



A meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE** will be held in **THE CIVIC SUITE (LANCASTER/STIRLING ROOMS), PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON, PE29 3TN** on **MONDAY, 20 APRIL 2026** at **7:00 PM** and you are requested to attend for the transaction of the following business:-

## **AGENDA**

**PLEASE NOTE THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA MAY CHANGE**

### **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

**1. MINUTES** (Pages 3 - 12)

To approve as correct records the Minutes of the meetings held on 16th and 23rd March 2026.

**2. MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

To receive from Members declarations as to disclosable pecuniary, other registerable and non-registerable interests in relation to any Agenda item. See Notes below.

**3. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT - DEFERRED ITEM - THE STUKELEYS - 01922/OUT** (Pages 13 - 150)

Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for site access for construction of Storage and Distribution (Use Class B8), General Employment (Use Class B2), Bus Depot (Sui Generis) floorspace with ancillary offices and gatehouses, provision of landscaping, access infrastructure (including new and improved vehicular access from the A141, highway, parking, cycle and pedestrian access), utilities (including gas, electricity, water, sewerage, telecommunications), sustainable drainage systems, and all associated engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and reuse of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works). The proposed development is phased with each phase being a separate and severable part of the development - Brookfield Farm, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley, Huntingdon, PE28 4AB.

### **LATE REPRESENTATIONS**

10 day of April 2026

**Michelle Sacks**

Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service

## **Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and other Registrable and Non-Registrable Interests**

Further information on [Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and other Registrable and Non-Registrable Interests is available in the Council's Constitution](#)

## **Filming, Photography and Recording at Council Meetings**

This meeting will be filmed for live and/or subsequent broadcast on the Council's YouTube site. The whole of the meeting will be filmed, except where there are confidential or exempt items. If you make a representation to the meeting you will be deemed to have consented to being filmed. By entering the meeting you are also consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes. If you have any queries regarding the streaming of Council meetings, please contact Democratic Services on 01480 388169.

The District Council also permits filming, recording and the taking of photographs at its meetings that are open to the public. Arrangements for these activities should operate in accordance with [guidelines](#) agreed by the Council.

**Please contact Anthony Roberts, Democratic Services, Tel: 01480 388015 / email [Anthony.Roberts@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:Anthony.Roberts@huntingdonshire.gov.uk) if you have a general query on any Agenda Item, wish to tender your apologies for absence from the meeting, or would like information on any decision taken by the Committee.**

Specific enquiries with regard to items on the Agenda should be directed towards the Contact Officer.

Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting as observers except during consideration of confidential or exempt items of business.

Agenda and enclosures can be viewed on the [District Council's website](#).

### **Emergency Procedure**

In the event of the fire alarm being sounded and on the instruction of the Meeting Administrator, all attendees are requested to vacate the building via the closest emergency exit.

## HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE held in THE CIVIC SUITE (LANCASTER/STIRLING ROOMS), PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON, PE29 3TN on Monday, 16 March 2026

PRESENT: Councillor D L Mickelburgh – Chair.

Councillors E R Butler, L Davenport-Ray, K P Gulson,  
D N Keane, S R McAdam, S Mokbul, J Neish,  
T D Sanderson, C H Tevlin and S Wakeford.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors J Clarke, S J Corney, D B Dew, P A Jordan and R A Slade.

### 56 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 16th and 23rd February 2026 were approved as correct records and signed by the Chair.

### 57 MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor D Mickelburgh declared a Non Registrable Interest in respect of Minute No 58 (a) by virtue of the fact that as a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council she had an interest in the application but that she had had no involvement in the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor L Davenport-Ray declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 58 (a) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council, but she had had no involvement in the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor T Sanderson declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 58 (a) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council and of the Council's Executive, but he had had no involvement in the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor J Neish declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 58 (a) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council and he was a Member of the Cabinet when the application was originally discussed, but he had had no involvement in the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor S McAdam declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 58 (a) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council, that he had had no involvement in the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor C Tevlin declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 58 (a) by virtue of the fact that she was a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council, but she had had no involvement in the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor K Gulson declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 58 (a) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council, that he had had no involvement in the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor D Keane declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 58 (a) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council and he was a Member of the Cabinet when the application was originally discussed, but he had had no involvement in the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor S Wakeford declared a Non-Registrable Interest by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of the Council's Executive with responsibility for housing and economic development, which were relevant to items on the Agenda, but he approached the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor S Wakeford also declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 58 (a) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council and was a Member of the Cabinet with responsibility for affordable housing, but he had had no involvement in the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor S Mokbul declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 58 (a) by virtue of the fact that she was a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council, but she had had no involvement in the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor E Butler declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 58 (a) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Huntingdonshire District Council, but he had had no involvement in the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

## **58 APPLICATIONS REQUIRING REFERENCE TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

The Planning Service Manager (Development Management) submitted reports (copies of which are appended in the Minute Book) on applications for development to be determined by the Committee. Members were advised of further representations, which had been received since the reports had been prepared. Whereupon, it was

RESOLVED

- a) **43 affordable dwellings of mixed size and tenure along with associated infrastructure and open space - Land North of Sewage Pumping Station, Station Road, Warboys - 25/01279/FUL**

*(J Drummond, Warboys Parish Council, Councillor C Lowe, Ward Member, Councillor R Martin, Cambridgeshire County Council, K Simson, objector, and C Lindley, Agent, addressed the Committee on the application).*

See Minute No 57 for Members' interests.

that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning, Infrastructure & Public Protection (Chief Planning Officer) to resolve Anglian Water matters including the wording of a suitable condition for foul drainage, and subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 obligation relating to affordable housing, BNG monitoring, provision of open space and wheeled bins, and to conditions to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted together with an additional condition relating to surface water drainage maintenance or refused only in the event that the obligation referred to above has not been completed, or on the grounds that the applicant is unwilling to complete the obligation necessary to make the development acceptable.

At 9.15 pm the meeting was adjourned.

At 9.26 pm the meeting resumed.

- b) Change of use of land for the stationing of two mobile homes and four touring caravans to include establishment of hardstanding and fences on a temporary or permanent basis (part retrospective) - Land at Rosefield, Parkhall Road, Somersham - 24/02116/FUL**

*(Councillor D Sutton, Somersham Parish Council, addressed the Committee on the application).*

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted together with an additional condition prohibiting the operation of a business.

- c) Retrospective development of day room and standing of two additional residential static caravans and two touring caravans on land granted planning consent in 2015 (Ref: 14/00997/FUL) - Hanley Stables, Middle Drove, Ramsey Heights - 21/01481/FUL**

*(Councillor V Fendley, Ramsey Town Council, S Carling Member of Parliament, and S Carruthers, Agent, addressed the Committee on the application).*

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted together with additional conditions relating to a site development scheme as set out in the Late Representations and to prohibiting the operation of a business..

- d) Retrospective proposed single traveller pitch with associated mobile home, touring caravan and dayroom for family that have their immediate family adjacent the site. - Whites Yard, Middle Drove, Ramsey Heights, Huntingdon - 23/02167/FUL**

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted together with additional conditions relating to a site development scheme as set out in the Late Representations and to prohibiting the operation of a business.

- e) **Retrospective change of use of land to one Gypsy / Traveller Pitch with two residential static caravans and two touring caravans, establishment of access and formation of hardstanding (temporary or permanent) for extended Gypsy / Traveller family. - Land South East of True Briton, Middle Drove, Ramsey Heights - 21/01476/FUL**

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted together with additional conditions relating to a site development scheme as set out in the Late Representations and to prohibiting the operation of a business.

- f) **Retrospective change of use of land to one Gypsy / Traveller Pitch with five residential static caravans and five touring caravans, establishment of access and change of use of existing hardstanding for occupation by the applicants and their family. - Land South East of True Briton, Middle Drove, Ramsey Heights - 21/01477/FUL**

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted together with additional conditions relating to a site development scheme as set out in the Late Representations and to prohibiting the operation of a business.

- g) **Retrospective change of use of land to one Gypsy / Traveller pitch with five residential static caravans and five touring caravans, establishment of access and use of hardstanding for occupation by the applicants and their family - Land South East of True Briton, Middle Drove, Ramsey Heights - 21/01478/FUL**

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted together with additional conditions relating to a site development scheme as set out in the Late Representations and to prohibiting the operation of a business.

- h) **Retrospective change of use of land to one Gypsy / Traveller pitch with five residential static caravans, and five touring caravans, establishment of access and use of hardstanding for occupation by the applicants and their family (temporary or permanent) - Magpie Farm, Middle Drove, Ramsey Heights - 21/01479/FUL**

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted together with additional conditions

relating to a site development scheme as set out in the Late Representations and to prohibiting the operation of a business.

- i) **Retrospective change of use of land to one Gypsy / Traveller pitch with two residential static caravans and two touring caravans (temporary or permanent), development of day room, establishment of access and use of existing hardstanding for occupation by the applicants and their family - Indianas Paddock, Middle Drove, Ramsey Heights, Huntingdon - 21/01480/FUL**

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted together with additional conditions relating to a site development scheme as set out in the Late Representations and to prohibiting the operation of a business.

- j) **Retrospective change of use of land to one Gypsy / Traveller pitch with day room, two residential static caravans and a touring caravan (temporary or permanent), establishment of additional access and use of existing hardstanding for residential occupation by the applicants and their family. - Land West of Kelvedon Cottage, Harpers Drove, Ramsey Heights - 21/01475/FUL**

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted together with additional conditions relating to a site development scheme as set out in the Late Representations and to prohibiting the operation of a business.

## **59 APPEAL DECISIONS**

The Committee received and noted a report by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management), which contained details of seven recent decisions by the Planning Inspectorate. A copy of the report is appended in the Minute Book.

RESOLVED

that the contents of the report be noted.

## **60 SECTION 106 AGREEMENT ADVISORY GROUP**

RESOLVED

that Councillors S McAdam and S Mokbul be appointed to the Section 106 Agreement Advisory Group in place of Councillors C Tevlin and S Wakeford.

Chair

## HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE held in THE CIVIC SUITE (LANCASTER/STIRLING ROOMS), PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON, PE29 3TN on Monday, 23 March 2026

PRESENT: Councillor D L Mickelburgh – Chair.

Councillors S J Corney, L Davenport-Ray, K P Gulson, D N Keane, S R McAdam, S Mokbul, T D Sanderson and S Wakeford.

APOLOGIES: Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors E R Butler, J Clarke, D B Dew, P A Jordan, J Neish, R A Slade and C H Tevlin.

### 61 MEMBERS' INTERESTS

In respect of Minute No 62 (a) Councillor T Sanderson declared a Registrable Interest by virtue of the fact that the application related to the Division he represented as a Member of Cambridgeshire County Council and a Non-Registrable Interest by virtue of the fact that the application related to the Ward he represented as a Member of the District Council.

Councillor S McAdam declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 62 (a) by virtue of the fact that the application related to the Ward he represented.

Councillor K Gulson declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 62 (b) by virtue of the fact that the application related to the Ward he represented.

Councillor S Wakeford declared a Non-Registrable Interest by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of the Council's Executive with responsibility for housing and economic development, which were relevant to items on the Agenda, but he approached the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Wakeford also declared a Non-Registrable Interest in Minute No 62 (a) by virtue of the fact that he represented the Huntingdon North Ward.

### 62 APPLICATIONS REQUIRING REFERENCE TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

The Planning Service Manager (Development Management) submitted reports (copies of which are appended in the Minute Book) on applications for development to be determined by the Committee. Members were advised of further representations, which had been received since the reports had been prepared. Whereupon, it was

RESOLVED

- a) **Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for site access for construction of Storage and Distribution (Use Class B8), General Employment (Use Class B2), Bus Depot (Sui Generis) floorspace with ancillary offices and gatehouses, provision of landscaping, access infrastructure (including new and improved vehicular access from the A141, highway, parking, cycle and pedestrian access), utilities (including gas, electricity, water, sewerage, telecommunications), sustainable drainage systems, and all associated engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and reuse of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works). The proposed development is phased with each phase being a separate and severable part of the development - Brookfield Farm, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley, Huntingdon - 01922/OUT**

*(Councillor P Pearce, The Stukeleys Parish Council, Councillor D Landon-Cole, Huntingdon Town Council, J Greenhalgh and Councillor L Beckett, Objectors, and J Barker and B Taylor, Applicants, addressed the Committee on the application).*

See Minute No 61 for Members' interests.

that consideration of the application be deferred to enable the following information to be obtained:

- a). a consultation response from the NHS reflecting on whether there would be an impact on their operations in the area that would be created by a potential increase in traffic movements because of this application; and
- b). traffic modelling of the impact on traffic on the junction of Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Views Common Road that would be created by the traffic movements in the area from the application.

At 9.36 pm the meeting was adjourned.

At 9.46 pm the meeting resumed.

- b) **Outline application with all matters reserved except for access via Peterborough Road for the demolition of 107 Peterborough Road, and the development of up to 185 dwellings (Use Class C3), public open space and associated infrastructure – Land West of Peterborough Road, Farcet - 25/00892/OUT**

*(Councillor A Cunnington, Farcet Parish Council, and D Robinson-Wells, Agent, addressed the Committee on the application).*

that, subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 obligation relating to affordable housing, BNG monitoring, provision of open space and wheeled bins, the application be approved subject to conditions to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted or refused only in the event that the obligation referred to above has not been completed, or on the grounds that the

applicant is unwilling to complete the obligation necessary to make the development acceptable.

- c) **Installation of cooling pond with ancillary equipment, new bund and ground-mounted solar panels (Retrospective) - The Old Hangar, Sibson Airfield, Sibson, Peterborough - 25/00017/FUL**

*(M Richardson, Applicant, addressed the Committee on the application).*

that the application be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Planning Service Manager (Development Management) to include those listed in paragraph 8 of the report now submitted.

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

**20<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2026**

**Case No:** 25/01922/OUT

**Proposal:** Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for site access for construction of Storage and Distribution (Use Class B8), General Employment (Use Class B2), Bus Depot (Sui Generis) floorspace with ancillary offices and gatehouses, provision of landscaping, access infrastructure (including new and improved vehicular access from the A141, highway, parking, cycle and pedestrian access), utilities (including gas, electricity, water, sewerage, telecommunications), sustainable drainage systems, and all associated engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and reuse of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works). The proposed development is phased with each phase being a separate and severable part of the development.

**Location:** Brookfield Farm Ermine Street Great Stukeley

**Applicant:** Newlands Property Developments (Huntingdon) Ltd

**Grid Ref:** 521676 272795

**Date of Registration:** 3<sup>rd</sup> OCTOBER 2025

**Parishes:** THE STUKELEYS (within which the majority of the site falls)  
HUNTINGDON (relating solely to the proposed new access on the A141)

**Adjacent Parish:** BRAMPTON (on the opposite side of the Alconbury Brook)

---

**POWERS DELEGATED to the Head of Planning, Infrastructure & Public Protection to APPROVE subject to:**

- (i) The conditions listed below;**
- (ii) Completion of a Section 106 agreement; and**
- (iii) Receipt of a Natural England Impact Assessment and Conservation Payment Certificate (“IACPC”) in respect of a District Level newt licence**

**OR**

**REFUSE in the event that the obligation referred to above has not been completed and the Applicant is unwilling to agree to an extended period for determination, or on the grounds that the Applicant is unwilling to complete the obligation necessary to make the development acceptable.**

**This application is referred to the Development Management Committee (DMC) because:**

- **Cllr Shaw has called in the application given objections in respect of visual impact/building heights, noise and traffic**
- **The recommended Section 106 agreement exceeds £100,000 in value.**

## **0. UPDATE FOLLOWING DEFFERAL AT 23<sup>rd</sup> MARCH 2026 DMC**

### Background

0.1 The application was presented to Members of the Development Management Committee on the 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2026. Following a lengthy debate on the item, Members resolved to defer the application for the following two reasons:

1. A consultation response from the NHS reflecting on whether there would be an impact on their operations in the area that would be created by a potential increase in traffic movements because of this application.
2. A traffic modelling of the impact on traffic on the junction of Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Views Common Road that would be created by the traffic movements in the area from the application.

0.2 Officers have since sought consultation responses from the NHS, which includes Hinchingsbrooke Hospital and the East of England Ambulance Service (attached to this report).

0.3 Following receipt of the consultation responses, the applicant has provided a letter (also attached to this report) which set outs their position on the deferral reasons.

0.4 The Highway Authority has reviewed the letter from the applicant and have provided the following comments (also attached to this report):

*'The Highway Authority did not request any additional information, however the information submitted by the applicant is noted and the content of the letter confirms their approach which has previously been agreed by the Highway Authority. The applicant has included detailed information on the developments impact on the surrounding road network, this included trip rates, distribution and junction impacts using industry standard methodology and software. The Highway Authority only requires junction modelling where a development will generate 30 or more new trips in either peak hour at a junction. The Hinchingsbrooke Park Road / Views Common Road signal junction did not trigger this requirement.*

*The Highway Authority are satisfied, therefore, we do not require any further information or modelling, it would be for members to decide whether the information that has been submitted by the developer is sufficient to address their concerns and make an informed decision on the planning application.'*

0.5 This update section of the report sets out the consideration of the deferral reasons. For the avoidance of doubt, the remainder of the report remains the same as the report presented to Members on the 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2026 DMC.

Full reconsideration of the item on 20<sup>th</sup> April DMC

- 0.6 Since the Development Management Committee meeting of 23<sup>rd</sup> March, the Council has received legal correspondence raising procedural concerns in relation to the meeting and the deferral process. The Council has sought independent legal advice on the matter. In order to ensure fairness to all parties and to remedy concerns, the application is to be returned and represented to the Development Management Committee for full consideration. As with any new agenda item, this will allow all registered speakers to address the Committee again and enable all DMC members to participate in the determination of the application. Letters have been sent to interested parties on this basis.

#### Deferral Reason 1

- 0.7 Members should note that the NHS is not statutory consultee. Whilst letters were not originally sent to either Hinchingsbrooke Hospital or the East of England Ambulance Service (EEAS) by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), the application was advertised via a site notice and press advert. The applicant has confirmed within their received letter that Hinchingsbrooke Hospital (along with all other business and residential addresses within Hinchingsbrooke) were sent a leaflet advertising the pre-application stage of public consultation events that took place last Summer. Officers can confirm the NHS and Hinchingsbrooke Hospital have been actively engaged within the emerging Local Plan commenting on draft policies as well as promoting their own draft allocation on land south of Hinchingsbrooke Hospital. This application site also forms a draft allocation in the emerging Local Plan. It is therefore a reasonable assumption that the NHS would have been aware of the draft allocation and application early on but chose not to comment. The EEAS has also provided a copy of a letter responding to the Residents Association dated 20<sup>th</sup> March 2026, which clearly demonstrates that the EEAS were aware of the application before the DMC on the 23<sup>rd</sup> March, but chose not to make any comment on the application.
- 0.8 Notwithstanding all of this, Officers have sought consultation responses from both Hinchingsbrooke Hospital and the EEAS.
- 0.9 Hinchingsbrooke Hospital have confirmed they have no objection to the proposal.
- 0.10 In addition to this, Hinchingsbrooke Hospital have also set out that they are aware of the existing traffic congestion in and around the hospital, and the resulting impact on staff and visitors. As mentioned above, the Hospital has its own draft allocation in the emerging Local Plan. The proposal is set out within an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Request and Opinion under reference 25/70078/SCOP. The Scoping Report submitted by the NHS sets out an intention to acquire land to the immediate south of the Hospital, currently under the ownership of the police, and to use this land for a car park and new vehicular access directly from Views Common Road: creating the ability for emergency vehicles to bypass Hinchingsbrooke Park Road, if necessary.
- 0.11 The East of England Ambulance Service (EEAS) has also confirmed no objection to this proposal.
- 0.12 The EEAS have also indicated that they are exploring the use of emergency services access via the industrial estate (Hinchingsbrooke Business Park), which is currently controlled by a barrier. The applicant has also set out in their letter that in the eventuality that emergency vehicles are able to rely on this route, the proposed all-movements roundabout on the A141 will enhance ambulance access to and from the

hospital via the Business Park. Ambulances may also benefit from the increased highway capacity at the various A141 junctions to the east that will arise from the off-site mitigation works committed to by the applicant.

- 0.13 Officers therefore consider that the first deferral reason has been satisfied as the NHS (Hinchingbrooke Hospital and the East of England Ambulance Service) has not only provided consultation responses but have confirmed they do not raise any objection to the proposal in terms of impact upon their operations.

#### Deferral Reason 2

- 0.14 Members should note that the Highway Authority was satisfied and remains satisfied that the applicant has provided all the necessary information to demonstrate that the proposal is acceptable in highway safety and transport matters. Officers accept this advice from the relevant technical consultee as they have the necessary experience and qualifications on such matters. This was not only set out in the Officer Report but also confirmed verbally at DMC by Officers of both the LPA and the Highway Authority.
- 0.15 As outlined above, the applicant has provided a letter setting out their position on the deferral reasons. Within the letter, the applicant acknowledges that applications of this scale are supported by a range of complex technical information and therefore has felt it would be helpful to Members to chronologise and explain the process.
- 0.16 The calculation of the potential number of Development trips passing through any part of the network is the product of a combination of:
- The Development trip generation assessment (calculated using the industry-standard TRICS trip rate database for similar-scale, similar-use developments); and
  - A calculation of where these development trips are going to travel to/from (the trip distribution assessment); followed by
  - An assessment of the routes these trips use in their journeys around the local network (the trip assignment).
- 0.17 The methodology was set out in a Pre-Application Transport Scoping Note prepared by Stantec and issued to the Highway Authority on 26 February 2025. The Highway Authority confirmed the methodology as acceptable on 17 March 2025.
- 0.18 Given the differing travel characteristics, the assessment separately considered staff trips (light vehicles) and delivery movements (heavy goods vehicles). Staff trip distribution used 2011 Census 'Journey to Work' data as the most robust and accepted source available, noting that more recent data is compromised by COVID-19 effects and may over-estimate car use. Route assignment for staff trips was informed by expected peak-hour conditions and typical route choices.
- 0.19 Delivery vehicle movements were assessed using assumed logistics park travel patterns, reflecting drivers' preference for strategic routes, legal weight limits, and avoidance of constrained or congested roads.
- 0.20 The resulting trip assignment demonstrates that no development traffic is expected to pass through the A1307 Views Common Road / Hinchingbrooke Park Road junction. This is due to the availability of quicker and more direct alternative routes

for staff traffic, the presence of HGV weight restrictions on Views Common Road, and more efficient strategic routing via the A141 and A14.

- 0.21 While a very small number of exceptional or linked trips could theoretically pass through this junction, these are expected to be minimal and would not represent new or material Development-related traffic. Consequently, Development traffic at this junction is well below the Highway Authority's threshold of 30 two-way peak-hour movements. In line with adopted guidance, no detailed junction capacity assessment was therefore required, and no mitigation or contributions are sought for this location. The Highway Authority in their latest response have reiterated '*The Highway Authority only requires junction modelling where a development will generate 30 or more new trips in either peak hour at a junction. The Hinchingsbrooke Park Road / Views Common Road signal junction did not trigger this requirement*'.
- 0.22 It is the position of the applicant that the Views Common Road / Hinchingsbrooke Park Road crossroads was duly considered as part of the transport assessment process. The reason it did not proceed to the detailed transport model is due to the lack of trips linked to this Development that would travel through it. The methodology and procedure underpinning this aligns entirely with adopted guidance, was not and is not disputed by the Local Highways Authority or National Highways either at the EIA Scoping or planning application stage.
- 0.23 The applicant has set out that because there are little to none vehicles routing through this part of the network from this proposed Development, any further detailed modelling of this junction in isolation (or indeed a full re-run of the Transport Assessment model with this junction incorporated) would not provide any additional material value and would not alter the conclusions of the Transport Assessment. It would only serve to highlight the known existing traffic issues, whilst demonstrating that the Proposed Development would not exacerbate them. The Highway Authority is also in agreement that no further modelling or information is required.
- 0.24 Planning legislation and guidance are clear that mitigation should be directly related to the impacts arising from a proposed development, and should not be sought to address pre-existing issues on the network. On this basis, Members are advised that neither the Highway Authority nor planning officers have identified a requirement for developer contributions or mitigation in respect of this part of the highway network in line with CIL Regulations.
- 0.25 As set out in the officer report, the applicant has committed to signage strategy, including enhanced weight limit signage in relation to Views Common Road, a Travel Plan to reduce car trips to and from the Proposed Development and a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (in accordance with the already-submitted CEMP Framework) to control the routing of construction-stage HGVs etc.
- 0.26 In addition to these, and following discussions at DMC on the 23<sup>rd</sup> March, the applicant has also confirmed they are willing to commit to an Operational Management Plan to provide an added layer of comfort to Members and residents. Draft wording of the condition is:

*"Prior to occupation of any warehouse building hereby permitted, an Operational Management Plan will be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Local Highways Authority). The Operational Management Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:*

*i. Details of HGV routing (including preferred and barred routes and pre-programming of navigation aids);*

*ii. Measures to manage HGV movements during peak periods (Monday-Friday AM Peak (0800-0900) and PM Peak (1630-1800)); and*

*iii. Details of staff shift changes which seek to minimise the effect during peak operational periods of the surrounding highway network.*

*The OMP should include detailed proposals for ensuring the HGV routing is adhered to.”*

0.27 The applicant’s letter concludes with the following:

*‘We reiterate the fundamental efficiency imperatives of modern industrial and logistics operators to utilise the strategic road network (the A1(M) and A14, via the A141), and to do so outside of peak hours. Indeed, the shift changeover times of logistics operators (typically 6am, 8am, 2pm, 10pm) deliberately avoid rush hours. Moreover, Newlands (whose business model involves long-term retention of the freehold, and leasing of buildings to occupiers) has a commercial prerogative to ensure the successful functioning of the Site, with transport and accessibility being the most fundamental component of an industrial and logistics development. Failure to achieve this (either for lorries or employee vehicles) would render the Site unattractive to occupiers and make it difficult for Newlands to let the buildings.*

*To that end, the Site has been carefully selected for its transport credentials, and has been appraised by HDC as an appropriate location for industrial and logistics in the emerging Local Plan. A substantial amount of specialist transport planning and highways engineering work, in collaboration with HDC, CCC, and National Highways, has been undertaken to ensure it functions optimally from a transport perspective. This work will continue throughout the construction and operational stages, and Newlands would be happy to establish a Residents Liaison Group to ensure communication channels are available to interested residents and other parties as the scheme progresses.’*

0.28 The Highway Authority has reiterated their position of no objection on the application, and that no further modelling or information is required. On review of the applicants letter, it is clear that the applicant has not provided any new information given that the LPA already holds all the necessary information to satisfy the second reason for deferral.

### Conclusion

0.29 Members resolved to defer the application on the 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2026 for the following two reasons:

1. A consultation response from the NHS reflecting on whether there would be an impact on their operations in the area that would be created by a potential increase in traffic movements because of this application.
2. A traffic modelling of the impact on traffic on the junction of Hinchingbrooke Park Road and Views Common Road that would be created by the traffic movements in the area from the application.

- 0.30 The NHS (Hinchingbrooke Hospital and the East of England Ambulance Service) has not only provided consultation responses but have confirmed they do not raise any objection to the proposal in terms of impact upon their operations. The first deferral reason therefore has been satisfied.
- 0.31 The applicant has set out the process and assessment of the impact on traffic on the junction of Hinchingbrooke Park Road and Views Common Road. The Highway Authority is in agreement with the applicant that as there are little to none vehicles routing through this part of the network from the development, any further detailed modelling of this junction in isolation (or indeed a full re-run of the Transport Assessment model with this junction incorporated) would not provide any additional material value and would not alter the conclusions of the Transport Assessment.
- 0.32 It is evident that the LPA already holds information regarding the junction of Hinchingbrooke Park Road and Views Common Road, and that information was held when the application was presented to Members of the DMC in March. The advice to members from both officers of the LPA and the Highway Authority is that the junction of Hinchingbrooke Park Road and Views Common Road has therefore been satisfactorily considered as part of the assessment, and no further modelling or information is required. It is clear that the LPA already holds all the necessary information to satisfy the second reason for deferral.
- 0.33 The officer recommendation therefore remains the same (with the addition of the recommended condition regarding an Operational Management Plan).

#### Further representations

- 0.34 A letter was sent by the Residents Association to the Highway Authority on the 27<sup>th</sup> March 2026 raising a number of questions regarding the Transport Assessment. The Highway Authority responded to the Residents Association on the 9<sup>th</sup> April 2026 stating that the Highway Authority was satisfied with the level of information submitted with the application.

## **1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND APPLICATION**

### Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 This is an outline planning application, with all matters reserved except access, for a substantial industrial and logistics development on a 126-hectare site north-west of Huntingdon.
- 1.2 The land is predominantly in agricultural use, including a farmstead at Brookfield Farm with its storage buildings and small cluster of dwellings. Of the agricultural land, 58% is Grade 3a and 36% is Grade 3b, with the balancing comprising hard standings, access roads, hedgerows etc.
- 1.3 To the north-east is the A1307 dual carriageway, beyond which there is an implemented planning permission for a mixed-use development of up to 1,000 dwellings, primary school, retail and community floorspace (18/01918/OUT) and other uses. An existing overbridge crosses the A1307 linking the two sites.
- 1.4 To the south-east and south are three distinct areas:

- 1.4.1 Hinchingsbrooke Business Park, with its wide range of employment, leisure and other commercial uses, accessed via the A141;
- 1.4.2 Approximately 800 homes at Hinchingsbrooke (accessed solely and exclusively via Hinchingsbrooke Park Road), which are set back from the A141 by an existing mature belt of trees and shrubs;
- 1.4.3 Hinchingsbrooke Country Park, approximately 60 hectares of public open space comprising a visitor centre, open grassland, mature woodland and lakes. The Country Park is managed by the District Council and a programme of improvements works, including a new visitor centre, was recently granted planning permission (25/00577/FUL). One of the Country Park's footpaths runs alongside the Alconbury Brook and under the A141 to the application site. The Country Park is also accessed primarily via Hinchingsbrooke Park Road.
- 1.5 To the south-west is Huntingdon Racecourse, a hotel, and a rugby club.
- 1.6 To the north-west is mostly farmland, but with a cluster of dwellings at Waterloo Farm. Waterloo Farmhouse itself is Grade II listed.
- 1.7 Public rights of way run along the southern boundary, cross the site east-west, and from the A1307 overbridge in the north skirting the site towards the racecourse to the south.

#### Proposed development

- 1.8 The proposal is for up to 205,000 sqm of floorspace for storage, distribution, and general industrial uses, together with ancillary offices, a bus depot (or similar transport-related use), landscaping, drainage and infrastructure improvements. Up to 30% of the floorspace is proposed for Use Class B2 (general industrial) use, with the majority falling within Use Class B8 (storage and distribution).
- 1.9 A new roundabout on the A141 would replace the existing left-in, left-out to Hinchingsbrooke Business Park and would provide access to both the existing business park and the proposed development. Detailed approval for the means of access is sought at this stage, which would include realigning the A141 dual carriageway to the south of the roundabout gradually moving it slightly further away from the existing housing at Hinchingsbrooke. A new footway/cycleway underpass is proposed below the A141, linking the development to Flamstead Drive and including the re-provision of the Flamstead Drive play area.
- 1.10 Over 50% of the site would be dedicated to green and blue infrastructure, with significant tree planting, biodiversity enhancements, and sustainable drainage systems.
- 1.11 The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement addressing potential impacts and mitigation measures.
- 1.12 The applicant's Planning Statement outlines substantial anticipated benefits, including:
  - 1.12.1 The creation of 2,371–3,287 direct jobs and up to 1,109 indirect jobs;
  - 1.12.2 An economic contribution estimated at £212–£476 million in annual Gross

Value Added;

1.12.3 A £229 million investment in the scheme's construction;

1.13 The application is accompanied by an extensive Environmental Statement addressing potential impacts and mitigation measures, and includes the following documents:

- Agriculture and Soil Resource Assessment\*
- Air Quality Assessment\*
- Arboricultural Assessment\*
- Archaeological Evaluation Report
- Biodiversity Net Gain Report\*
- Climate Change Assessment\* (including climate change projections and carbon calculations)
- Construction Environmental Management Plan (Framework)
- Design and Access Statement
- Design Code
- Drainage Strategy (Outline)
- Ecological reports (including a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and specific reports on bats, birds, invertebrates, great crested newts, reptiles) and an Ecology Assessment\*
- Employment Land Needs and Economic Benefits Assessment
- Environmental Colour Assessment
- Flood Risk Assessment\*
- Foul Water Drainage Strategy\*
- Geoenvironmental Desk Study Report
- Geophysical Survey Report
- Habitat Regulations Assessment\*
- Health Impact Assessment
- Heritage and Archaeology Assessment\*
- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment\*
- Lighting Impact Assessment\*
- Noise and Vibration Assessment\*
- Planning Statement
- Road Safety Audit (Stage 1)
- Site Waste Management Plan\*
- Social Value Framework (Construction Phase)
- Socioeconomic Assessment\*
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Sustainability Strategy (Framework)
- Transport Assessment\*
- Travel Plan (Framework)
- Utilities Statement
- Waste and Minerals Assessment\*
- Water Scarcity Feasibility Assessment

\* contained within the applicant's 4,000 page Environmental Statement

1.14 The scope and methodologies of the Environmental Statement were subject to technical consultation and formal scoping prior to submission (reference

25/70019/SCOP).

- 1.15 Amendments and additional information have been received during the consideration of this application, which have been consulted upon accordingly.
- 1.16 In response to various public consultation comments, the applicant has agreed to rename the scheme “Newlands Park Huntingdon” rather than marketing it as “Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park”.

## **2. NATIONAL GUIDANCE**

- 2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF December 2024)(“the NPPF”) sets out the three objectives - economic, social and environmental - of the planning system to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. NPPF paragraph 10 provides as follows: 'So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11).'
- 2.2 The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for (amongst other things):
  - building a strong, competitive economy;
  - achieving well-designed, beautiful and safe places;
  - conserving and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment
- 2.3 Of particular note is paragraph 87(b) in which Government policy is stated as follows:

“87. Planning policies and decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for:  
b) storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations that allow for the efficient and reliable handling of goods, especially where this is needed to support the supply chain, transport innovation and decarbonisation”
- 2.4 Planning Practice Guidance and the National Design Guide 2021 are also relevant and material considerations.
- 2.5 Relevant legislation:
  - Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
  - Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
  - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
  - Environment Act 2024
  - Localism Act 2011
  - Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981
  - Habitat Regulations 2017
  - Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017

For full details visit the government website [National Guidance](#)

- 2.6 A revised NPPF was published for consultation in December 2025 which, whilst signalling the Government's planning policy direction of travel, is not currently attributed any weight in the determination of planning applications.

### **3. PLANNING POLICIES**

#### **3.1 Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 (Adopted 15<sup>th</sup> May 2019)**

- LP1: Amount of development
- LP2: Strategy for Development
- LP3: Green Infrastructure
- LP4: Contributing to Infrastructure Delivery
- LP5: Flood Risk
- LP6: Waste Water Management
- LP7: Spatial Planning Areas
- LP10: The Countryside
- LP11: Design Context
- LP12: Design Implementation
- LP14: Amenity
- LP15: Surface Water
- LP16: Sustainable Travel
- LP17: Parking Provision and Vehicle Movement
- LP18: Established Employment Areas
- LP30: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- LP31: Trees, Woodland, Hedges and Hedgerows
- LP34: Heritage Assets and their Settings
- LP36: Air Quality
- LP37: Ground Contamination and Groundwater Pollution

#### **3.2 The Stukeleys Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2036 (Made 19<sup>th</sup> July 2023)(spatially relating to the majority of the site)**

- 1: Definition of 'Built-up Area' (Settlement Boundary)
- 4: Community Engagement
- 5: Community Facilities

#### **3.3 Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2026 (Made 9<sup>th</sup> October 2019)(spatially relating only to the proposed new roundabout access on the A141)**

- E1: Opportunities for Employment
- E2: Business Investment
- NE3: Setting of Huntingdon
- BE1: Design and Landscaping
- BE2: Local Distinctiveness and Aesthetics
- BE3: Heritage Assets
- TT1: Sustainable Transport

#### **3.4 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021)**

- 5: Minerals Safeguarding Areas

### 3.5 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and Guidance:

- Huntingdonshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017)
- Developer Contributions SPD (2011)
- Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape SPD (2022)
- Huntingdonshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2024)
- Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD (2017)
- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021)
- RECAP CCC Waste Management Design Guide (CCC SPD)(2012)
- Technical Advice Note: Environmentally Sustainable Design and Construction (2025)

For full details visit the government website [Local policies](#)

#### Emerging planning policy

- 3.5 In October 2025 the Council published a Preferred Options consultation on the emerging Local Plan, within which the site is identified as “Draft Allocation North Huntingdon 2” for 103.5 hectares of B2 light industrial and B8 storage and distribution uses with up to 70% of floorspace to be for B8 use.
- 3.6 Paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that decision-takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies, and their degree of consistency with policies in the [National Planning Policy Framework](#).
- 3.7 5no. objections were received in respect of this draft allocation on matters of both principle and detail. Consequently, at the time of writing, the emerging Local Plan remains at such an early stage in its preparation that little if any weight can be attributed to the Preferred Options document.

## 4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 The site has only a limited planning history:

03/00959/FUL (Unit 1, Brookfield Farm)  
Change of use to office, workshop/store for Ouse Valley Dial-a-Ride  
Approved 29.05.2003

## 5. CONSULTATIONS

Two rounds of consultation were undertaken by the Local Planning Authority; the first (October 2025) formed the initial statutory consultation whilst the second (December 2025) followed the submission of amended parameter plans and additional supporting information.

- 5.1 Huntingdon Town Council  
Recommends support on the basis of economic development, jobs, skills, accessible landscaped areas, and sustainable travel (Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan E1, BE1, partially TT1), welcoming the changes to the plans, natural areas including use of

native species, SuDS, and the significant number of jobs, and significant investment in skills; however, the development does need mitigation, and so the Town Council's support is subject to a range of recommended mitigation measures (Officer note: these are explored in the relevant sections of this committee report)

#### 5.2 The Stukeleys Parish Council

Objects on grounds of flood risk and traffic impacts, than noting that a secondary access should be provided, as the current entrance to and from the development is considered unsuitable. Recommends a comprehensive traffic management plan is conditioned should the application be approved.

#### 5.3 Brampton Parish Council

Comments/concerns:

- Questions the need for the development in this location
- Initially questioned the efficacy of the proposed drainage strategy; had no comment on make on the revised strategy
- Concerned at potential anti-social behaviour in the proposed A141 underpass, preferring an overbridge instead
- Seeks confirmation that the proposed new A141 roundabout would not be signalled-controlled, and clarification on whether it would be lit
- Concerned at the potential for heavy goods vehicles to use Thrapston Road to access the site
- Adequate onsite car parking has not been demonstrated
- Whilst reassured that construction traffic modelling has been undertaken, concerned that full highway impacts have not been fully modelled and that the scale of the proposed development is likely to result in a detrimental impact on the roads surrounding the village

#### 5.4 Alconbury Parish Council

Recommends refusal, or in the alternative deferral until a full cumulative transport study is completed. Main concerns can be summarised as:

- Severe existing congestion on Hinchingbrooke Park Road; close proximity to the single access Hinchingbrooke estate poses risks for emergency response, school travel and hospital access
- Risks to vulnerable road uses (children walking, cycling and travelling by bus) on Hinchingbrooke Park Road
- High HGV volumes next to residential areas
- The Transport Assessment fails to consider driver rerouting when congestion increases, with foreseeable diversion routes including via Great Stukeley & Little Stukeley, Brampton via Huntingdon Road/Thrapston Road, and Abbots Ripton and rural roads
- Incomplete/unsound transport modelling (based on initial comments made by National Highways)
- No cumulative infrastructure assessment
- Scale and visual impact
- Flood risk and water management
- Prematurity in respect of the emerging North Huntingdon Growth Cluster and policy conflict with Adopted Local Plan
- Loss of high grade agricultural land

- 5.5 Spaldwick Parish Council  
Objects, supporting concerns raised by Hinchingsbrooke Residents Association in respect of Hinchingsbrooke Park Road delays and safety. Concerns in respect of significant HGV and 24/7 operational impacts adjacent to residential areas; failure to assess traffic displacement into surrounding villages; incomplete and unreliable transport modelling; absence of a coordinated, cluster-wide infrastructure assessment
- 5.6 National Highways  
No objection. Is satisfied that the proposed mitigation at the A1 / A141 Brampton Hut junction suitably mitigates the development traffic impacts, and that these works can be secured by condition.
- 5.7 Local Highway Authority  
Detailed discussions have been ongoing in respect of the offsite junctions requiring improvement and the nature of those works. The County Council has confirmed that capacity upgrades would be required to:
- The A141/Ermine Street roundabout
  - The A141/Washingley Road roundabout
  - The A141/Kings Ripton Road signalised junction
- Detailed junction improvement proposals have been submitted and are currently under review. Final comments will be reported on the Update Sheet.
- 5.8 Active Travel England  
No comments received
- 5.9 Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority (buses)  
No objection subject to a Bus Strategy being secured by way of Section 106 agreement. Sufficient funding for an appropriate bus service is required for a 5-year period. This would be either a demand-responsive service or a fixed schedule service, funding to be secured for whichever is the more expensive.
- 5.10 Cambridgeshire Police (Roads Policing Unit)  
No objection to amending the A141 speed limit to 50mph between the Ermine Street roundabout to the south of the proposed new access roundabout
- 5.11 Rights of Way Officer  
Initial holding objection sought clarifications; no comments received on those clarifications. Recommends conditions.
- 5.12 Ramblers Association  
Notes that the development would affect a Right of Way (Footpath 230/8) and that provision has been made for this in the plans. Regrets the loss of green space but welcomes the proposal for an underpass connecting this path to another (133/43), allowing walkers to avoid having to cross the busy A141.
- 5.13 British Horse Society  
No comments received

- 5.14 Buckden Highways and Sustainable Transport Group  
Objects to additional traffic generation likely to affect the A1 and A14, noting the congestion and noise/air quality issues already evident on those routes. Recommends deferral until a strategic highways solution (taking into account all potential future growth) is agreed.
- 5.15 Natural England  
No objection, advising the proposed development would not have significant impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes
- 5.16 HDC Ecology Consultant  
No objection subject to conditions
- 5.17 Wildlife Trust  
No comments received
- 5.18 Environment Agency  
No objections, noting that the proposed onsite foul treatment works would require specific permits and that an abstraction licence may also be required. Supports Anglian Water's comments in respect of potable water supply.
- 5.19 Lead Local Flood Authority  
No objection subject to conditions. The submitted documents demonstrate that the surface water from the proposed development could be managed through the use of attenuation ponds and swales.
- 5.20 Alconbury Brook Flood Group  
Following receipt of additional information and amendments, no objection to the proposed surface water drainage strategy; detailed suggestions made in respect of future reserved matters applications. Welcomes revisions to the drainage strategy that increased attenuation capacity and restricted discharge rates. Makes constructive suggestions to alleviate footpath flooding at the existing A141 underpass.
- 5.21 Alconbury and Ellington Internal Drainage Board  
No objections, noting that no development should take place with 9m of a watercourse and that the Board's consent would be required for the discharge of any water to a watercourse within their district.
- 5.22 Anglian Water  
No objection subject to conditions, noting that onsite waste water treatment is proposed. The site is in an area of water stress and therefore a daily restriction of 20m<sup>3</sup> to non-domestic premises is being imposed; recommends a water resources strategy is secured by condition.
- 5.23 Historic England  
Raises concerns. Although the site contains no designated heritage assets, the proposed large commercial buildings would be visually prominent in long views and cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II\* Church of St Bartholomew, Great Stukeley. Advises this harm must be weighed against public benefits in line with the NPPF, and remind the authority of its statutory duty to give

special regard to preserving listed buildings and their settings. Some mitigation may be possible at reserved matters stage, but would entirely remove their concerns.

- 5.24 HDC Conservation Officer  
Identifies less than substantial harm to the setting of three listed buildings which must be weighed in the planning balance.
- 5.25 County Archaeologist  
No objection subject to condition.
- 5.26 HDC Urban Design Officer  
Following revisions (which included height reductions in some parts of the site) and receipt of additional information, no objection subject to conditions
- 5.27 HDC Landscape Consultant  
No objection subject to conditions. Notwithstanding the applicant's proposed landscape mitigation measures, residual moderate adverse landscape and visual effects would remain, for up to Year 15 post-development. Whilst this harm is not sufficient to warrant planning permission being refused on landscape grounds, the residual harm should be weighed in the planning balance.
- 5.28 HDC Tree Officer  
Objection. Whilst the site is not located within a Conservation Area and there are no trees protected by TPO's present on site, there are large mature trees that need to be considered. Objects to the removal of one of the 3 grade 'A' trees on the site (a Giant Redwood) and disagrees with the categorisation of some trees attributed by the applicant. Loss of the onsite tree belt alongside the A141 is regrettable.
- 5.29 HDC Environmental Health Officer  
No objection subject to conditions
- 5.30 Friends of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park  
General:
  - New documents still don't assess impacts on Hinchingsbrooke Country Park (HCP) adequatelyBats:
  - HCP hosts several species; development site is valuable foraging habitat
  - 2,448 HGVs/day (24/7) would pose risks (collision, noise, barrier effects).
  - Conflicts with wildlife legislation
  - Requests time-restricted HGV movements at dusk/dawn and more surveys
  - Particularly concerned about the potential for vehicles on the A141 striking passing batsOtters:
  - Otters use HCP and Alconbury Brook
  - Requests a 10–15m dark, undisturbed riparian buffer and clear maintenance responsibilityBridleway/Footpath:
  - Purpose of proposed route unclear; FHCP did not request a new direct path
  - No agreed plan; stakeholder involvement and potential Section 106 agreement needed

Water Management:

- Attenuation increased and runoff rates lowered
- Accepts that, if properly maintained, flood risk to HCP would not increase

Name of Development:

- “Hinchingbrooke Logistics Park” considered misleading
- Suggests alternative names reflecting Brookfield Farm and mixed uses

5.31 HDC Economic Development Officer

Supports, confirming that the proposal aligns with key objectives of the Huntingdonshire Economic Growth Strategy and in particular the pillars of:

- Business Growth and Investment: Facilitating modern, flexible employment space that attracts and retains high-value sectors including logistics and green industries.
- Infrastructure for Growth: Delivering strategic improvements to the A141 corridor and enabling better access for goods, services, and people.
- Sustainable and Inclusive Growth: Supporting the creation of quality local employment opportunities, promoting upskilling, and encouraging sustainable modes of transport.
- Social values: offering local employment opportunities during the construction of the development.

Recognises the development’s potential to deliver significant economic benefits, improve connectivity, and contribute meaningfully to the district’s long-term growth and competitiveness.

5.32 Cambridgeshire Chamber of Commerce

Supports, advising that the site is well placed to attract investment. A number of longstanding expansion requirements have not come to fruition due to lack of floorspace supply. Welcomes the growth in local employment potential, highlighting that the logistics sector opens doors for people with limited qualifications or experience. The scheme would play a key role in the region’s prosperity combining high-quality employment floorspace, sustainable design and major infrastructure investment.

5.33 Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority (Careers Hub)

Supports, considering the proposed development to be a great opportunity to bring new jobs and skills to the local area, creating local jobs for young people including gateway roles for young people and a substantial quantum of construction jobs.

5.34 Constructed Pathways

Supports, noting the long-term job creation potential as well as significant number of construction jobs. Long-term social advantages would include providing solid career pathways for individuals, reducing dependence on debt-reliant career pathways. Considers the proposed development would bring lasting economic, infrastructure and community benefits

5.35 Cambridgeshire Police (Designing Out Crime Officer)

Considers the location to be an area of medium to high risk to the vulnerability to crime based on recorded figures. Recommends reserved matters proposals comply with the Secured by Design (SBD) Non-Residential (Commercial) Guide 2025 in

respect of building design/materials, access control, lighting, CCTV/alarms, external areas and boundary treatments.

5.36 Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service  
No comments received

5.37 Minerals and Waste Authority  
Comments: Minerals & Waste Local Plan Policy 5 applies as the site partially lies within a Sand and Gravel Minerals Safeguarding Area. Accepts minerals extraction prior to development is unlikely to be feasible and notes that the part of the site within the safeguarded area would be used purely for landscaping and biodiversity uses.

5.38 Cllr David Shaw - District Councillor for Brampton & Hinchingsbrooke  
Objects due to the significant adverse visual effects the development would have on local residential receptors and the wider landscape. Has proposed an 18.5m building height cap across the site, which the applicant has rejected. Questions the accuracy of the economic benefits put forward by the applicant, given their Planning Statement quotes the rateable value figure (£9.8 million), rather than between £5M and £6M in annual business rates once the standard multiplier is applied. Recommends refusal, given the unresolved visual, heritage, and amenity impacts, overstated key benefits and the absence of any firm commitments on noise mitigation or monitoring.

## 6. REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 For the initial consultation, letters were sent to 279 addresses and the application was publicised by 8 site notices and two press notices in the *Hunts Post*.

6.2 When reconsulting on the applicant's revised plans and additional information, consultation letters were sent to the same addresses and the application was publicised by 8 fresh site notices and a further press notice in the *Hunts Post*.

6.3 Across both rounds of consultation representations in objection were received from 53 addresses raising the following matters:

### Principle of development

- Land is not zoned for development in the Local Plan
- Brownfield sites should be redeveloped first
- Better sites exist elsewhere
- Office space is unnecessary
- Land would be better used for housing
- Loss of agricultural land
- Effect on food security
- Employment benefits have been exaggerated
- Premature to the emerging Local Plan
- Cumulative effects with other potential developments in the area
- A rail-served location would be more appropriate

### Scale and form

- Height and scale are excessive
- Buildings too tall

### Effect on living conditions

- Effect on residents' outlook
- Too close to existing homes
- Revised site layout should move buildings further away from homes
- Harm to enjoyment of existing footpaths on/around the site
- Loss of Flamsteed Drive playground
- Light pollution
- Noise pollution
- Air pollution
- 24/7 operation should not be permitted
- Potential crime/antisocial behaviour at the proposed A141 underpass

### Effect on the countryside

- Landscape harm
- Loss of tranquillity

### Highways effects

- Increased vehicle movements
- Worsening effect on existing traffic congestion, particularly on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road
- Risk of additional on-street car parking on Flamsteed Drive
- Additional traffic on Thrapston Road
- Route of former A14 across Views Common should be reopened
- A second vehicular access to the Hinchingsbrooke estate is needed
- Safety risk to schoolchildren using local roads
- New roundabout too close to the Busy Bees nursery
- Insufficient highway modelling
- A141 is already over capacity
- Sensitivity testing during A1 or A14 closures is required
- A141 underpass not appropriate; a surface-level crossing would be better
- Increased footfall past homes between the site and the railway station
- Alternative routes for the applicant's proposed footway/cycleway link are suggested, including through the existing business park, in preference to the proposed connection point at Flamsteed Drive
- Potential anti-social use of the underpass by motorbikes etc
- Extra traffic would impede ambulances accessing the hospital
- Disruption during construction of the proposed A141 access roundabout
- Poorly served by bus services
- Bus depot element may result in wasteful empty "dead-leg" bus movements

### Flooding and drainage

- Pollution to watercourses
- Increased flood risk
- Temporary drainage during construction required
- Over-reliance on existing flood defences which may fail
- Rainwater recycling should be required

### Ecology

- Loss of biodiversity

- Effect on Hinchingsbrooke Country Park
- Effect on nearby SSSIs
- Loss of mature trees
- Loss of woodland
- Loss of a Giant Redwood tree

Other concerns

- Harm to setting of a listed building
- Increased commercial and industrial waste
- Gas connection to the site would increase carbon emissions
- Loss of archaeology
- Inclusion of “Hinchingsbrooke” within the development’s name
- Community engagement by the applicant has been poor

Effects on private property values and anticipated increased insurance premiums are also raised, which are not material planning considerations.

6.4 Across both rounds of consultation representations were received from 8 addresses in support of the application, noting the following benefits:

- Substantial job creation
- Construction jobs
- Would particularly benefit young people
- Creation of gateway jobs particularly supported
- New bus services to the site to avoid having to drive
- New underpass below the A141 would be safer than as existing
- Potential for ANPR enforcement of the Views Common Road weight limit

6.5 Delta Hotels by Marriott Huntingdon supports the application, citing a range of hospitality-related economic benefits, wider infrastructure benefits, and commending the applicant’s proactive engagement with stakeholders.

6.6 Hinchingsbrooke Residents’ Association was established during the course of the application’s consideration and has raised detailed objections on a number of occasions during the course of extensive liaison with Officers, which can be summarised as follows:

1. Policy Conflicts

- Development results in loss of Grade 2 Best and Most Versatile farmland, contrary to NPPF requirements to protect high quality soil
- Site is designated Countryside (LP2); industrial use conflicts with LP10 and LP11 restrictions
- Conflicts with the Local Plan’s spatial strategy and bypasses allocated employment sites such as Alconbury Weald
- Application is premature ahead of the Local Plan 2046 review

2. Landscape, Design & Heritage Impact

- Proposed warehouse heights (18.5–24m) exceed local context and violate Design Guide expectations
- Major visual intrusion due to rising topography and large massing

- Harm predicted to heritage assets including Hinchingsbrooke House (Grade I) and Great Stukeley church (Grade II)
3. Impacts on Hinchingsbrooke Country Park & Green Infrastructure
    - Continuous industrial operations (24/7) incompatible with the park's recreational and wellbeing functions
    - Conflict with Local Plan policies allocating nearby land for Country Park extension
    - Public rights of way routes would be degraded into "industrial corridors"
  4. Biodiversity & Ecology
    - Risk of creating a "biodiversity island", severing ecological connectivity with the Country Park
    - Additional noise, light and vibration may affect SSSIs at Great Stukeley, the Racecourse and Portholme
  5. Traffic, Highways & Emergency Access
    - Approx. 2,448 HGV movements/day, plus LGVs and employee vehicles, would exceed network capacity
    - Severe risk of delays to ambulances accessing Hinchingsbrooke Hospital, already subject to congestion on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road
    - No independent, comprehensive traffic or blue light impact assessment has been completed despite requests
    - A141 existing layby removal would limit opportunities for goods vehicles waiting to enter the site
  6. Flooding & Drainage
    - Concerns over increased surface water runoff from 126 ha of hardstanding, risking A141 and downstream impacts
    - Uncertainty over foul drainage capacity at Godmanchester WRC
  7. Public Engagement
    - Direct public engagement by the applicant is considered insufficient
  8. Economic Concerns
    - The applicant's projected £9.8m business rates uplift is believed to be overstated; council officers now estimate £5–£6m
    - Concerns over inconsistent or misleading applicant statements about employment numbers and economic benefits.
  9. Community Impacts
    - Fears of noise, light pollution, visual intrusion ("cruise ship like" warehouses), and falling house values.
    - Strong objections to the proposed A141 underpass, citing safety, crime risk and anti-social behaviour

If members are minded to approve the application, the Residents' Association requests:

- The removal or reduction of the nearest warehouses (particularly 2e and 3d) or as a fall-back, siting these buildings 100m further away from the A141/nearby homes
- Restricted operations to daytime hours only (no 24/7 use)
- A full, independent traffic assessment before approval
- Replacing the proposed A141 underpass with a Toucan crossing
- S106 funding for a second access road to the Hinchingsbrooke estate
- Construction traffic bans on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road/Views Common Road; enforceable weight limits and ANPR

- Road signage strategy to direct traffic (goods vehicles in particular) away from the A1307 Views Common Road
- Noise mitigation conditions
- Retention and protection of an onsite Giant Redwood tree
- Provision of a strong evergreen landscape buffer to the A141/nearby homes
- Colour and appearance to be agreed with residents
- Alternative cycleway/footpath routes that avoid residential intrusion
- A penalty clause if visual screening claims prove incorrect.

6.7 In addition to the two rounds of consultation undertaken by the Council, in accordance with best practice the applicant undertook their own public consultation prior to submitting their application. This ran from 13 June to 6 July 2025 and included a dedicated website, two drop-in exhibitions, and a variety of feedback channels including by email, via freephone, and social media. In total, 2,926 flyers were distributed, social media adverts reached nearly 19,500 accounts, and 284 unique visitors accessed the project website. The consultation generated 148 pieces of feedback, with 68 attendees at the exhibitions. According to the applicant's Statement of Community Involvement, feedback revealed mixed views: nearly half of respondents supported the proposals, citing job creation, economic growth, and sustainability benefits, while just over a third opposed them, raising concerns about traffic congestion, noise, and loss of farmland.

## 7. ASSESSMENT

7.1 When determining planning applications, it is necessary to establish what weight should be given to each plan's policies in order to come to a decision. The following legislation, government policy and guidance outline how this should be done.

7.2 As set out within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Section 38(6)) and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Section 70(2)) in dealing with planning applications the Local Planning Authority shall have regard to have provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. This is reiterated within the NPPF (2024). The development plan is defined in Section 38(3)(b) of the 2004 Act as "the development plan documents (taken as a whole) that have been adopted or approved in that area". Section 70(2) also requires, as a matter of law, local finance considerations to be taken into account, defined in this instance as any sums that the Council could receive in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy.

7.3 In Huntingdonshire the Development Plan (relevant to this application) consists of:

- Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 (2019)
- The Stukeleys Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2036
- Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2026 (whose spatial area in respect of this application is limited to the proposed site access)
- Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021)

7.4 The statutory term 'material considerations' has been broadly construed to include any consideration relevant in the circumstances which bears on the use or development of the land: *Cala Homes (South) Ltd v Secretary of State* for

Communities and Local Government & Anor [2011] EWHC 97 (Admin); [2011] 1 P. & C.R. 22, per Lindblom J. Whilst accepting that the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the Development Plan, paragraph 2 confirms that it is a material consideration and significant weight is given to this in determining applications.

7.5 The main issues to consider in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of development
- Access Matters
- Flood Risk, Drainage and Water
- Landscape and Design Considerations
- Residential Amenity
- Biodiversity and Ecology
- Trees and Hedgerows
- Heritage
- Developer Contributions
- Other matters

### **Principle of development**

7.6 Local Plan Policy LP1 sets out the target of approximately 14,400 additional jobs during the plan period whilst Policy LP2 directs the majority of employment growth to the Spatial Planning Areas (SPA). The application site relates to the Huntingdon SPA at which Policy LP7 sets out the types of development which are supported on unallocated sites.

7.7 The existing Hinchbrooke Business Park is identified on the Local Plan Policies Map as an Established Employment Area, thereby engaging Local Plan Policy LP18 and notably, the first paragraph of that policy:

“Areas of land and buildings that contribute to the local economy and provide on-going employment opportunities have been identified as Established Employment Areas. **A proposal for business development (class 'B') will be supported** on land within an Established Employment Area or **on land immediately adjoining and capable of being integrated with an Established Employment Area.**” (author’s emphasis)

7.8 The proposed development would be immediately adjoining the existing Established Employment Area and would be integrated with it by virtue of:

- 7.8.1 The proposed new A141 roundabout, which would provide vehicular access to both sites;
- 7.8.2 A new pedestrian/cycleway underpass below the A141;
- 7.8.3 Appropriate place-making on the proposed development through both its parameter plans and its Design Code, to visually integrate with the existing business park

- 7.9 Consequently, the proposed development enjoys specific policy support from Local Plan LP18. Insofar as they are spatially relevant, Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan Policies E1 and E2 also provide support for the proposed development. Whilst Hinchingsbrooke Residents' Association's concerns in respect of prematurity are noted, given the policy support from Local Plan Policy LP18 and Government policy at NPPF paragraph 51, issues of prematurity are not considered to be engaged.
- 7.10 Against this specific policy support, Local Plan Policy LP10 more broadly seeks to use lower agricultural value land in preference to land of higher agricultural value, where possible avoiding the irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 1 to 3a). The applicant's Environmental Statement advises that 67ha of Grade 3a agricultural land would be lost, assessing this as a major adverse residual effect. This must temper the level of policy support derived from Local Plan Policy LP18 and the Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan.
- 7.11 Additionally, the site is located outside the 'Built-up Area' as defined at Policy 1 of The Stukeleys Neighbourhood Plan, which again provides a level of policy conflict.
- 7.12 Taking all the above into account, and noting the words "will be supported" in Policy LP18 compared with "where possible" in LP10, the proposed development is considered to comply with the spatial strategy of the Development Plan when read as a whole.

### **Access Matters**

- 7.13 Local Plan Policy LP16 seeks to ensure that developers fully consider how the opportunities and impacts of the range of travel and transport modes are addressed in their proposals. Local Plan Policy LP17 sets out that a proposal will be supported where it incorporates appropriate space for vehicle movements, facilitates accessibility for service and emergency vehicles and incorporates adequate parking for vehicles and cycles.
- 7.14 Concerns raised by the Parish and Town Councils, Hinchingsbrooke Residents' Association and neighbours in relation to existing and potential traffic issues are noted and addressed within this section of the report. Both the County Council and National Highways have sought clarifications and additional information during the course of the application, which has been submitted accordingly. The applicant has engaged with both bodies prior to and during the course of the application's consideration.

### Effect on the highway network

- 7.15 The applicant's Transport Assessment compares 2033 traffic conditions with and without the development, covering severance, pedestrian amenity, fear and intimidation, road safety, and delays for drivers and non-motorised users. Baseline surveys show existing traffic levels, safety records, and receptor sensitivities, with most major roads near the site having few or no sensitive receptors other than the accident cluster sites at the A1/A141 Brampton Hut roundabout and the Ermine Street/A141 junction. Construction traffic in 2027 was found to generate low daily movements relative to the local network, finding no significant construction-stage impacts.

- 7.16 Their assessment concludes that post-completion the development's transport impacts would be negligible across all topics. Although some links on the A141 and A14 would see increases in traffic flow, these changes would remain well below thresholds for significant severance, amenity change, or increased fear and intimidation, and occur on routes without sensitive receptors. Implications on road safety, driver delay, and pedestrian delay are all expected to remain at negligible levels, reflecting adequate network capacity and resilient junction performance. The applicant's assessment finds that residual and cumulative effects would be negligible.
- 7.17 They also point out that there is already a 7.5T weight limit on Views Common Road, and that traffic volumes on the A141 (Brampton Hut to Spittals Interchange) have fallen by more than 50% since the A14 Huntingdon southern bypass opened, releasing significant capacity on that route:

A141 Flow Comparison							
	AM Peak (0800-0900)			PM Peak (1700-1800)			Approx AADT
	EB	WB	2-Way	EB	WB	2-Way	2-Way
2016 (WebTRIS)	1,168	1,255	2,423	1,443	1,700	3,143	42,500
2025 (Observed)	1,057	757	1,813	744	1,022	1,766	21,000
<b>DIFFERENCE</b>	-111	-498	-609	-698	-678	-1,376	-21,500

- 7.18 The applicant's highway assessment is challenged in a number of public consultation responses and by Hinchingsbrooke Residents' Association, who raise particular concerns about the development's effects on the already congested Hinchingsbrooke Park Road/Views Common Road signalised junction and more widely on the A1307 between Spittals Interchange through the town and eastwards out towards Fenstanton. Concerns in respect of new traffic on the A141, particularly goods vehicles, are also raised. Huntingdon Town Council recommends specific mitigation measures, whilst Brampton Parish Council raises concerns at the potential use of Thrapston Road by heavy goods vehicles to access the site. Alconbury Parish Council considers key junctions require new surveys and full modelling (e.g., Brampton Hut, A14 slips), whilst the applicant's assumption that 80% of HGVs would travel west is not evidenced and the worker travel assumptions use 2011 Census data, not 2021, making them outdated and unreliable. They are also concerned at the potential for additional rat-running on rural lanes, particularly at times of congestion (including when there are delays on the trunk road network).
- 7.19 In robustly assessing the proposed development, the Local Highway Authority has interrogated the applicant's traffic modelling and during the course of the application requested additional information/clarifications. Notwithstanding some remaining disagreement in respect of the modelling of peak time A141 queues north of Spittals Interchange, in principle the Local Highway Authority is content with the three strands of mitigation that the applicant has proposed:

- 7.19.1 A comprehensive Bus Strategy  
 The principle of this has been agreed by the applicant, the Local Highway Authority and the Combined Authority. Optionality for either a

directly-procured service or a publicly-subsidised service (both of which would be acceptable to the Combined Authority and Local Highway Authority) would be set out in the Section 106 agreement, subject to the cost of provision for a 5-year period being capped at the figures provided by the CPCA:

• Year 1:	£ 137,500
• Year 2:	£ 137,500
• Year 3:	£ 585,000
• Year 4:	£ 550,000
• Year 5:	£ 550,000
Total:	£1,960,000

Huntingdon Town Council's request for a requirement to consult with the CPCA and Cambridgeshire Bus Alliance ahead of any reserved matters applications on the location, number, and equipment of bus shelters given likely usage patterns at the site is noted, which can be incorporated within the relevant Section 106 obligation.

#### 7.19.2

##### A141 junction improvements

The applicant's Transport Statement identified junction improvements on the A141 north of Spittals Interchange as being necessary to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development:

- The A141/Ermine Street roundabout
- The A141/Washingley Road roundabout
- The A141/Kings Ripton Road signalised junction

Following extensive discussions with the applicant and receipt of a Stage 1 Road Safety audit on the A141/Ermine Street roundabout redesign, the Local Highway Authority has agreed the general arrangement principles for each of these capacity improvements.

The applicant proposes the direct delivery of these works, but with the flexibility for the Local Highway Authority to instead call-down the equivalent cost of those works to be spent on alternative mitigation as the Local Highway Authority identifies as appropriate.

General arrangement plans for each of the three junctions are appended, which give an indication of the nature and type of improvement works envisaged.

The cost of improving the three junctions as shown has been costed by the applicant as being £3,000,000.

#### 7.19.3

##### Improvements to footway/cycleway links

(see paragraph 7.33 below)

7.20 Alconbury Parish Council's concerns in respect of potential cumulative highways impacts in the context of the wider North Huntingdon Growth Arc are noted, but are read in the context that each application must be considered on its own merits and that wider strategic matters lie within the scope of the emerging Local Plan, not discrete planning applications.

- 7.21 National Highways initially requested additional information in respect of the operation of the signals at the A1/A141 Brampton Hut roundabout. That information has been submitted by the applicant and considered by National Highways, who have confirmed that the modelling is representative and that the results are therefore reliable. National Highways are content that the Local Planning Authority can secure mitigation at the Brampton Hut roundabout works by condition.
- 7.22 Huntingdon Town Council has additionally requested specific mitigation measures, comprising:
- Funding for improved signage for and enforcement of the weight limit on the A1307 between Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Spittals interchange
  - A requirement for a contribution to improving active travel infrastructure across Huntingdon for workers coming to the development so that the targets for pedestrian and cycle traffic are met – see paragraph 7.35 below
- 7.23 Cllr David Shaw has similarly requested mitigation by way of:
- Improved signage for the weight limit on the A1307 between Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Spittals Interchange
  - Weight limit enforcement measures via ANPR, with appropriate funding via an S106 agreement
- 7.24 A Goods Vehicle Signage Strategy could be secured by way of the submission of an appropriate scheme pursuant to a Section 106 obligation. The applicant has responded to the suggested ANPR enforcement provision by placing reliance on their traffic modelling's findings that goods vehicles could not lawfully and therefore would not use Views Common Road due to the existing weight limit; this is disputed by Hinchingsbrooke Residents Association. They further advise that there would be no operational or commercial imperative to do so given occupiers would want their supply chains to be as efficient as possible. The potential for 'wrong turns' onto the local road network could be mitigated through contractual monitoring agreements between the applicant and end occupiers, with commercial enforcement measures in place (e.g. barred routes and the correct programming of Sat Navs). Whilst this explanation is noted, none of these commercial measures would be enforceable by the Local Planning Authority.
- 7.25 Taking all the above (including mitigation) into account, in terms of Government policy the NPPF at paragraph 116 is clear:
- “Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.”
- 7.26 Subject to conditions and Section 106 obligations to secure appropriate offsite highway mitigation works, in principle the proposed development's residual cumulative impacts on the road network would not demonstrably be severe (NPPF paragraph 116) and are considered to be in accordance with Local Plan Policy LP16 and Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan Policies E1 and TT1.

#### Proposed new A141 roundabout

- 7.27 Replacing the existing left-in, left-out access to Hinchingsbrooke Business Park with a new roundabout would improve its access to/from the West, and in particular from the A14. It would integrate both employment areas from an access perspective. To provide appropriate approach alignments, the applicant proposes to realign the existing A141 and move it slightly further away from the existing homes at Hinchingsbrooke (not greater than 37m), resulting in the loss of existing trees on the north-western side of the dual carriageway.
- 7.28 The Local Highway Authority has confirmed that the proposed new roundabout and A141 realignment are acceptable in design terms, subject to a new Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to reduce the speed limit. Cambridgeshire Constabulary is supportive of this and the TRO could be secured by Section 106 agreement.
- 7.29 The proposed complex features such as embankments, vehicle restraint systems, and an underpass form part of the access design, which the Local Highway Authority has also confirmed are acceptable in principle. Detailed design elements (drainage, underpass, earthworks) would need to be agreed before works begin, which could be secured by condition.
- 7.30 A separate agreement would need to be entered into under the Highways Act 1980 (Section 278) ahead of any works to the public highway. The applicant's Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and designer's response has been scrutinised by the Local Highway Authority who confirm there are no unmitigable issues. Drainage principles are provided but full details must accompany the Stage 2 Safety Audit, which would be undertaken as part of the Section 278 process.
- 7.31 The applicant's assessment of existing lay-bys concludes these are no longer required due to alternative nearby facilities and the A141 no longer being a trunk road; the Local Highway Authority supports this conclusion, albeit this does not align with the view of Huntingdon Town Council or Hinchingsbrooke Residents Association who would prefer the retention of these facilities. National Highways has not expressed a view either way, the A141 no longer being a trunk road in this location.
- 7.32 Subject then to conditions the proposed means of access would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety (NPPF paragraph 116) and would be acceptable Local Plan Policy LP17 and Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan Policies E1 and TT1.

