

**Reference number: 14/506738**

A letter of objection was received from Bearsted & Thurnham Society. The letter was sent by email on 2 November 2016 to the case officer but was not sent to the planning comments in box. Unfortunately this resulted in the letter not being uploaded to the electronic application and the comments have not been included in the officer's report.

The comments (submitted within time) raised the following issues:

- Expressed disappointment over the previous decision to grant planning permission subject to conditions and S106 agreement;
- Confirmed that objections have been made regarding the LB application;
- MBC should not be granting 'reserved matters' for the demolition of the wall when planning permission has not been issued for the 100 houses;
- the Society objects strongly to planning approval being granted for the widened access and the demolition and relocation of the boundary wall because these works will create substantial demonstrable harm to:

'1. the setting of Barty House because:

(i) the relocated wall will inevitably be of a 'new' reconstructed appearance; be lower in height than the existing historic wall; will introduce alien pedestrian steps which will destroy the integrity of the wall; and, most importantly, will substantially reduce the lawn and tree planting area to the front of Barty House which are so important to maintaining its historic setting and appearance; and

(ii) the widened access will introduce more hard surfacing and open areas that will reduce the sense of enclosure around Barty House which are also so important to maintaining its historic setting and appearance;

2. the local historic street scene because both the widened access and the relocated boundary wall will lessen the sense of enclosure along the street scene and harm the setting of Barty House in a very attractive and historic approach road into Bearsted village.

In addition, we should like to point out again that the application for Listed Building Consent should be determined solely on its architectural and historical merits. Therefore, the argument put forward by the applicants that there are 'public benefits' flowing from the proposal because the realigned wall will enable access to be provided to another proposal to build 100 houses at Barty Farm is irrelevant and cannot be taken into account. '

If the LB Consent is refused, so should the outline application be and an alternative means of access sought. If the LB is approved there needs to be clear justification why when previous applications have been refused.

Officer Comments

The report is providing Members with an update to material changes since the resolution was taken in April 2016 to grant planning permission subject to conditions and a legal agreement. As the decision was never issued, the reconsultation provided an opportunity to comment on the proposed material changes set out in the committee report. I am satisfied that the comments raised in the Bearsted & Thurnham Society representation have been addressed.

**RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED**