it was supposedly put on a notice board.

I also object most strongly to the clear inference that I removed the notice and this flies contrary to written assurances J Platt gave on 24th July 2023 that he would not make derogatory remarks about me.