#### Cycling and pedestrian links

- 7.33 In order to maximise the potential for employees to walk or cycle to work, the proposed development would include the following direct links to nearby homes:
- A new footway/cycleway under the A141 connecting the development to Flamstead Drive to the east;
  - Improvements to the existing A1307 overbridge, connecting the development to the 1,000 new homes being constructed to the north at Ermine Street;
  - Improvements to the existing east-west footpath within Hinchingsbrooke Country Park, providing a new/improved hardsurfaced route 4.0m wide from the existing A141 underpass towards Hinchingsbrooke Park Road

- 7.34 These improved pedestrian/cyclist routes would integrate the existing and proposed employment areas from a connectivity perspective, and could respectively be secured through conditions and Section 106 obligations.
- 7.35 The County Council's Rights of Way Officer has recommended conditions and sought clarification on proposed resurfacing and dual-use pedestrian/cyclist routes within the site, which the applicant has provided but upon which at reconsultation the Rights of Way Officer has made no further comment. Officers consider the Rights of Way Officer's comments have been satisfactorily addressed.
- 7.36 Huntingdon Town Council has requested a contribution to improving active travel infrastructure across Huntingdon for workers coming to the development so that the targets for pedestrian and cycle traffic are met, in accordance with Policy TT1 of their Neighbourhood Plan. In response the applicant points to their proposed new underpass and link to Flamsteed Drive as well as the proposed improvements to the footway/cycleway through the Country Park. A Travel Plan condition is recommended which would include measures to maximise walking and cycling.
- 7.37 The Town Council has further asked that consideration be given to the impact of flooding on the proposed A141 underpass including alternative routes during flooding. A detailed design review (including drainage) would be undertaken the Local Highway Authority under their Highways Act responsibilities, and it is noted that an alternative access would remain via the existing A1307 overbridge to the north. Whilst the Town Council and Residents' Association's request for an at-grade A141 crossing (such as a Toucan crossing) has been considered, this has been ruled out by the Local Highway Authority on safety grounds. Similarly, whilst the Residents' Association's request for alternative footway/cycleway arrangements to be explored as an alternative to the proposed Flamsteed Drive link are noted, the proposed development must be considered on its own merits and case law provides that consideration of alternatives is only relevant and necessary where there is clear planning harm, which is not considered to be engaged in this instance (Trusthouse Forte v SSE (1987)). Cambridgeshire Police have raised no objection to the proposed underpass and have submitted no evidence to suggest that the existing A141 underpass further to the south is itself a crime or disorder hotspot; the applicant also points out that alternative alignments put forward by residents would cross third party land not within the applicant's ownership or control, the delivery of which could not be conditioned or guaranteed.
- 7.38 Subject to conditions and Section 106 obligations to secure offsite footway/cycleway improvements, the proposed development is considered to comply with Local Plan Policies LP16 and LP17, and Policy TT1 of the Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan.

#### Leisure routes

- 7.39 As well as the proposed improvements to the existing east-west footpath within Hinchingsbrooke Country Park, the applicant proposes new paths through the development's substantial new landscaping and open spaces, including a circular path connecting with the Country Park. These are shown in broad terms on the submitted parameter plans and can be secured in detail through the reserved matters process.

- 7.40 The proposed green infrastructure network is considered to be strong and includes 10m wide multifunctional green corridors, publicly accessible routes and improved links to surrounding countryside and Hinchingsbrooke Country Park. Proposals for public car parking within green corridors is welcomed, subject to sensitive screening at reserved matters stage. A signage strategy linking to the Country Park and rights of network is recommended.
- 7.41 Comments received from the Friends of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park seek clarity on the proposed footway/cycleway enhancements through the Country Park. The applicant has liaised with the Council on this, with a specification for hardsurfacing improvements being set by the Council's Leisure Health & Environment Team. Those improvements could be secured by Section 106 agreement, including a timeline for the applicant's direct delivery of the works in accordance with the Council's specification. The proposed works would complement the works already approved in the Council's own enhancements scheme (25/00577/FUL). The Alconbury Flood Group's comments in respect of footpath flooding at the existing A141 underpass are noted, including their constructive advice on potential solutions; those comments are echoed by the Friends of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park who are also concerned that the detailed design of any upgraded link would need to be of a flood resilient design. This would not be the only footway/cycleway link from the principal urban area to the site, with convenient alternatives available during times of highest flood levels.
- 7.42 In summary, the proposed development complies with Local Plan policies LP16 and LP17 relating to transport, access arrangements, and parking provision, and Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan Policy TT1, subject to conditions and Section 106 obligations.

### **Flood Risk, Drainage and Water**

- 7.43 Local Plan Policy LP5 sets out that a proposal will only be supported where all forms of flood risk have been addressed. Policies LP6 and LP15 set out the Council's approach to wastewater and surface water management.

#### Surface water drainage

- 7.44 The applicant proposes a network of new onsite drainage ponds and swales as the key features of a comprehensive onsite sustainable urban drainage system, which would result in increased wetland planting and biodiversity enhancement. This approach is supported in principle by the relevant technical consultees.
- 7.45 During the course of the application amendments and additional information were sought from the Lead Local Flood Authority, Internal Drainage Board and the Ellington Flood Group. In response the applicant submitted a revised outline drainage strategy, updated the parameters plan and provided additional detailed calculations. Following a subsequent detailed assessment there is now no technical objection to the proposed development on flood risk or drainage grounds.
- 7.46 The Lead Local Flood Authority is specifically supportive of the use of attenuation basins and swales given that these have a valuable water quality treatment function as well as controlling the rate of surface water leaving the site.

- 7.47 The Alconbury Flood Group's initial comments have been taken into account in the applicant's revised proposed surface water drainage strategy, which the Group has welcomed. Notably their comments have resulted in increased attenuation capacity for the southern part of the site and restrictions on surface water run-off rates. Their recommendation that a maintenance regime is conditioned reflects the same advice received from the Environment Agency.
- 7.48 The Friends of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park note that the Park regularly floods but accept that, if properly implemented and maintained, the proposed surface water drainage strategy design would avoid increasing flood risk or siltation in HCP.

#### Foul drainage

- 7.49 Given existing treatment capacity constraints at Anglian Water's water treatment works the applicant proposes an onsite treatment facility. There is no objection to this from either Anglian Water or the Environment Agency, subject to an overarching foul drainage strategy condition and noting that any discharges are regulated under a separate environmental permitting regime.

#### Potable water

- 7.50 The application site falls within an area of water stress. Anglian Water has underlined that there is no legal requirement for them to supply fresh water for industrial processes if doing so puts the supply of water for domestic uses at risk. The company currently restricts daily non-domestic water supply to 20 cubic metres per occupier, albeit this position may change once strategic water infrastructure including the Fens Reservoir is in place. Consequently, a condition requiring a strategic water resources strategy is recommended, which both Anglian Water and the applicant are content with in principle, and which provides the opportunity for innovative solutions to be explored which may reduce overall water demand.
- 7.51 With the above, the proposed development is considered to satisfy the requirements of the NPPF and Local Plan policies LP5, LP6 and LP15 in relation to flood risk subject to the recommended conditions.

#### **Landscape and Design Considerations**

- 7.52 Policies LP11 and LP12 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 state that developments should respond positively to their context, draw inspiration from the key characteristics of its surroundings and contribute positively to the area's character and identity. Policy LP10(b) says all development in the countryside must recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Furthermore, the Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD (2017) contains place making principles for 'big box' buildings, this being a general term for any development incorporating office, industrial, retail or warehouses.

#### Landscape

- 7.53 The submitted Environmental Statement includes a full landscape and visual impact assessment, including wireline visualisations from several viewpoints (agreed with Officers in advance). This document has been subject to independent review by the Council's Landscape Consultant, who during the course of the application recommended revisions to minimise landscape impact.

- 7.54 In response the applicant has submitted revised parameter plans reducing the maximum proposed building height in selected locations by 3m, which would allowing the treed ridge line to remain visible. This does not alter the overall level of effect but represents an improvement over the original parameters and is an improvement over the original submission from certain key viewpoints including Church Close and footpath 16 south of Great Stukeley.
- 7.55 Having assessed the revised information the Council's Landscape Consultant has confirmed they have no landscape objection, subject to conditions and recommendations. In reaching this balanced conclusion they note that moderate adverse residual effects on users of some rights of way and nearby residents would remain, and that there would be a long-term loss of tranquillity and visual amenity. Disagreement remains over the level of effect on the Central Claylands Landscape Character Area, although the Council's Landscape Consultant accepts the applicant has explored reasonable mitigation options.
- 7.56 The Council's Landscape Consultant recommends a substantial suite of conditions, including:
- Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).
  - Advanced structural planting prior to commencement.
  - 5-year Landscape Management Plan with monitoring and review.
  - Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP).
  - Detailed earthworks strategy.
  - Phased landscaping implementation and replacement.
  - Detailed soft and hard landscaping schemes.
- 7.57 The proposed development heights were reduced during the pre-application stage in discussion with your officers, and then reduced further following submission of the planning application in response to detailed comments from Officers and other stakeholders. Heights were originally tested at 24m to ridge across all three development plateaux. The reduced parameters now propose heights of 24m to ridge on just one part of Plateau A, with heights falling to 21m to ridge on the rest of Plateau A and all of Plateau B, and to 18m to ridge on Plateau C. These height reductions have been welcomed by Officers.
- 7.58 Notwithstanding these conditions and the applicant's proposed landscape mitigation measures, residual moderate adverse landscape and visual effects would remain, for up to Year 15 post-development. The Landscape Consultant advises that this harm is not sufficient to warrant planning permission being refused on landscape grounds but rather, the residual harm should be weighed in the planning balance.

#### Urban Design

- 7.59 The applicant has submitted a detailed Design & Access Statement, an Environmental Colour Assessment, and an 83-page Design Code. These documents are supported and considered fit for purpose. The Design Code provides high-level controls to ensure that future reserved matters applications meet the high design quality objectives set out in the Design & Access Statement and includes comprehensive prescriptions for:
- Strategic landscaping
  - Green corridors and SuDS

- Ecology and biodiversity enhancement
- Gateway spaces and landscape bunds
- Plot-level landscape design (employee spaces, cycle parking, level changes)

7.60 Having reviewed the applicant's revised parameter plans and Design Code, the Urban Design Officer acknowledges that these address many of their initial comments and represent a significant improvement on the initial submission. The updated Design Code now includes:

- Clear mandatory requirements,
- Stronger controls on façade articulation (30–40m intervals),
- Defined character areas:
  - Strategic Distribution Core
  - Flexible Employment Quarter

7.61 The two proposed primary character areas are supported:

- Strategic Distribution Core – large-format logistics with deep setbacks and strong structural planting.
- Flexible Employment Quarter – smaller-scale employment with more human-scaled frontages and amenity planting.

Key differentiators between character areas (setbacks, articulation frequency, landscaping depth, public realm quality) have been clearly defined and are supported in design terms. A detailed Environmental Colour Assessment submitted with the application has been taken into account and would continue to provide a useful guide as to the most appropriate external colours at reserved matters stage.

7.62 The proposed site framework of developable areas, green corridors and movement routes is broadly supported, as is a proposed continuous north–south Green Movement Corridor (39.5m wide) and green corridors of between 10m and 20m between development parcels. The cross-sections, planting palettes and drainage details submitted by the applicant provide helpful information.

#### Impact on Hinchingsbrooke Country Park

7.63 Huntingdon Town Council's consultation response sets out a requirement that there be no negative impact on Hinchingsbrooke Country Park, and that the issues raised from the Friends of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park about the number of connections between the park and the new park areas are addressed to the Council's satisfaction.

7.64 In respect of the Friends of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park's comments, these can broadly be summarised as ecology concerns (see report paragraph 7.88 onwards); water management (see report paragraph 7.47); and proposed bridleway/footpath improvements through the park (see report paragraph 7.39 above).

7.65 Within the applicant's Environmental Statement is a Zone of Theoretical Influence diagram which shows that Bob's Wood and topography would screen the proposed development from most viewpoints within the Country Park. Whilst the development would theoretically be visible from parts of the lake to the south, and the green fields between the lake and Brampton, these are not part of the Park itself. The applicant

has submitted wireframe photography demonstrating the efficacy of existing landscape planting from this location.

- 7.66 Taking all the above into account, subject to the conditions recommended within this report, the proposal is considered to broadly accord with the Design Guide SPD (2017) and Policies LP11 and LP12 of the Local Plan, albeit there is not full policy compliance as some residual landscape harm would remain. The extent to which that harm is contrary to Local Plan Policies LP10(b), LP11 and LP12, and Policies NE3 and BE1 of the Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan (insofar as they spatially apply) must be weighed in the planning balance.

### **Amenity**

- 7.67 Policy LP14 of the Local Plan states that a proposal will be supported where a high standard of amenity is provided for all users and occupiers of the proposed development and maintained for users and occupiers of neighbouring land and buildings. Policy LP10(c) says that development in the countryside must not give rise to noise, odour, obtrusive light or other impacts that would adversely affect the use and enjoyment of the countryside by others.
- 7.68 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has undertaken a detailed assessment of the applicant's supporting information. Comments submitted by nearby residents raising amenity concerns in respect of noise, disturbance, air quality and light pollution have all been carefully noted.

### Noise & Vibration

- 7.69 The applicant has submitted a detailed Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment which concludes that the worst case construction noise and vibration is likely to meet the requirements of BS 5228:2009 +A1:2014 and unlikely to exceed a minor impact. This is with the exception of roadworks to re-align the A141 which are likely to impact the nearest residential properties during their construction. The timing of these works and mitigation measures to ensure any impact is acceptable will need to be considered within the relevant phase CEMP.
- 7.70 Piling activities would need to be covered within the CEMP and in line with the applicant's submitted assessments, which advised that if piling is required in the vicinity of dwellings, auger piling must be used. For the avoidance of doubt a specific Piling Method Statement condition is recommended.
- 7.71 In terms of noise once the scheme is occupied, the applicant's assessment is based on assumptions given that the detailed design will not be proposed until reserved matters stage. Whilst (based on those assumptions) no significant effects have been identified, this could change during the detailed design and accordingly an assessment would need to be undertaken with each reserved matters application to ensure no significant effects occur at noise sensitive receptors; this can be conditioned. The proposed re-alignment of the A141 would achieve a slight noise betterment for neighbouring residents as this dual carriageway moves further away from them with reduced speeds.
- 7.72 The Environmental Health Officer supports this approach and recommends a condition that a further noise impact assessment is required to support any reserved

matters application. In doing so they highlight that the BS4142 assessment demonstrates that the rating level from commercial/industrial activities at the units is likely to be more than 10 dB below the background sound level during the daytime and night-time periods at the nearest noise sensitive receptors. Achieving a demonstrable noise rating level of 10dB below background at nearest residential receptors in line with BS4142 should form part of the recommended condition, to ensure no significant effects from noise and/or vibration occur at noise sensitive receptors.

- 7.73 This also reflects Huntingdon Town Council's recommendation that there is a full noise impact assessment ahead of any reserved matters application, and appropriate mitigations identified in that assessment are included in those assessments. The Town Council's recommendation that there be noise mitigation measures such as noise abatement boards to cover Flamsteed Drive would be subject to detailed design at reserved matters stage, itself subject to further public consultation at that point.

#### Lighting

- 7.74 The Environmental Health Officer notes that construction lighting is included as part of the framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and will be included in phase CEMPs. This can be controlled by condition.

- 7.75 In terms of permanent "operational" lighting they note the applicant's conclusion that there would not be any significant adverse impact for operational lighting if best practice measures are followed. In practical terms this means that, as reserved matters applications come forward, detailed lighting designs should comply with the lighting strategy and include a luminaire schedule and plan; a modelled prediction of lighting levels and obtrusive light (including horizontal and vertical isolines) at sensitive receptors to confirm the requirements of the lighting strategy have been achieved. A condition to ensure this information is submitted is recommended, which would have a number of requirements including:

- Protection of nearby homes from light spillage (Local Plan Policy LP14)
- Minimising the intrusion of light spill into the surrounding countryside (Local Plan Policy LP10(c))
- Protecting ecologically notable dark corridors (see report paragraph 7.111)

#### Air Quality

- 7.76 The Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the submitted Air Quality Impact Assessment, advising a construction dust risk assessment has been submitted along with appropriate construction dust mitigation measures. These would need to be included in the relevant Construction Environmental Management Plans to safeguard air quality during construction, and can be secured by condition.

- 7.77 The applicant's assessment concludes that the impact on air quality from the proposals would not be significant and advises some Travel Plan Measures to minimise impact; this conclusion has been critically assessed by the Environmental Health Officer. They advise that the proposed development would be unlikely to breach air quality objectives, and that nearby sensitive receptors would not be subject to levels above the objectives. Even so, current advice from public health experts is that the health impacts of air pollution should be minimised, even if there is no risk that air quality objectives will be breached. This is supported by both national and

local planning policies promoting air quality improvements and minimisation of impacts.

- 7.78 Notwithstanding that they judge the likely effect on air quality to be insignificant, the Environmental Health Officer advises that consideration is given to the application of good design and good practice measures during the detailed design phase, including:
- Promoting active travel and ensuring good cycling and walking infrastructure (preferably away from roads) to reduce reliance on vehicle use – this has been discussed.
  - The provision of electric vehicle rapid charge points/infrastructure,
  - Access to public transport,
  - Good property insulation,
  - Low emission design.
- 7.79 In the event that matters change significantly during the detailed design phase, for example a significant increase in the number of vehicles trip being generated and/or significant combustion-based plant or industrial emissions sources be proposed, a further air quality assessment would be required as part of the appropriate reserved matters application. These matters can all be controlled by conditions.

