

**Planning Application MC/20/0753
Plots 69 & 70 Bakersfield**

I wish to **OBJECT** to MC/20/0753 |(Construction of 2 two-storey three bed houses with associated parking, Plots 69 And 70 Bakersfield Land At Station Road Rainham Gillingham Medway ME8 7QZ ME8 7PZ) for the following reasons:

These comments are based upon documents on the Medway Planning Website on Sunday, 26th April 2020.

1. If this is a retrospective planning application as Plots 69 and 70 are virtually complete and work continued even after the visit to site by Mr. Harouni on 4 November 2019 where the WRONG design of the roofs was acknowledged by him. This was recognised after information was given to him by myself. He also became aware of the distance issue from our boundary to these properties.
2. I strongly object to this actual amendment to the original plans and the actual construction that has occurred. Hence my objections are most strongly made against Medway Council Planning Department agreeing to accept and seeing no fault in the developer submitting incorrect information with their application.
3. I find it objectionable that what should be legally binding documents with errors can be accepted by the Medway Planning Department. Mr. Harouni has informed me that this is an acceptable practice and that decisions can be made from documents which include incorrect information.
4. How can decisions and recommendations made to the Planning Committee be based upon wrong information and incorrect documentation submitted for a planning issue?
5. Surely for a professional organisation these documents should have been vetted and checked for accuracy prior to acceptance and publication to allow for decisions to be made and for the public to review and comment?
6. After discussing this with the Planning and Case Officer Mr. Harouni he was adamant that this is acceptable for errors to be allowed in these processes and it seems that they can be ignored.
How can this occur when the information is assessed by Mr. Harouni in the Medway Planning Department who I understand makes recommendations to the Planning committee for a decision to be made?
The information submitted should be correct, especially as I am sure some of the Planning Committee will not be fully up to date with this particular development.
7. The Planning Committee should be informed of any errors in the documentation to enable them to make a decision on whether the application should be approved or the documentation corrected prior to any decision.
8. As a lay person I have identified some of the errors, but I am sure this will not be all of them, which is why I suggest they should be checked by a Planning professional prior to any decision meeting.

It is worth noting here that the original understanding for this specific application to be submitted was to correct the drawings and approval for the roof design of Plots 69 and 70, which were not built as per the agreed plans. Mr. Harouni did say in an email to me the roofs are wrong and should be rebuilt. I quote from his email of the 23rd December 2019 to Martin Potter, our Local Councillor, copied to my wife:

“Please note that the applicant has been informed that the changes carried out to the roof design of plots 69-70, from pitched to butterfly is not acceptable and they have to rebuild the roof to the original design”.

I fully concur with Mr. Harouni’s statement and recommend that this application is **REJECTED**.

I am very concerned that this is allowed to happen, whilst publishing it on the Medway Planning website for public reference and for comment. Truly astonishing.

Ivor Francis
21 Finwell Road
Rainham
Kent
ME87PZ