

1. It is of concern that around 20 pages of material have been submitted, just before the 29 November deadline, in response to a one page Appeal lodged in May. This seems a questionable use of scarce resources by a public body with the statement submitted as late as possible to minimise opportunity for comment. Much is repetitive and unnecessary. Copious references to National and Local Planning Policies are largely irrelevant given the limited scope of the proposal.
2. The statement is replete with terms like historic character and significance. These cannot apply to the material aspects of the existing windows which were probably installed in the 1990's during flat conversion. There is no evidence of their provenance. What is important is that the **Appearance** and architectural features of the building be retained. The proposal fully responds to this.
3. Three precedents for replacement windows with double glazing were cited in the Appeal. In Planning History, (2.0), the statement lists 9 prior approvals, most of which involve window replacement with double glazing. Why then was the present proposal singled out for refusal? The Inspector may wish to note that, prior to refusal, the Appellant had lodged a complaint with the LPA regarding inaction on the adjacent Royal Shades.
4. The statement notes, (5.1), that no comments were received from 3rd parties during consideration of the planning application. Had any strong public objections existed, these would have arisen in response to public notices. Two representations supporting the Appeal have now been made. The first, from a Director of the Seafront Management Company, confirms support from all other flat owners at the Royal Apartments. The second is from the Chair of the Hayling Island Residents Association whose views must provide some measure of public opinion. Had it been possible to canvas wider public input, it is likely this would have been overwhelmingly in favour of the proposal. It is disturbing that the views of a few individuals in authority in the LPA can outweigh this.
5. The statement, (6.0), repeats advice from Historic England favouring repair rather than replacement. It is important to recognise that this is guidance, not law, most relevant when windows have a clear provenance and historic significance which is not the case here. Thermal efficiency, (6.11), is not the only reason for the proposal. Ventilation, Hygiene, and Functionality are also important.
6. While it is accepted, (7.4), that concern on the Royal Shades is not directly relevant to the Appeal, it is relevant to the performance, attitude and behaviour of the LPA. Inaction over many years has had a serious, adverse effect on the amenity of the area, (for which the LPA is responsible). This directly affects the setting of the Royal Apartments.
7. To state, (8.0), that the proposal would be harmful to the architectural and historic significance of the building for which there are no public benefits arising, is unreasonable and reflects very badly on the quality of decision making within the LPA. It is quite evident that the proposal would be beneficial, fully retaining architectural and historic features of the building while improving its appearance, public perception and environmental aspects. What is truly harmful and of serious concern is that the LPA adopts a posture which, if sustained, will lead to continued deterioration rather than conservation.
8. The statement argues, (7.6), that the proposal would result in a material alteration to appearance and Planning Permission would be required. The proposal would improve appearance and all architectural features would be preserved. The Planning Permission process would only result in wasteful duplication of what the Listed Building Consent process has already covered. If the Appeal is allowed, the LPA seeks to impose onerous conditions involving further reference to them. Given the long time that has elapsed since refusal of the proposal by the LPA, new quotations will be required for the work causing further inconvenience and expense for the Appellant. The Inspector is therefore invited to allow work to proceed without further reference to the LPA but conditional on replacement window design being retained.