#### Overshadowing and overbearing impacts

- 7.80 Local residents have raised concerns at the potential for the proposed development to have an overshadowing or overbearing effect on their homes. Huntingdon Town Council's consultation responses asks that consideration be given for the effect on residents of the Hinchbrooke estate of units 2E and 3D, suggesting the removal of these units, or, if unsuitable, a requirement that these are restricted in height to become the development's lowest buildings.
- 7.81 Cllr David Shaw's consultation response proposes a maximum height cap of 18.5 metres across the whole logistics park as a reasonable compromise. This has been put to the applicant, who has responded by pointing out that this height cap is already proposed for a third of the developable area (Plateau C), which is the most elevated and visually sensitive part of the Site, and also the closest to Hinchbrooke residences (albeit still some 150 metres away). Their position is there is a commercial imperative to be able to deliver some buildings at their maximum proposed heights.
- 7.82 Existing homes east of the site at Flamstead Drive, Bliss Court, Meadow Rise, The Shrubbery and The Glades are on the opposite side of the A141 dual carriageway, alongside which the linear landscaping (comprising existing trees/shrubs) would remain. Assessment of the proposed parameters plans reveals that the closest proposed building would be not less than 150m away, beyond that existing landscaping. Whilst objections to this impact from residents have been noted, given the separation distance and intervening landscaping this is not considered to be an inherently unacceptable relationship.
- 7.83 Waterloo Farm and two further dwellings are approximately 300m to the north-east. Whilst there would be no significant overshadowing or overbearing impact on those properties, nonetheless the visual presence of the proposed development in what is currently an expansive, open setting would be a substantial change. The applicant's visualisations demonstrate the magnitude of that impact and that landscape screening would not provide effective mitigation until approximately 15 years of

growth. This medium-term harm would be contrary to Local Plan Policy LP14(b) and must be weighed in the planning balance.

#### Construction impacts

- 7.84 The applicant has submitted a Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan which proposes construction times of 07:00 – 19:00 hours Monday to Friday & 07:00 – 16:00 hours on Saturdays. The Environmental Health Officer notes that these differ from those within the applicant's Noise Impact Assessment which are 08:00 – 18:00 Mon – Fri and 08:00 – 13:00 on Saturdays. The shorter construction times set out in the Noise Impact Assessment are those which have been assessed in detail and consequently, a condition is recommended to limit construction to these hours only. A condition is also recommended to require a specific detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan is approved for each development phase.
- 7.85 Huntingdon Town Council has requested a robust construction traffic management plan is agreed for the construction phase that prohibits anyone involved in construction from parking in or accessing residential areas outside the application site; this is reasonable and can form part of the approval process for each phase's detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan.

#### Contaminated Land

- 7.86 The submitted Geoenvironmental Desk Study Report identifies some potential contamination issues that would require further investigation prior to any development, including an intrusive ground investigation to assess the soil chemistry and ground gas and water characteristics, together with an asbestos survey of the remaining farm buildings prior to demolition and an intrusive ground investigation following their demolition. These can be secured by condition, along with any necessary remediation.
- 7.87 Summarising all of the above, subject to the recommended conditions, the proposal is considered to comply with Local Plan Policy LP14 and Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan Policy E1 with the exception of the medium term impact on Waterloo Farm and the adjacent dwellings, whereby conflict with Local Plan Policy LP14(b) must be weighed in the planning balance.

#### **Biodiversity and Ecology**

- 7.88 Local Plan Policy LP30 requires proposals to demonstrate that all potential adverse impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity have been investigated; to ensure no net loss in biodiversity; and provide a net gain where possible, through the planned retention, enhancement and creation of habitats and wildlife features, appropriate to the scale, type, and location of development. This aligns with the ecological and environmental policies at NPPF Section 15.
- 7.89 One internationally designated site lies within 2km of the site, namely the Portholme Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which has been designated for its lowland hay meadow habitat. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has been undertaken in respect of the SAC.
- 7.90 Four nationally designated sites lie within 2km:
- Brampton Racecourse SSSI
  - Brampton Meadow SSSI

- Portholme SSSI
- Great Stukeley Railway Cutting SSSI.

7.91 Seven non-statutory designated sites are also located within 2km, including Hinchingsbrooke Gravel Pits and parts of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park.

7.92 Whilst Natural England has raised no objection, the Friends of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park and other public consultation responses raise concerns in respect of the effect on bats and otters.

7.93 Given these ecological sensitivities, the extensive habitat and protected species information submitted by the applicant has been reviewed in detail by an independent Ecology Consultant appointed by the Council.

#### Baseline conditions

7.94 The site is predominantly intensive arable farmland, with additional habitats including:

- Hedgerows and field margins
- Lines of trees and areas of woodland
- Four ponds
- Ditches and a watercourse
- Farm buildings and hardstanding areas

7.95 The onsite habitats of highest ecological value identified in the applicant's Preliminary Ecological Appraisal comprise:

- The watercourse (a Priority Habitat of County-level importance)
- Mature and veteran trees (of County-level importance)
- Woodland, ponds, hedgerows and field margins (generally Local-level importance)

No hedgerows were classified as "important" under the Hedgerow Regulations. Approximately 500m of the A141 dual carriageway past the site is lit.

7.96 The applicant's Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identifies potential for protected and notable species, including:

- Bats – roosting potential identified in trees and some buildings; the site also provides suitable commuting and foraging habitat;
- Birds – breeding and wintering bird interest, with confirmed use by barn owl;
- Great crested newts – historic records within on-site ponds;
- Reptiles – suitable habitat present; potential for common species;
- Otters – potential for occasional use of the watercourse;
- Hedgehog and brown hare – both priority species recorded or considered likely to be present.

7.97 Additional surveys have therefore been recommended and undertaken for bats, birds, reptiles, amphibians and invertebrates. Water voles are considered unlikely to be present. These detailed reports have been assessed by the Council's Ecology Consultant, who has no objection to the survey methodologies and supports their findings.

#### Bats

- 7.98 Surveys identified common pipistrelle bats roosting in all three existing onsite buildings, being low-status but legally protected roosts. Four trees were inspected, with two having moderate potential (no bats present) and one low potential (no bats present). The wider site supports regular bat foraging and commuting, including common and soprano pipistrelles, Nathusius' pipistrelle, Myotis species, and occasional barbastelle/noctule-type bats.
- 7.99 The bat survey contained a range of recommendations which are supported by the Council's Ecology Consultant and can be summarised as:
- A bat licence will be required prior to the demolition of any roost-holding buildings
  - Demolition and clearance works must be avoided during the hibernation season (Nov–Feb).
  - Trees with roost potential must be checked immediately prior to removal.
  - Dark flight corridors to be maintained, and bat-friendly lighting ( $\leq 2700\text{K}$ , avoid uplighting) used
  - Bat boxes provided and bat-friendly planting as compensation/enhancement
  - A preconstruction bat survey should be undertaken to ensure any mitigation can reflect the situation immediately prior to works commencing
- 7.100 Whilst the Friends of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park's suggestion of restricted goods vehicle movements during dusk and dawn (April–October) and extend surveys to confirm bat commuting routes across the A141 are noted, these are not recommended or supported by the Council's Ecology Consultant. It is noted that the A141 is already lit passing the application site, and that vehicle volumes were more than double on this section of road prior to the A14 Huntingdon southern bypass opening. Notwithstanding these observations the Friends of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park continue to be concerned at the risk of bats being hit by vehicles on the A141, albeit this concern is not echoed by Natural England or the Council's Ecology Consultant.

#### Birds

- 7.101 Surveys recorded a diverse assemblage of farmland and hedgerow birds, including several red-listed species of conservation concern:
- Skylark (S41, Red-listed)
  - Yellowhammer (S41, Red-listed)
  - Linnet (Red-listed)
  - House sparrow (Red-listed)
  - Starling (Red-listed)
  - Song thrush (S41)
- 7.102 Common hedgerow/scrub species were also recorded (whitethroat, blackcap, chiffchaff, goldfinch), reflecting the mix of hedgerows, margins, scrub and small ponds. The site is considered at least Local importance for breeding birds due to habitat diversity and presence of declining farmland species. The hedgerow–rough grass–arable mosaic provides important winter foraging habitat, especially in an intensively farmed landscape.
- 7.103 Barn owl activity was recorded, with use of existing barns as roost/nest structures

and good foraging habitat in arable margins and rough grassland. Barn owls are treated as being of local importance.

#### Reptiles

- 7.104 The applicant's desk study returned one grass snake record (*Natrix helvetica*) 1.09 km south of the Site. Field surveys identified some suitable reptile habitat (arable margins, woodland edges, scrub). Seven survey visits were completed using 100 artificial refugia, checked between April–June 2025. No reptiles were recorded during any survey visit.

#### Amphibians and Invertebrates

- 7.105 The applicant's desk study returned 32 amphibian records within 2 km, including 28 great crested newt (GCN) records and 4 common frog records. A previous positive eDNA result for GCN (2019) exists for a pond on site. Four ponds were retested using DNA sampling, with three testing positive for GCN and the fourth Indeterminate due to lack of water (and therefore considered unsuitable for breeding). Common frogs were recorded in site ditches.
- 7.106 Because GCN are present a licence from Natural England would be required and an Impact Assessment Certificate for Planning (IACPC) will need to have been received by the Local Planning Authority, counter-signed by Natural England, prior to any planning permission being issued.

#### Water voles

- 7.107 A desk study identified one historical water vole record within 2 km of the site, located 230m west of the boundary. Field surveys found no suitable habitat for water vole within the site and no field signs (latrines, feeding remains, burrows, runways). The watercourses on site (ditches, Alconbury Brook) were recorded as largely unsuitable for water vole occupancy.

#### Otters

- 7.108 The Friends of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park highlight that otters were confirmed within the Country Park in 2025. The applicant's desk study confirms this, returned two otter records within 2 km and the closest being 10m south of the site, associated with the Alconbury Brook tributary. Field surveys found potentially suitable otter habitat along Alconbury Brook and Brampton Brook, plus some site ditches. No otter field signs (no spraints, slides, feeding remains, holts or couches). Although no individuals were detected on-site, the area forms part of a wider foraging and commuting corridor.
- 7.109 Potential long-term impacts on otters include disturbance from human activity and vehicle presence and pollution, particularly water quality effects. Controls would be required during construction to prevent pollution/run-off to Alconbury Brook and connected ditches and to manage noise, lighting, and disturbance in riparian areas. There would need to be permanent appropriate habitat management to maintain bankside vegetation and water quality once the development is occupied.
- 7.110 The Council's Ecology Consultant supports these controls. Additionally, the Friends of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park suggest maintaining a 10–15m riparian buffer along Alconbury Brook and keeping a dark buffer dark, in this location; these suggestions are reflected in the submitted parameters plans.

### Ecological protection, mitigation and enhancement measures

- 7.111 The applicant proposes to address potential onsite ecological impacts through:
- Avoidance of high-value habitats where possible, particularly woodland, watercourses, ponds, trees and hedgerows;
  - Timing vegetation clearance to avoid bird nesting;
  - Development focused on areas of lower ecological value, such as arable land;
  - Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to control impacts during construction;
  - Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) to secure long-term habitat management and monitoring;
  - Retention and enhancement of key habitat features and provision of new habitats, including hedgerows, ponds, wildflower grassland and ecological features such as bat boxes and log piles.
  - Licensing and mitigation strategies for bats and Great Crested Newts
  - New boxes for swifts, house sparrows, house martins and barn owls, incorporated within the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
  - Farmland Bird Mitigation Strategy incorporating the creation of 10 skylark plots (16–24 m<sup>2</sup> bare ground patches) on or adjacent to the site, away from hedges/trees
  - A Great Crested Newt Mitigation Strategy
  - A detailed Lighting Strategy
- 7.112 Whilst Huntingdon Town Council's suggestion of restricted goods vehicle movements during dusk and dawn (April–October) and extend surveys to confirm bat commuting routes across the A141 are noted, these are not recommended or supported by the Council's Ecology Consultant or by Natural England.
- 7.113 Subject to securing appropriate mitigation by condition the proposed development is considered to comply with Local Plan Policy LP30 and Policy NE3 of the Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan.

### Biodiversity Net Gain

- 7.114 In accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as inserted by the Environment Act 2021 and amended by the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023, this development is subject to the mandatory requirement to deliver at least a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). The submitted Biodiversity Metric Assessment demonstrates measurable net gains across all habitat types assessed.
- 7.115 In summary, the applicant proposes a 16.5% increase in habitat units overall, including a 15.6% increase in hedgerow units and a 21.1% increase in watercourse units. This is sufficient to demonstrate that a Biodiversity Net Gain can be delivered substantially in excess of the minimum requirement, and can be secured by condition.
- 7.116 Subject to securing Biodiversity Net Gain via conditions, the proposed development is considered to comply with Local Plan Policy LP30 and the requirements of the Environment Act 2021.

### **Trees and Hedgerows**

- 7.117 Policy LP31 of the Local Plan states a proposal will be required to demonstrate that the potential for adverse impacts on trees, woodland, hedges and hedgerows has been investigated and where development has any adverse impacts in these regards,

that they be minimised as far as possible. The applicant notes that the site is not located within a Conservation Area and there are no trees protected by TPO's present on site.

- 7.118 The Local Highway Authority has confirmed that, for the proposed new access roundabout to be formed, a section of the A141 to the south of that roundabout would need to be realigned westward into the site. This would inherently result in the loss of a substantial linear woodland parcel, to which the Tree Officer understandably raises concerns. In the absence of an acceptable alternative design solution, the harm caused by the unavoidable loss of that woodland (mitigated to some extent by significant areas of proposed new planting across the site) must be weighed in the planning balance.
- 7.119 Whilst the applicant's other onsite arboricultural proposals are largely acceptable, the Council's Tree Officer has expressed regret at the proposed loss of a large Category A Giant Redwood located centrally on the site. This concern is shared by Hinchingsbrooke Residents' Association. However, if the applicant is to provide the level development plateaux suitable for the proposed uses, that existing tree cannot be retained. In mitigation the applicant proposes to plant 6 no. replacement Giant Redwood trees (or similar native evergreen species such as Scots Pine or Juniper), which in principle the Tree Officer is content with. These can be secured by a specific condition, in addition to the usual conditions requiring landscaping reserved matters to be submitted and approved.
- 7.120 The Tree Officer also disagrees with some of the tree category assessments submitted by the applicant, notably in respect of mature willows adjacent to the river. Some of the Category A trees could be considered as veteran within the meanings set out in the Environment Act (relating to Biodiversity Net Gain) and the NPPF. In reflection of this conflict of professional judgement it is appropriate to require a programme of remedial works to these trees, to extend their lifespan; a condition is recommended accordingly. Suitable root protection zones could be identified, secured and controlled within the remit of future reserved matters applications.
- 7.121 Huntingdon Town Council requests tall tree planting on the eastern side of the A141 from Spittals Interchange to the racecourse to reduce the visual impact of the development from Hinchingsbrooke and Hinchingsbrooke Country Park and maintain the current wooded horizon. Land on the eastern side of the A141 falls outside the applicant's ownership or control, but it is noted that the submitted parameters plans provide for significant new tree planting on the western side of the A141 within the site, which would serve a similar purpose and can be secured at reserved matters stage.
- 7.122 Overall then despite proposed mitigation measures and the recommended conditions, the proposed development would result in the loss of mature trees and would not therefore fully comply with Local Plan Policy LP31 or Policies NE3 and BE1 of the Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan insofar as they spatially apply to the site. This harm must be weighed in the planning balance.

### **Heritage**

- 7.123 The decision on this application has to be made in accordance with section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (General duties as

respects listed buildings and Conservation Areas in exercise of planning functions). Section 66(1) states, *“In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority ... shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”*.

- 7.124 Section 16 of the NPPF (paragraphs 202 to 221) sets out principles and policies for conserving and enhancing the historic environment, in particular paragraph 212 which advises that ‘great weight’ should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets; and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Any harm to, or loss of significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification (paragraph 213). Paragraph 215 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 7.125 Paragraph 216 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- 7.126 Local Plan Policy LP34 similarly requires great weight and importance to be given to the conservation of heritage assets and their settings.

#### Listed buildings

- 7.127 Whilst there are no designated heritage assets on the application site itself, a 1.5km search surrounding the application site identifies:
- 4 Grade I listed buildings,
  - 2 Grade II\* listed buildings,
  - 48 Grade II listed buildings,
  - 5 Scheduled Monuments, and
  - 2 Conservation Areas.
- 7.128 The three Heritage Assets most likely to be impacted by the development are Waterloo Farmhouse (Grade II Listed), Church of St Bartholomew (Grade II\* Listed) and Alconbury House (Grade II Listed).

#### Waterloo Farmhouse

- 7.129 The development will be approximately 340m to the southeast of Waterloo Farmhouse. The Conservation Officer advises that the closer fields offer the best setting to the farmhouse and that the wider countryside setting to the farmhouse also makes a contribution to the significance of the listed building as part of its historic agricultural context. The applicant’s visualisations indicate that due to the relatively close proximity of the development to the listed building the proposed bund and tree planting is likely to offer moderately effective screening in the longer term. This could

be made more effective with further development of the types of planting and building finishes at the reserved matters stage.

