

Item 20, Page 128
MA/09/1906:

Address
HEATH VIEW, FARADAY ROAD,
PENENDEN HEATH, MAIDSTONE,
KENT, ME14 2DB

Representations

Three further letters of objection have been received, emphasising previous points already considered in the main committee report, as well as raising concerns over the re-consultation process.

Officer comments

To clarify for Members, this submission is a retrospective planning application for the erection of a summerhouse with decking and for the erection of trellis fencing along part of the western boundary of the site. The existing close boarded fencing along the western boundary is not part of this application and was on the approved plans under MA/02/2166.

The original submission was for the summerhouse only, but after the site visit the decking to the front of the summerhouse and the trellis fencing was noted. The applicant confirmed that he wanted these details to be dealt with under this application and so the description was changed and amended plans were submitted. For those neighbours that were originally consulted and for those who objected, re-consultation letters were sent out with the amended description on 11th January 2010. This letter gave 21 days for any further comments to be made. In addition, a new site notice was put up on the same day, with the amended description.

Although the plans do not show all existing buildings on the site, the proposed summerhouse, the decking and trellis fencing are accurately shown and the site was fully assessed.

The planning history for this site has already been listed in the main committee report. However, I would like to stress that MA/04/0140 was for the extension of the already approved dwelling and would include alterations to its roof (to be 9m in height), the erection of a double garage and for the change of access. This application was refused and subsequently dismissed on appeal on 10th January 2005. The reason for refusal was the roof design, particularly its scale and height and its impact upon the streetscene. I can draw no similarities between this application and what is being considered under MA/09/1906, in terms of its scale, design and location. As such, I believe that this modest out building, would not have a significantly harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the streetscene.

My recommendation remains unchanged