

simon, jonathon

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 June 2026 10:05
To: simon, jonathon
Subject: Fwd: Urgent MC/26/0385

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Sent via BT Email App

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 1 June 2026 10:03:04 BST
To: planning.representations@medway.gov.uk
Cc: teresa.murray@medway.gov.uk
Subject: Fwd: Urgent MC/26/0385

I have tried to send this to Jonathon.simon@medway.gov.uk but bounced back .

Sent via BT Email App

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 1 June 2026 09:52:38 BST
To: jonathan.simon@medway.gov.uk
Subject: Urgent MC/26/0385

Good morning.

I am emailing as I cannot add to my objection on the portal and have been told by Teresa Murray that this planning application is being considered at the full planning committee meeting on the 3rd of June .

My neighbours have informed me that there has been another alteration to the application for MC/26/0385 which has been made to the plans . I believe this has been done in response to the online objections with regards the parking. I do not believe that this will be used as a viable alternative to the parking at the front of the property due to it's location and ability to gain access. I would also like to point out that this application is for two self contained flats , the plans show one kitchen for the whole building so this is not two self contained flats unless one lives on takeaway meals and washes up in the bathroom. This is an application for an HMO (house of multiple occupancy) not two separate flats . Howard ave is a road of family houses and bungalows not HMO accommodation.

Please add my objections to the application for discussion by the planning committee to be considered. The late revised plans have caught local residents out who had already submitted objectives on the portal on the now superceded plan .

Gary Rigden
76 Howard Avenue

Rochester
Kent
ME1 2AN

Sent via BT Email App

simon, jonathon

From: Julia Knight [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 May 2026 13:49
To: simon, jonathon
Cc: Councillor Teresa Murray; representations, planning
Subject: MC/26/0385

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Dear Jonathon,

I have been told by a neighbour who was looking at the above planning application that the application has again been altered to show an area of hard-standing at the rear of the property instead of side on at the front of the property as previously shown. None of us who live in the surrounding properties were informed of the change. To park at the back of the property the occupant of the flats will have to negotiate the un-made up track which runs steeply down the side of the property and turn sharply on to the hard standing. The previous owners of the bungalow had to install metal protective barriers at the top and bottom of the track because of repeated damage to their garden wall and fence.

The difficulty of the access will mean that there will be a need for more vehicles to park on Howard Avenue, which is already a problem for residents. It seems the developer has 'tweaked' the plans again in an effort to have them accepted.

The proposed building will loom over the rear of the bungalows on Delce Road, being considerably larger than the surrounding properties and because of its position higher up the hill. I hope the Committee understand that we are not just being awkward, but are genuinely concerned about the problems with access and parking, and the change from a family dwelling into flats, which will not be in keeping with the area and local community. Thank you for your consideration,

Yours sincerely, Julia Knight. (37, Delce Road.)

simon, jonathon

From: Judy Woodall [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 May 2026 18:18
To: simon, jonathon
Subject: RE Mc/26/0385

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

I am writing as it seems this case for 98 Howard Avenue cannot be accessed via the on line system.

I understand from a neighbour that the planning application has been changed. I had previously objected and should have been informed directly by the council planning department of the change.

I would again object to the application to triple the living space of this small bungalow. The proposed building would be totally out of keeping with neighbouring properties and would overlook my property resulting in a loss of privacy.

Further the only access is down an unmade, unadopted track which cannot accommodate lorries that would be needed to get materials to the site.

For these reasons I object to the application.

Judith Woodall

simon, jonathon

From: thelma donnelly [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 June 2026 08:08
To: simon, jonathon; membersplanningenq
Subject: Fwd: Comment on request for alterations to 98 Howard Avenue to become 2 flats with parking spaces via hazardous unadopted road, and accommodating 2 families (Mc/26/0385... ?)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, 3 Jun 2026 at 08:00
Subject: Comment on request for alterations to 98 Howard Avenue to become 2 flats with parking spaces via hazardous unadopted road, and accommodating 2 families (Mc/26/0385... ?)
Cc: <jonathon.simon@medway.gov.uk> [REDACTED]
<planning.representations@medway.gov.uk>

Please see below sent today:

Good morning Councillor Murray

I am sending my comments and concerns to you as I seem to have no other viable access for the communication of my objection to the above ongoing planning application.

When the very first proposal was published I entered my objection via the portal but when I reviewed the site at a later date to check any decisions/updates my letter was nowhere to be found. Please see a copy of it below.

I have found this whole process very frustrating apart from the initial proposal itself. It feels as if the council are keen for objectors to not have a voice - apart from the first notice at the very beginning we have not been furnished with any other information as to the changes and developments as time has gone on, and we have had to rely on the goodwill of neighbours to know anything.

Now we learn that the development officer himself is in favour of pushing this through - why - what gain is it to the council causing even more congestion and lack of road safety to a very dangerous area for residents. The decisions councils make are so important for residents who have lived in an area for most of their lives.

When my husband and I first moved to City Way we, along with our neighbours, had numerous parked cars written off (4 cars for us alone) because of the dangerous junction at Howard Avenue/City Way junction.

Once the council understood the dangers the thoughtful change to parking/yellow lines means that in the recent years I have not witnessed accidents nor been involved with my stationary parked cars being written off. Thank you.

The council has a huge responsibility towards its loyal residents and I would like to feel that the councillors in this area will fight for decent consideration towards the people who are long standing supportive residents. We deserve a safe environment for our families and increasing the inevitable number of people and vehicles on one residential plot will add to a worrying scenario.

Thank you for your consideration

Regards

Thelma Donnelly

56 City Way (backs onto plot in question)

My first objection letter below: (submitted through the very questionable 'portal' - which is one of the most frustrating barriers ever encountered!)

Comments for Planning Application MC/25/2093

Application Summary

Application Number: MC/25/2093

Address: 98 Howard Avenue Rochester Medway ME1 2AN

Proposal: Prior approval for the enlargement of a dwelling by construction of additional storeys,

The maximum height proposed is 8.3m

Case Officer: Jonathon Simon

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Thelma Donnelly

Address: 56 City Way, Rochester ME1 2AB

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:wish to object to the application at 98 Howard Avenue, ME1 2AN.

The property is at the end of an unadopted access road that joins Howard Avenue on a sharp right-angle bend. The junction already poses serious visibility and manoeuvring problems.

Vehicles (including large white vans) frequently drive over my concrete slope to negotiate the bend - the unadopted road surface is very uneven and unstable. I do not object to neighbours using the slope, but the limited width and drop on the opposite side (into the front garden of 98 Howard) make this area unsafe for increased traffic.

Vehicles often edge very close in to the slope fearful of a risk of slipping or damage to their own vehicles.

Howard Avenue and the adjoining access road are already heavily congested with parked cars and vans serving nearby dwellings on both sides of HA. **Extra vehicles would obstruct access for**

residents, emergency, and service vehicles.

At 8.3 m high, the proposed extension would be out of scale with the surrounding bungalows and alter the established character of the area. The height also raises concern that it could effectively create three storeys, inconsistent with neighbouring properties and potentially leading to overdevelopment or future use as a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).

For reasons of highway safety, traffic impact, and scale, I respectfully request that the application be refused or amended to protect the safety and character of the area.