Church of St Bartholomew (Grade II\* Listed)

- 7.130 The most significant setting to the Church of St Bartholomew is its churchyard. This is currently screened from the proposed development by thick planting to the south, located in the garden of Moat House. The planting is not protected though, and could be removed at any time or suffer natural degradation through disease or climate change. In anticipating long term conservation of the setting to the church it should not be relied upon to offer the same level of screening as at present. Without the existing planting the proposed development would form a dominant modern feature in the landscape, undermining the landscape setting and harming the significance of a traditional rural church. Taking a cautious approach, the potential harm to the significance of the church would be less than substantial.
- 7.131 More widely, the church is located on the southern edge of the ridge that forms the edge of the wide valley to the Alconbury Brook. The church tower is visible in wider views that will also include the proposed development which is therefore considered to be located in the wider setting to the church. The applicant's visualisations show that the church tower would be relegated to a secondary feature in the landscape against the massing, scale and bulk of the development. This would undermine the significance of the church being a key historic part of a small village in a rural landscape as it is currently experienced. Although the presence of other modern development is noted, consideration should be given to the contribution of the proposed development to the cumulative impact of 20th Century development within the setting of the church.
- 7.132 Historic England has specifically noted that the proposed development would be visually prominent within long-distance views, especially from Ermine Street, which would cause a permanent change to the character of the church's wider setting. As this is an outline application, Historic England advise that impacts might be reduced at reserved matters stage through:
- Detailed building design,
  - Landscaping, and
  - Materials

This would not, however, remove all their concerns. Both Historic England and the Council's Conservation Officer agreed that the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II\* listed church.

Alconbury House (Grade II listed)

- 7.133 Alconbury House is similarly built on the southern edge of the ridge overlooking the valley to Alconbury Brook. That siting was deliberate, designed to allow views from and to the house across associated parkland and countryside. The house was initially a neo-classical villa, likely built for Sir Peter Burnell (later Lord Gwydir) as part of the English landscape movement. Built on a T-plan it faces the valley with a two storey bay punctuated with 'picture' windows to make the most of the 'romantic' pastoral views. In the mid nineteenth century it was enlarged, taking on the form of a small country house.

7.134 The proposed development would sit within the wider setting to Alconbury House and be clearly visible in views from the house and garden. The distance between the development and the house (approximately 3.5km) would to some degree mitigate the visual impact in those views. However, given the elevation of Alconbury House the scale and extent of the development is unlikely to be successfully screened from view and would clearly feature in the middle distance. Consequently, the proposed development would undermine the landscape setting to Alconbury House which contributes to our understanding of its 'raison d'être' and evolution. Under the terms of the NPPF the harm to its significance would be less than substantial.

#### Archaeology

7.135 The applicant has undertaken a large onsite archaeological evaluation of 482 trenches which revealed multi-period activity from the Early Neolithic to the Late Roman period, concentrated in five main areas. Key findings were:

- Early Prehistoric: Very limited activity; one Early Neolithic flint assemblage and two Late Bronze Age pits.
- Middle Iron Age: Two small settlement zones with post-built structures, pits, and pottery. These appear short-lived.
- Late Iron Age–Early Roman: Major expansion with substantial enclosure systems, roundhouses, pits, and a Roman inhumation plus scattered human bone. Sites 2 and 5 represent significant settlement areas.
- Later Roman (2nd–4th century AD): Settlement contracted to a single dense zone (Site 3), with large enclosures and abundant pottery, fired clay, and animal bone.
- Medieval/Post-medieval: Mostly ridge-and-furrow, boundary ditches, and later quarry pits; limited finds.

7.136 The site contains multiple phases of prehistoric and Roman rural settlement, with the most substantial activity occurring in the Late Iron Age–Early Roman period and a strong later Roman focus in the west. Post-Roman use was entirely agricultural. The County Archaeologist has confirmed that the submitted archaeological evaluation report is satisfactory and that archaeological remains identified, while significant, are not of equivalent significance to a designated asset (as per NPPF footnote 75). A programme of archaeological excavation and recording and/or preservation in situ is appropriate, which can be secured by condition.

#### Conservation Areas

7.137 No material impact on the character and appearance of any Conservation Area, or its setting, has been identified by the Council's Conservation Officer.

7.138 Taking all the above into account, notwithstanding the conditions recommended within this report, the proposed development would cause harm to the settings of a number of designated heritages contrary to Local Plan Policy LP34. That harm must be weighed in the planning balance in accordance with NPPF paragraph 215.

#### **Developer Contributions**

7.139 The development would be CIL liable in accordance with the Council's adopted charging schedule, with the liability to be calculated once reserved matters have been approved for each phase.

7.140 In order to mitigate the site-specific impacts of the proposed development, the following Heads of Terms have been identified from various consultations responses and an Officer assessment:

#### Construction and End User Employment and Skills Plans

- Supported by monitoring on an agreed basis delivering significant employment and skills outcomes during both the construction and end user phases of this development, including apprenticeship opportunities, local employment, local subcontracting and support for local VCSE sector organisations and projects.

#### Public Transport

- An Interim Bus Strategy and a Permanent Bus Strategy, requiring either contracted provision of an appropriate bus service or a financial contribution to the Combined Authority of £1,960,000 to subsidise that service
- A financial contribution to the County Council for their monitoring of the development's Travel Plan

#### Highways works

- Requirement to enter s278 Agreement to deliver improvements to A141 comprising
  - The principal vehicular, cycle, and pedestrian access to the development including provision of a new underpass connecting across the A141 (including restoration of a previously severed right of way)
  - Capacity enhancements at the A141/Ermine Street roundabout, including widened approach/exit lanes on specified arms and an enhanced pedestrian crossing
  - Capacity enhancements at the A141/Washingley Road roundabout
  - Capacity enhancements at the A141/Kings Ripton Road signalised junction, including widened/amended approach lanes on the A141 and an enhanced pedestrian crossing
- An application for a Traffic Regulation Order to be submitted to reduce the speed limit on the A141 from 70mph to 50mph on the approaches to the new development access roundabout
- A Signage Strategy to clearly direct goods vehicles to/from the strategic road network and highlight the existing 7.5t weight limit on Views Common Road
- Improvements to the existing A1307 overbridge north of the site to include appropriate lighting

#### Travel Planning

- Measures, and ongoing monitoring delivering long-term active travel and public transport commitments to support the Site and locality.

#### Flamsteed Drive Footway/Cycleway Link and Play Area Enhancements

- Measures to provide a footway/cycleway link to Flamsteed Drive and to secure enhancements to (or replacement of) the existing play area situated on the Council-owned land located to the southeast of the Site.

#### Hinchingbrooke Country Park Footway/Cycleway Enhancements

- Widening and surfacing/resurfacing of the existing path through the Country Park from the A141 underpass (next to the Alconbury Brook) to the existing Country Park car park

#### Biodiversity Net Gain

- Monitoring contribution relating to the monitoring of the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan secured separately by condition

#### **Other Matters**

##### Need

- 7.142 The applicant's *Employment Land Needs and Economic Benefits Assessment* report (September 2025) sets out a clear need for the proposed development in the context of a severe undersupply of large units. The report evidences vacancy rates for large industrial units (100,000+ sq ft) in Huntingdonshire & Peterborough having been below 5% for over a decade (and usually below 2%), demonstrating a consistently low level of supply. At the time of writing only one modern large unit was available across the whole market area and much existing stock is old, small, and outdated, especially in Huntingdon.
- 7.143 The report demonstrates that take-up exceeds supply; that new premises have been quickly absorbed; and that rents continue to rise, signalling strong demand and constrained supply.
- 7.144 Using market-based modelling (completions, absorption, suppressed demand), the report asserts that there is an Industrial Market Area Need (Huntingdonshire + Peterborough) to 2046 of between 1,570,000sqm and 2,510,000sqm of large-unit floorspace. Apportioning that need to Huntingdonshire alone based on existing stock patterns would suggest a need of between 638,000sqm (baseline scenario) and 1,028,000 sqm (growth scenario). Current supply identified as relevant pipeline space does not exceed 45,000 sqm, giving a modelled shortfall of between 593,000sqm (baseline) and 983,000sqm (growth).
- 7.145 The clear conclusion that can be drawn from this evidence is that a substantial release of new employment land is urgently required. This is considered to carry significant weight.

##### Fire hydrants

- 7.146 Whilst Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service has not commented on this application, it is standard practice to impose a condition securing the provision of fire hydrants in accordance with Policy LP12 of the Local Plan.

##### Community safety

- 7.147 NPPF Para 135(f) requires that planning decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.
- 7.148 The application has been assessed by Cambridgeshire Constabulary who raise no objections in principle, subject to further consideration at reserved matters stage.

- 7.149 Huntingdon Town Council, Hinchingsbrooke Residents' Association and a number of residents have raised concerns about the potential for crime and disorder at the proposed A141 underpass.
- 7.150 In this respect the Constabulary has raised no objection, but has recommended that footway/cycleway routes should be as straight and as short as possible with a minimum width of 3m to avoid potential physical conflict points as pedestrians pass each other. Good lighting will facilitate natural surveillance and enable people to identify a specific risk but for the most part and in a very reassuring way it also serves to enable people to see that they are safe. The general alignment of the proposed underpass and its approach paths accords with this advice, and details of its lighting can be secured by the recommended lighting condition.
- 7.151 Additionally the Constabulary advises that CCTV, whilst not a universal solution to security problems, can help deter vandalism or burglary and assist with the identification of culprits once a crime has been committed. The provision and effective use of CCTV fits well within the overall framework of security management and a CCTV strategy condition (to include CCTV coverage of the underpass) is recommended accordingly.
- 7.152 In light of the Constabulary's advice and subject to the recommended mitigation measures it is considered that the proposed development would not impact adversely on the safety and security of its users or the general public and therefore it is in accordance with Local Plan Policy LP14.

#### Environmental Sustainability

- 7.153 Local Plan Policy LP12 provides policy support for applications that can demonstrate sustainable design and construction methods including in respect of the efficient use of energy, water and other resources, with a minimum of BREEAM "Good". The Council's recently-published Technical Advice Note on Environmentally Sustainable Design and Construction builds on this and provides practical additional advice.
- 7.154 The applicant's Framework Sustainability Strategy sets out several key objectives including:
- Reducing carbon emissions
  - Enhancing biodiversity
  - Promoting wellbeing.
- 7.155 Their strategy mandates minimum BREEAM "Excellent" certification, EPC rating 'A', and operational net zero carbon compliance. It targets embodied carbon below 400kgCO<sub>2</sub>/m<sup>2</sup> and at least 15% biodiversity net gain, exceeding current policy requirements. Design principles incorporate PV-ready roofs, natural daylighting, WELL Building Standards, and EV charging infrastructure (20% active, 80% passive). Waste reduction measures aim for 95% diversion from landfill during construction, while smart metering and sustainable procurement policies reinforce resource efficiency.
- 7.156 In going beyond the minimum BREEAM "Good", the applicant's Framework Sustainability Strategy demonstrates the scheme's ability to accord with the Council's recently-published Environmentally Sustainable Design & Construction Technical Advice Note and therefore benefits from the policy support set out in Local Plan Policy

LP12.

#### Training and skills

- 7.157 The Local Plan does not contain any specific policy in relation to training and skills, albeit both the Council and the Combined Authority have published various documents that provide general support. The
- 7.158 The applicant's Construction Phase Social Value Framework sets out a detailed Employment and Skills Plan built around four commitments:
- Inward investment through local subcontracting
  - Inspiring the next generation via careers events and work experience
  - Prioritising local employment and apprenticeships
  - Supporting community initiatives.
- 7.159 Proposed activities include "meet the buyer" events, mentoring, site visits, and partnerships with schools, colleges, and VCSE HDC, Job Centre Plus, and Cambridge Regional College to ensure opportunities are accessible and aligned with local economic priorities. These measures aim to maximise local participation in the construction supply chain and create pathways into high-value employment sectors. They are supported by the Council's Economic Development Team, the Careers Hub at the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority, and the construction skills-focussed CIC *Constructed Pathways*.

#### Health Impact Assessment

- 7.160 A Health Impact Assessment has been submitted in accordance with Local Plan Policy LP29, which cross-references various aspects of the scheme with other Local Plan policies.

#### **Planning Balance**

- 7.161 Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38[6] of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

#### Benefits

- 7.162 The development would contribute significantly to the delivery of employment opportunities in line with Local Plan Policy LP1 and the Huntingdonshire Economic Growth Strategy. The outline planning application is designed to provide flexibility and adaptability at reserved matters stage, catering to a range of occupiers and supporting local economic growth.
- 7.163 Evidence submitted with the application demonstrates that there is a clear, compelling and urgent need for large-scale industrial and logistics development in Huntingdonshire, to which this site could make a meaningful and positive contributing.
- 7.164 This development supports the Strategy's ambition to create a resilient, inclusive, and sustainable local economy by bringing forward new employment land that responds to market demand for industrial and logistics uses. It would play an important role in strengthening and diversifying Huntingdonshire's employment base, providing a

range of job opportunities and supporting both business retention and inward investment within the district.

- 7.165 Substantial business rates are anticipated, estimated as between £5M and £6M per annum when calculated on the basis on £47/sqm rateable value and depending on the final mix of uses. The applicant has provided recent evidence of similar schemes in nearby Counties to which the Valuation Office Agency has attributed rateable values in excess of £85/sqm, which if applied in this location would potentially increase that business rate revenue to between £9M and £10M per annum. Setting rateable values is a matter for the Valuation Office Agency, not the District Council.
- 7.166 These economic benefits, including significant local job creation estimated at between 2,371 and 3,287 onsite jobs, individually and cumulatively carry substantial weight in the planning balance. Members will note that the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule has a zero rating for "B-class" employment uses; noting this fulfils the legal requirement to give this regard (Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 70(2)).
- 7.167 In addition to economic benefits, the proposed development would deliver environmental and social benefits.
- 7.168 The development is capable of achieving measurable net gains across habitats, hedgerows, and river features, exceeding the statutory 10% BNG requirement. Additional biodiversity enhancement measures are also proposed.
- 7.169 A significant proportion of the site is dedicated to soft landscaping, including structural buffer zones, swales, and amenity areas for leisure use. Local Plan Policy LP3 provides specific policy support accordingly.
- 7.170 The proposed development includes off-site highway works to upgrade footpath and cycleway links which would enhance pedestrian and cycle infrastructure.
- 7.171 Enhanced bus services to/from the site would be available for public use.

#### Harms

- 7.172 Less than substantial harm has been identified in respect of the setting of one Grade II\* listed building and two Grade II listed buildings. Considerable importance and weight must be given to the statutory duties under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, applying Section 16 of NPPF (2024).
- 7.173 Despite the applicant's proposed landscape mitigation measures, residual moderate adverse landscape and visual effects would remain, for up to Year 15 post-development. This conflicts with Local Plan Policies LP10(b), LP11 and LP12, and Policies NE3 and BE1 of the Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan (insofar as they spatially apply)
- 7.174 Waterloo Farm and two further dwellings approximately 300m to the north-east would experience harm to their setting with a magnitude of that impact that landscape screening would effectively mitigate until approximately 15 years of growth. This medium term harm would be contrary to Local Plan Policy LP14(b).

- 7.175 The proposed development would result in the loss of mature trees, including a linear woodland on the northern side of the A141 and a Category A Giant Redwood, contrary to Local Plan Policy LP31 and Policies NE3 and BE1 of the Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan insofar as they spatially apply to the site.
- 7.176 Other forms of harm have been identified through public consultation and technical consultee responses which, for the reasons set out in this report, are considered capable of mitigation.
- 7.177 Not all developments are entirely without harm or entirely without benefit. In reaching a recommendation, the identified harm has been carefully balanced against the benefits of the development. In this case, the cumulative benefits are considered sufficient to outweigh the identified harms.
- 7.178 Having fully assessed all three objectives of sustainable development; economic, social and environmental within this report, the proposed development would achieve these overarching objectives, and Officers consider the collective material benefits of the proposed development firmly outweigh the identified harm. When considered holistically the proposal represents sustainable development and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement.

**8. RECOMMENDATION - POWERS DELEGATED to the Head of Planning, Infrastructure & Public Protection to APPROVE subject to conditions, completion of a Section 106 obligation and receipt of an Impact Assessment Certificate for Planning (IACPC) from Natural England in respect of Great Crested Newt mitigation:**

1. Reserved Matters (appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale) to be approved
2. Time limit
3. Approved plans
4. Design Code compliance
5. Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)
6. Advanced structural planting prior to commencement
7. On-plot landscape delivery
8. Phase-specific detailed soft and hard landscaping schemes
9. 6 no. replacement Giant Redwood trees
10. Tree protection measures
11. Detailed earthworks strategy
12. Finished floor levels
13. Minimum 10% roof mounted PV
14. Maximum floorspace quantum
15. Site-wide Biodiversity Net Gain plan
16. Phase-specific Biodiversity Net Gain plans
17. Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan
18. Preconstruction Bat Survey
19. Provision of skylark plots
20. Detailed Site Wide Surface Water Drainage Scheme
21. Individual Phase/Plots – Drainage Details
22. Post-Installation Drainage System Validation
23. Phase-specific/building-specific Water Resources Statement

24. Fire hydrants
25. Foul water drainage strategy
26. Phasing plan
27. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
28. Construction limited to 08:00 – 18:00 Mon – Fri and 08:00 – 13:00 on Saturdays
29. Phase-specific noise reports and mitigation
30. Phase-specific air quality reports and mitigation
31. Lighting strategy
32. Electric Vehicle Charge Points
33. Phase-specific access provision
34. Detailed pedestrian and cycle connections
35. Detailed underpass design, including lighting
36. CCTV scheme
37. Building-specific Travel Plans
38. Changing and showering provision
39. Secure cycle parking
40. BREEAM Excellent compliance
41. Phased archaeological investigations and recording
42. Demolition Method Statement compliance
43. Piling Method Statement
44. Contamination site investigations
45. Soil Management Strategy
46. Screening of external storage
47. Off-site highways mitigation scheme (Local Highway Authority network)
48. Off-site junction mitigation works (Strategic Road Network)
49. Operational Management Plan
50. *Any other conditions the Head of Planning, Infrastructure & Public Protection considers necessary*

**OR**

**REFUSE in the event that the obligation referred to above has not been completed and the Applicant is unwilling to agree to an extended period for determination, or on the grounds that the Applicant is unwilling to complete the obligation necessary to make the development acceptable.**

If you would like a translation of this document, a large text version or an audio version, please contact us on 01480 388388 and we will try to accommodate your needs

**CONTACT OFFICER:**

Enquiries about this report to **James Croucher** (Interim Development Management Team Leader Strategic Team) [james.croucher@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:james.croucher@huntingdonshire.gov.uk)

[REDACTED]

**25/01922/OUT Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for site access for construction of Storage and Distribution (Use Class B8), General Employment (Use Class B2) ,Bus Depot (Sui Generis) floorspace with ancillary offices and gatehouses, provision of landscaping, access infrastructure (including new and improved vehicular access from the A141, highway, parking, cycle and pedestrian access), utilities (including gas, electricity, water, sewerage, telecommunications), sustainable drainage systems, and all associated engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and reuse of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works)**  
**Brookfield Farm Ermine Street Great Stukeley Huntingdon PE28 4AB**  
**Consultation closes 29th October 2025**

Recommend approval on the basis of policy E1, but conditional on the following:  
We also request that the applicants and Huntingdonshire District Council approach the owners of the Hinchingsbrooke Business Park about allowing access through the gate off Parkway off the estate at peak times.

