

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 19/01/2026 5:08 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Millers Farm Gravesend Road Fairseat Sevenoaks Kent
Proposal:	Extension of existing traveller site to provide 6 additional mobile home units.
Case Officer:	Ms Amanda Cue

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Gravesend Rd, Fairseat Sevenoaks

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing in relation to the planning history at Millers Farm, Gravesend Road, Fairseat, and in particular the planning permission granted in 2017 (Application 20171128) for the continued use of the land as three pitches accommodating a limited number of caravans, subject to a number of clear and restrictive conditions.

At the outset, I wish to make clear that we are not habitual objectors, nor have we historically sought to challenge the lawful use of the site. The 2017 permission [REDACTED] and we accepted that, as a form of residential use, it was likely the most appropriate and least disruptive outcome for that part of the holding. Provided that no further development occurred and the agreed limitations were respected, we were content to maintain the status quo.

However, our understanding is that several of the key assurances and conditions which underpinned the 2017 consent have, over time, become blurred and, in some cases, appear no longer to be being observed. These include, but may not be limited to, the following:

- Number and type of units

The 2017 permission limited the site to a maximum of three static caravans and two touring caravans. While the presence of a single touring unit would fall within that allowance, there now appears to be a fourth static caravan positioned immediately adjacent to the original 2017 site, in a location that corresponds precisely with the first new structure shown on the Proposed Block Plan (Drawing No. 003, dated 04/11/2025). There are indications that this unit is in residential use, including gas canisters plumbed into the structure.

- Accuracy of the current application

The current planning application states that no work or change of use has already started. Given the presence and apparent occupation of the additional static caravan described above, we respectfully question whether this declaration accurately reflects the situation on the ground.

- Visibility from public land

The application also states that the site cannot be seen from a public road, footpath, bridleway or other public land. In practice, the site is visible from a public footpath crossing nearby land, and this visibility appears to have increased as development and activity have intensified.

- Bonfires and burning

The 2017 permission expressly prohibited bonfires or incineration. Fires have nevertheless been made on the land. On a number of occasions, the smoke and fumes arising from these fires have been such that it has become difficult to remain in the [REDACTED] materially affecting our ability to use nearby spaces. While we are not in a position to determine precisely what materials may have been burned, the nature and persistence of the fumes have caused concern from an amenity and health perspective and are inconsistent with the clear restriction imposed by the 2017 permission.

- External lighting

The consent required that no external lighting be installed or operated unless first approved in writing. Permanent external lighting is now present and used at night, materially altering the character of what was intended to remain a low-key rural site and bat habitat.

- Parking, turning and hardstanding

The approved scheme required a defined parking and turning area within the consented site boundary. In practice, the turning area appears to extend beyond the approved footprint and onto open land. In addition, a new area of tarmac hardstanding, approximately 10 metres by 6 metres in extent, has been laid beyond the confines of the originally approved site area shown on the 2017 plans.

- Additional storage, structures and enclosure

The Existing and Proposed Block Plans (Drawing No. 002 and Drawing No. 003, dated 04/11/2025) both label an "existing 1.8 m close-boarded fence" along parts of the site boundary. Our understanding is that this fencing was not part of the original 2017 approval and that significant sections have been erected relatively recently. Given the conditions attached to the 2017 permission restricting the erection of fences or other means of enclosure without prior approval, it is unclear on what basis this fencing has been installed or is now being treated as an established feature.

- Boundary treatment and landscaping

The 2017 approval relied upon boundary treatments and native species planting to soften visual impact. It is apparent the planting has not been implemented or maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Individually, some of these matters might be seen as incremental. Taken together, however, they represent a material departure from the tightly controlled arrangement that justified the 2017 permission, particularly given the site's Green Belt context.

Our concern is heightened by the current planning application (20251267), which proposes a substantial intensification of use and would introduce residential accommodation [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The resulting change in proximity, activity, and intensity would be significant and would materially alter the character of this boundary area compared with the existing arrangement.

We wish to emphasise that our decision to raise these matters has not been taken lightly. There is a genuine concern that speaking up may expose us to prejudice or harm to our property, which is precisely why we have previously sought to live quietly alongside the existing arrangement. Nonetheless, the scale of the divergence from the 2017 permission, and the implications of the new proposal, leave us with little alternative but to place these observations formally on record.

We respectfully ask the Council to consider whether the conditions and concessions that formed the basis of the 2017 approval have been complied with, and to take this into account when assessing the current application. We do not seek confrontation, nor do we seek to undermine lawful planning, but we do believe that the integrity of the original permission, and the accuracy of the current application and accompanying plans, are central to any fair assessment of what is now being proposed.

Yours faithfully,

Kind regards