MULBERRY FARM, EAST STREET, HUNTON, MAIDESTONE, KENT

Reference number: MA/13/0255

A letter from a local resident has been received, objecting to the proposal. Their comments are summarised below:

- There is insufficient natural screening to the northern and eastern boundary of the site. The existing siting of caravans on the land impacts on my privacy. The addition of more mobile homes will compound this and also be visually unsightly from my property;
- The visual impact of the site will be increased. The existing caravans already effect the landscape of the designated Special Landscape Area;
- The site is already clearly from several public rights of way. The addition of more mobile homes will increase the site's visual impact;
- The noise generated by the current occupiers of the site is already noticeable. Any increase in caravans will invariably result in further noise and disturbance;
- There is clearly insufficient parking facilities on the site, to accommodate an increase of two more caravans/homes could in turn result in an increase of between 2 and 5 motor vehicles;
- Visibility for traffic approaching from the south side is poor and any increase in traffic movements would increase the potential for road accidents at the entrance to the application site;
- Consideration of this application should take into account what constitutes a mobile home. The building currently at the front of the site appears to be more like a bungalow;
- The additional two caravans would be contrary to the local planning authorities policies in respect of maintaining a feeling of openness and space around residential buildings in this area;
- The appeal decision APP/U2235/A/03/1131604 states that the previous application was for the housing of gypsy families, namely that they were persons of a nomadic habit of life. Evidence was put forward that the existing occupants of the site lead a nomadic way of live. There is no evidence that they have led a nomadic way of life before or after the appeal decision of August 2004. There is no reason to believe that the occupants of the additional mobile homes will be nomadic. This would be in contravention of the conditions imposed by the planning inspector;
- There is no justification for additional families to be located on the site to contribute towards agricultural work. There has been no harvesting of fruit before or after the appeal decision in 2004.

These issues are dealt with at length in the report.

My recommendation is unchanged.