

On 12/02/2019 21:26, HCS Chairman wrote:

Dear Paul,

Thank you for taking the time to reply.

The [report pack](#) documented and circulated before the DMC meeting of 24/1/2019 was factually incorrect and did not 'fully appraise' the members of the DMC of the objections supported by the HCS deputation. You will note that while the report is dated January 15th, by January 2nd there were already 40 objections on file rather than the 34 noted in the report pack.

Given this discrepancy, I would have expected the public meeting to have been given an update as part of the introduction to the agenda item as indeed happened when the same application was considered and rejected at October's DMC meeting.

Please can you explain why this did not happen at the January DMC meeting and what action you will take at future public meetings to ensure that all present are 'fully appraised' of the current responses?

Kind regards,

On 09/02/2019 23:59, Buckley, Paul wrote:

Dear Mr Comlay

I apologise for the delay in responding to your comments, but I have been very busy over the last week.

The details and a summary of all the comments for and against were provided in the Planning Officers report, with responses as appropriate. I expect the members of DMC to have read the report fully before the meeting and visit the planning portal if required for more detail. I believe we were all fully appraised of the objections which were supported by your deputation.

The rules of debate and entitlement to address the committee are set out in the Constitution. The facility to allow questions to deputies to clarify points has been added this year.

The members of the committee are required to listen to and read all the information provided and then to assess whether the recommendation is sound. They do not have to speak in the debate if they do not wish to or have no new comment to contribute. Provided they do this they are perfectly entitled to vote. As long as they understand clearly the recommendation and proposal then they should not abstain.

I appreciate that you are not happy with the outcome but the DMC has made a decision based on material planning considerations and the meeting was procedurally sound. I am sorry that you are disappointed.

Kind regards

Paul

Councillor Paul Buckley  
Chairman of DMC  
02392 266418

Sent from my iPad

On 8 Feb 2019, at 22:02, HCS Chairman wrote:

Dear Michael,

I assume that Cllr. Buckley is either indisposed or perhaps on holiday since I've not yet received a response to either of the notes below. As a result, I would be grateful if you could forward this to somebody who can respond with authority regarding Development Management Committee procedures.

To simplify the question, when there are a significant number of objections raised within the consultation period, should it not be standard procedure for this fact to be brought to the attention of the DMC and made public at the meeting before any discussion or debate?

At the DMC referred to in the subject line, at which you yourself were present, the point was completely ignored.

I would be grateful for a response to this note.

Kind regards,

Bob Comlay  
Chairman, [Havant Civic Society](#)

----- Forwarded Message -----

**Subject:**Fwd: DMC Meeting procedure - APP/18/01234, 24/1/2019

**Date:**Fri, 1 Feb 2019 10:50:20 +0000

**From:**HCS Chairman

**To:**[paul.buckley@havant.gov.uk](mailto:paul.buckley@havant.gov.uk)

**CC:**[tim.pike@havant.gov.uk](mailto:tim.pike@havant.gov.uk) <[tim.pike@havant.gov.uk](mailto:tim.pike@havant.gov.uk)>, [michael.wilson@havant.gov.uk](mailto:michael.wilson@havant.gov.uk)

Paul,

I'd be grateful for your response to this note from last Friday.

Kind regards,

Bob Comlay

----- Forwarded Message -----

**Subject:**DMC Meeting procedure - APP/18/01234, 24/1/2019

**Date:**Fri, 25 Jan 2019 10:48:33 +0000

**From:**HCS Chairman

**To:**[paul.buckley@havant.gov.uk](mailto:paul.buckley@havant.gov.uk)

**CC:**[tim.pike@havant.gov.uk](mailto:tim.pike@havant.gov.uk) <[tim.pike@havant.gov.uk](mailto:tim.pike@havant.gov.uk)>, [michael.wilson@havant.gov.uk](mailto:michael.wilson@havant.gov.uk)

Paul,

At last night's DMC meeting, in the introduction to the first item on Domino's at 39 West Street there was no mention of 'Comments received'. Given that there were 40 comments recorded as 'Objecting' to the application with only 4 comments recorded as 'Supporting' the application, I am surprised that this was not considered significant enough to mention, particularly given the timing of the re-submission of this application over the Christmas and New Year period. Of the 40 Objections, I also noted that 37 were recorded under 'Public Comments' with 3 seemingly mis-filed under 'Documents' on the planning public access portal.

To residents and council tax payers, one of the most frustrating aspects of 'the planning process' is the strict exclusion of deputies from active engagement with the questioning and the debate. This is particularly frustrating when, as was the case last night, two members of the committee play absolutely no visible or audible role in the process and yet still vote. Where members show no active interest in the application under review, the public could be forgiven for assuming that they should abstain from voting.

I would welcome your comments on these points.

Kind regards,

Bob Comlay

Chairman,  
[Havant Civic Society](#)