

**CIRCULATED AT  
THE MEETING**



**REPORT of  
DIRECTOR OF STRATEGY, PERFORMANCE AND GOVERNANCE**

---

to  
**SOUTH EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE  
21 MAY 2019**

**MEMBERS' UPDATE**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 8**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>FUL/MAL/19/00224</b>
<b>Location</b>	Land Rear of 32 Steeple Road Mayland
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of 2No. bungalows, attached garages and erection of workshop (B1)
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr Penny – Penny Homes Ltd.
<b>Agent</b>	Mr M Jackson – Mark Jackson Planning
<b>Target Decision Date</b>	24.05.2019
<b>Case Officer</b>	Devan Lawson
<b>Parish</b>	<b>MAYLAND</b>
<b>Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council</b>	Member Call in: Cllr Helm Reason: Public Interest

**3.1 Proposal / brief overview, including any relevant background information**

3.1.6 Paragraph 3.1.6 of the Officer's report reads:

*'It is noted that the application plans show that the proposed dwellings will have three bedrooms. However, given the provision of a study it is considered that there is potential for four bedrooms to be provided'*

3.1.7 The applicant has submitted a revised plan (18.650 03 Rev A) which omits the study/fourth bedroom from the proposal. Therefore, it is now considered that the proposal is for three bedroom properties. It is not considered that this represents a material change to the scheme which would require re-consultation and therefore, the revised plan has been accepted.

**5.5 Access, Parking and Highway Safety**

Paragraphs 5.5.4 and 5.5.5 discuss the level of car parking provision at the site. As the proposed bungalows would now have three bedrooms, opposed to four, the vehicle parking requirement is reduced to two parking spaces per dwelling. Given that the two parking bays meet the required standards it is considered that the proposal would now provide the minimum level of vehicle parking spaces. It is therefore, considered that the second reason for refusal falls away.

**7. CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

## 7.1 Representations received from Parish/ Town Councils

7.1.2 Mayland Parish Council provide a further consultation response following a period of re-consultation relating to amendments to the scheme including the clarification of the use of the workshop building and changes to the site area. The comments provided by the Parish Council do not differ from their original comments, but for the sake of clarity they are provided below:

Name of Parish / Town Council	Comment	Officer Response
Mayland Parish Council	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Backland Development</li> <li>- Outside the settlement boundary</li> <li>- Intrusion on neighbouring properties</li> <li>- Long history of refusal for similar developments at the site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- These points are addressed at sections 5.1 and 5.3 of the Officer's report.</li> <li>- Addressed at section 5.4 of the Officer's report.</li> <li>- This is noted and whilst it is considered that previous concerns in relation to the loss of employment have been overcome, the proposal still represents unjustified and unacceptable urban sprawl into the countryside.</li> </ul>

## 7.4 Representations received from Interested Parties

7.4.1 A further letter of objection has been received from a member of the public who has previously provided a letter of objection on the application. Therefore, **9** letters have been received **objecting** to the application from **five different persons**. New points raised are outlined in the table below:

Objection Comment	Officer Response
The submitted diagram of the driveway has outlined the boundary of Plovers incorrectly according to its house deeds. The proposed plans will intrude onto the front lawn of Plovers which is not allowed. The post to the left of the garden sands within Plovers boundary and will not be removed.	The applicant has been contacted and has advised that they consider the correct notices have been served. However, land ownership is a civil matter and cannot be dealt with via the planning system.

Objectors have been to see their local MP, Mr John Whittingdale to follow up on previous noise complaints and hours of work at the site.

This is not a matter which relates to this application.