

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

The documentation supplied, with the application, contains a number of significant errors, which I have identified, as a lay person. I am sure there are more, but I have focussed only on the obvious ones to the issues relating to the location of my property to Plots 69 and 70.

Some of the errors I have identified in the documents on the Planning website are as follows:

A. Planning Application Form

The Planning Application Form is for two houses to be built, Plots 69 and 70. There is no mention of retrospective planning permission or a change of roof design. It is confusing and infers the construction of two new house, Plots 69 and 70. Do we assume the existing houses are to be demolished and new homes constructed. If this is the case they may then meet the Medway Planning Guidelines. I believe the existing properties do not.

Two houses (Plots 69 and 70) do already exist and if they are not to be replaced when the application is discussed The Drawing mentioned below shows a distance of 20m, from our boundary to Plots 69 and 70. In fact these houses have already been built and are 10m from our boundary.

We believe the distance should be 20m, which would then meet the Medway Planning Guidelines as the FRONT of our bungalow (as agreed by Mr. D. Harris (Head of Planning) faces the development. In fact it is 10m, which we believe is WRONG. Consequently the planning application should be rejected.

I would like the issue of distance from our property to be seriously considered as part of the Planning process and application.

Is it a coincidence these latest plans show 20m, where in fact they are built 10m from our boundary and should not have been permitted to be built so close to our home in the first place?

B. Drawing No.: 301

Revision:	P1
Dated:	24th March 2020
Title:	Site Plan - Plots 69 and 70

Sample Errors:

- The whole document DOES NOT reflect the site alongside the boundary to my property at 21 Finwell Road, Rainham and the actual reality of what had previously been published and made available to local residents and Planning Committee. It is wrong and should not be allowed as it DOES NOT reflect what has actually been built.
- The distance between Plots 69 and 70 are shown as being 20m away from my boundary (21 Finwell Road). In fact it is 10m. The scale is WRONG. We have printed and measured the details and verified our findings..
- The Car Park alongside Plots 69/70 is shown as the original design whereas the actual construction is totally different. Mr Harouni is aware of this.
- The boundary fence alongside our property DOES NOT reflect the current situation and legal changes due to a Party Wall Act Agreement between the developer and ourselves.
- These are the obvious errors to me.
- These errors need to checked and verified and the whole document verified.

Objection 6

1st May 2020

I am sure there are other errors. Hence the need for these documents to be checked before they are added to the Medway Planning website and made available for discussion or decision. Hence due to these errors the application should be **REJECTED**, until correct documentation is made available to the public and the Planning Committee.

The main objection is that incorrect information has been supplied and accepted by Medway Planning Department. In our professional experience this would never have been acceptable and something like this should have been rejected and subsequently corrected prior to any publication, formal decision or recommendation being made.

I wonder if this has happened in the past and in other applications being considered.

What makes this issue worse is that the documents have been accepted and published knowing they contain errors. I personally find this totally unprofessional.

Is this the normal situation where incorrect documentation is acceptable and published and can it be assumed it has occurred in the past and may be permitted for any future developments?

Truly worrying.

Ivor Francis

21 Finwell Road
Rainham
Kent
ME87PZ