We also request, because of the size of the proposal and its wide-ranging impacts, that this matter be considered by the Development Management Committee.

1. Further study of the potential flooding impact including other developments in the area.
2. The implementation of appropriate noise mitigation measures, in particular for Flamstead Drive because of the underpass, and consideration of noise abatement boards.
3. A condition for a robust traffic management plan for the construction phase that prohibits anyone involved with the construction from parking in or accessing Hinchingsbrooke.
4. Improved signage for the weight limit on the A1307 between Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Spittals Interchange, and enforcement via ANPR, with appropriate funding via a S106 agreement.
5. A report into the potential for constructing a road from Parkway to the A1307, bearing in mind the requirement for developments over 200 houses to have 2 access points as per Cambridgeshire Highways Development Management General Principles for Development, with appropriate funding via a S106 agreement.
6. A report into the potential for replacing the interchange between Views Common Road, Brampton Road, and Hinchingsbrooke Road with a roundabout, with appropriate funding via a S106 agreement.

7. An S106 contribution to improving cycling infrastructure across Huntingdon as a whole to improve non-motorised access to the site for workers.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

## Huntingdon Town Council Comments – 20<sup>th</sup> January 2026

**25/01922/OUT Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for site access for construction of Storage and Distribution (Use Class B8), General Employment (Use Class B2), Bus Depot (Sui Generis) floorspace with ancillary offices and gatehouses, provision of landscaping, access infrastructure (including new and improved vehicular access from the A141, highway, parking, cycle and pedestrian access), utilities (including gas, electricity, water, sewerage, telecommunications), sustainable drainage systems, and all associated engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and reuse of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works). The proposed development is phased with each phase being a separate and severable part of the development.**

### **Brookfield Farm Ermine Street Great Stukeley Huntingdon PE28 4AB**

Recommend support on the basis of economic development, jobs, skills, accessible landscaped areas, and sustainable travel (Huntingdon Neighbourhood Plan E1, BE1, partially TT1), welcoming the changes to the plans, natural areas including use of native species, SuDS, and the significant number of jobs, and significant investment in skills; however, the development does need mitigation, and so our support is conditioned on the following conditions being imposed in order to ensure that the requirements of BE2, NE3 and TT1.

To fulfil BE2 and TT1

- a requirement that consideration be given to the impact of flooding on the proposed A141 underpass including alternative routes during flooding (BE2(4), TT1)
- the s106 or s278 agreement to include funding for improved signage for and enforcement of the weight limit on the A1307 between Hinchingbrooke Park Road and Spittals interchange (BE2(4), TT1)

To fulfil TT1

- a requirement for a contribution to improving active travel infrastructure across Huntingdon for workers coming to the development so that the targets for pedestrian and cycle traffic are met (TT1)
- a requirement to consult with the CPCA and Cambridgeshire Bus Alliance ahead of any reserved matters applications on the location, number, and equipment of bus shelters given likely usage patterns at the site (TT1)

To fulfil NE3

- a requirement that there is a full noise impact assessment ahead of any reserved matters application, and appropriate mitigations identified in that assessment are included in those assessments (NE3)
- separately, a requirement that there be noise mitigation measures such as noise abatement boards to cover Flamstead Drive (NE3)
- a requirement that there be no negative impact on Hinchingbrooke Country Park (NE3)
- a requirement for tall tree planting on the eastern side of the A141 from Spittals to the racecourse to reduce the visual impact of the development from Hinchingbrooke and Hinchingbrooke Country Park and maintain the current wooded horizon. (NE3)

- a requirement that the issues raised from the Friends of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park about the number of connections between the park and the new park areas are addressed to the satisfaction of HDC. (NE3)
- a requirement that the development reduces the working hours on the site and incorporates a dark skies policy during closing times to reduce the effect on the bats within the nearby conservation area Bobs Wood, Hinchingsbrooke Park. (NE3)

During construction to fulfil BE2

- a requirement that there be a robust construction traffic management plan agreed by HDC for the construction phase that prohibits anyone involved in construction from parking in or accessing the area outlined in red in the image (area1.png)

Additionally, we require the following considerations are made.

- Consideration of a name change of the site to Brookfield Logistics Park to ensure that the focus of Hinchingsbrooke is kept as a nature conservation area.
- Consideration of a different route across the A141, possibly the previously proposed Toucan Crossing, to prevent the potential increase of crime and disorder in the currently proposed underpass.
- Consideration of the retention of the existing layby on the A141. If this is not an appropriate request, Huntingdon Town Council would ask for an explanation of why this must be removed from the highway.
- Consideration be given for the effect on residents of the Hinchingsbrooke estate of units 2E and 3D. We ask for the removal of these units, and, if unsuitable, then a requirement be made that these units are the shortest on the site, due to the potential for loss of light and an adverse impact outside the Hinchingsbrooke Estate spatial planning area.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]


[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <clerk@thestukeleys-pc.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 07 November 2025 11:32  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: Planning Permission Consultation - Brookfield Farm Ermine Street Great Stukeley (ref 25/01922/OUT)

Hi [REDACTED]  
Please see below Stukeleys Parish Councils objection to the above planning application.

Many Thanks  
[REDACTED]  
Clerk of Stukeley PC  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** clerk@thestukeleys-pc.gov.uk <clerk@thestukeleys-pc.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 4, 2025 4:15 pm  
**To:** 'DMAdmin' <Development.ManagementAdmin@huntingdonshire.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Permission Consultation - Brookfield Farm Ermine Street Great Stukeley (ref 25/01922/OUT)

Stukeley Parish Council objects to this application on the following grounds:  
**Flood Risk:** The potential flooding impact has not been sufficiently assessed, particularly in relation to this and other nearby developments. A more detailed study is required.  
**Traffic Impact:** The development is likely to increase traffic on the surrounding roads. A comprehensive traffic management plan must be approved as a condition of any consent.

Many Thanks

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]  
Clerk of Stukeley PC  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** DMAdmin <Development.ManagementAdmin@huntingdonshire.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 09 October 2025 15:03  
**To:** clerk@thestukeleys-pc.gov.uk  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Permission Consultation - Brookfield Farm Ermine Street Great Stukeley (ref 25/01922/OUT)

Hi [REDACTED]  
4<sup>th</sup> November should be fine. I will inform the case officer who will be in touch if any concerns.

Thanks  
[REDACTED]



**From:** [clerk@thestukeleys-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@thestukeleys-pc.gov.uk)  
**To:** [DMAdmin](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Planning Permission Consultation - Brookfield Farm Ermine Street Great Stukeley (ref 25/01922/OUT)  
**Date:** 13 January 2026 10:29:51

---

Stukeley Parish Council had no comments on this application, however, it was noted that a secondary access should be provided, as the current entrance to and from the development is considered unsuitable.

Many Thanks

Kind Regards

  
Clerk of Stukeley Parish Council  
[clerk@thestukeleys-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@thestukeleys-pc.gov.uk)  


---

**From:** [Dmadmin@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:Dmadmin@huntingdonshire.gov.uk) <[Dmadmin@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:Dmadmin@huntingdonshire.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** 29 December 2025 12:19 PM  
**To:** [clerk@thestukeleys-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@thestukeleys-pc.gov.uk) <[clerk@thestukeleys-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@thestukeleys-pc.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Permission Consultation - Brookfield Farm Ermine Street Great Stukeley (ref 25/01922/OUT)

Dear Parish Clerk,

Please find correspondence from Development Management at Huntingdonshire District Council attached to this email in relation to the following application for planning permission.

Proposal: Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for site access for construction of Storage and Distribution (Use Class B8), General Employment (Use Class B2), Bus Depot (Sui Generis) floorspace with ancillary offices and gatehouses, provision of landscaping, access infrastructure (including new and improved vehicular access from the A141, highway, parking, cycle and pedestrian access), utilities (including gas, electricity, water, sewerage, telecommunications), sustainable drainage systems, and all associated engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and reuse of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works). The proposed development is phased with each phase being a separate and severable part of the development.

Site Address: Brookfield Farm Ermine Street Great Stukeley

Reference: 25/01922/OUT

Opting out of email correspondence

-----  
We are continually striving to improve the service we deliver to our customers. As part of this we are now contacting our customers by email where possible in an effort to provide a faster, more efficient service.

If you would prefer not to receive correspondence from us via email you have the right to



## Alconbury Parish Council

[www.alconburyparishcouncil.gov.uk](http://www.alconburyparishcouncil.gov.uk)

[parishclerk@alconburyparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:parishclerk@alconburyparishcouncil.gov.uk)

18<sup>th</sup> November 2025

To: Huntingdonshire District Council

Dear Sir/Madam

### **Planning Application 25/01922/OUT Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park (HLP) – OBJECTION**

Alconbury Parish Council wishes to register its objection to the outline planning application submitted by Newlands Developments for the proposed Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park at Brookfield Farm, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley.

Whilst we recognise and welcome the principle of sustainable employment growth in Huntingdonshire, particularly the creation of jobs for local residents, we believe that this proposal, both in scale and location, is inappropriate, unsustainable, and premature in the context of the existing and emerging local plan framework.

#### **1. Scale and Visual Impact – Building Heights Incompatible with Local Character**

The proposed heights of the buildings, some up to 24 metres, are excessive and entirely out of keeping with both the immediate surroundings and the established character of Hinchingsbrooke and its adjoining landscape.

For comparison, national TV news channels have widely reported on the warehouses at Tyldesley are only around 18-metres high and have generated significant public opposition due to their dominating scale. Similarly, in Milton Keynes, an 18-metre warehouse at Blakelands was described in a council review as *“oppressive”* and a *“monstrosity.”*

At 24-metres, the proposed buildings on Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park would be one third taller and visible for miles around, particularly from residential areas such as Flamstead Drive, Bliss Close and The Glades.

Such vertical massing would erode the rural setting of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park and the transition between the urban edge of Huntingdon and open countryside to the west. The Parish Council considers this contrary to the Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD and to Local Plan policies Design Concept LP 11 and Design Implementation LP 12 concerning landscape character and settlement identity.

#### **2. Flood Risk and Water Management**

The Alconbury Brook Flood Group (ABFG) has already identified the proposed site as being at moderate to high flood risk, with floodwaters often retained on or near this site for extended periods during peak flow events. The site forms part of a wider natural floodplain and ecological corridor along the Alconbury Brook.

We are particularly concerned that the submitted Environmental Statement downplays the residual flood risk and fails to demonstrate how the development will integrate with existing and proposed flood mitigation strategies downstream.

The Parish Council endorses the ABFG's position that:

- Significant additional mitigation beyond minimum policy compliance is required;
- Smart drainage systems, rainwater storage and permeable surfaces must be integral, not optional.

We further note and endorse the detailed technical observations submitted by the Alconbury Brook Flood Group to both Newlands Developments and HDC, which demonstrate unresolved surface water and flood storage concerns.

Given the recent flooding events across the Alconbury and Hinchingsbrooke catchments, approving a logistics park of this scale without comprehensive hydrological modelling and flood resilience design would be reckless and contrary to national planning guidance (NPPF paragraphs 170-182).

### **3. Cumulative Impact of Development – Need for Strategic Assessment**

The cumulative impact of this proposal has been seriously underestimated by the applicant.

The Environmental Statement's conclusion (produced by David Lock Associates dated September 2025) that *"the Proposed Development would have few adverse effects of more than minor or moderate significance"* is demonstrably inaccurate when considering:

- The ongoing redevelopment of Hinchingsbrooke Hospital;
- The A141 & St Ives Improvements Scheme proposal;
- Planned housing growth at Alconbury Weald; and
- The emerging North Huntingdon Growth Cluster identified in the draft Local Plan (currently under consultation) which includes both allocated and unallocated sites.

Taken together, these projects represent a major concentration of development on the north-western side of Huntingdon, all of which will funnel traffic towards and through the A1307 and Hinchingsbrooke Park Road (HPR) corridor, a road network that already operates at or beyond capacity.

It is entirely inappropriate to consider the HLP application in isolation when its impacts clearly interact with the cumulative traffic, pollution, and amenity pressures of these other developments. Indeed, the Parish Council does not accept that *"in overall terms, the outcome of the EIA is that significant beneficial effects would be substantial, while significant adverse effects would be few and limited, such that its beneficial effects would outweigh its adverse ones."*

A comprehensive strategic transport assessment covering the whole North Huntingdon Growth Area should be undertaken before any further large-scale development is consented.

### **4. Highway and Access Constraints**

The Parish Council shares local residents' concerns that Hinchingsbrooke Park Road remains the only vehicular access for thousands of residents, hospital staff and visitors, school traffic, and emergency services. The addition of substantial HGV and van traffic to this constrained network would cause further congestion, worsen air quality around schools and the hospital, and increase risks to emergency response times.

The development's reliance on the A1307 and Views Common Road, both already under strain, is unsustainable. Enforcement of existing weight limits and the long-overdue provision of a second access road to the Hinchingsbrooke estate, must be prerequisites before any further expansion in traffic-generating development is permitted.

#### **5. Prematurity and Conflict with Emerging Policy**

The site lies outside the current Local Plan allocation and sits on high-quality agricultural land. Proceeding with this proposal now would pre-empt decisions being made through the Draft Local Plan Preferred Options, which is currently under public consultation.

The Draft Local Plan identifies the North Huntingdon Growth Cluster as a strategic focus for coordinated employment and housing development. Granting permission for HLP at this stage would undermine the plan-led process, set an undesirable precedent for unallocated industrial development, and compromise the strategic spatial vision that Huntingdonshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council are currently consulting on.


#### **Conclusion**

For the reasons set out above - with particular regard to the excessive building heights, the unresolved flood risk, the unmitigated cumulative impact on road infrastructure and the proposal's conflict with the emerging spatial strategy - Alconbury Parish Council objects to the outline application for Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park.

We respectfully request that Huntingdonshire District Council refuse this application or defer its determination pending the completion of a comprehensive cumulative impact and flood risk assessment aligned with the Draft Local Plan and North Huntingdon Growth Cluster.

Yours faithfully

Alconbury Parish Council





## Alconbury Parish Council

[www.alconburyparishcouncil.gov.uk](http://www.alconburyparishcouncil.gov.uk)

[parishclerk@alconburyparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:parishclerk@alconburyparishcouncil.gov.uk)

28 January 2026

To: Huntingdonshire District Council

Dear Sir/Madam,

### **Planning Application 25/01922/OUT – Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park (HLP) Further Objection from Alconbury Parish Council**

Alconbury Parish Council writes further to its formal objection submitted in November 2025 in respect of the above outline planning application. This additional representation is intended to assist the Development Management Committee by drawing attention to material cumulative transport, safeguarding and infrastructure impacts which remain unresolved and which, in the Parish Council's view, have not been adequately or robustly assessed.

In particular, the Parish Council considers that the application must be assessed in the context of the North Huntingdon Growth Cluster, as identified in the Huntingdonshire District Council Preferred Options Local Plan to 2046. The Cluster explicitly anticipates multiple employment, housing and infrastructure proposals coming forward within the same geographic area. It follows that development proposals within the Cluster cannot be considered in isolation and that planning authorities have a clear duty to consider cumulative impacts on transport networks, communities and essential services.

## **1. Existing highway constraints at Hinchingsbrooke Estate**

The Parish Council wishes to formally reference and support the detailed concerns raised by the Hinchingsbrooke Residents' Association, whose members experience the day-to-day reality of the transport network adjacent to the proposed development site.

The Parish Council further notes the recent representation made by the Interim Chair of the Hinchingsbrooke Residents' Association to Huntingdon Town Council, which highlighted residents' strong objection to the use of the name "Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park". The site at Brookfields Farm has never historically formed part of Hinchingsbrooke Estate and the Parish Council endorses the request made on behalf of residents that the development be renamed. This will avoid misleading any association with the established residential area.

Hinchingsbrooke Estate comprises approximately 2,000 residents living in over 800 properties, yet is served by a single vehicular access route of Hinchingsbrooke Park Road. This single route must already accommodate, often within the same peak periods:

- Commuting movements of approximately 2,000 hospital staff and access for patients and visitors to Hinchingsbrooke Hospital (with circa 1,300 parking spaces);
- The daily arrival and departure of over 2,100 pupils and 300 staff at Hinchingsbrooke School, including significant numbers of school buses from surrounding villages;
- Movements associated with Cromwell Academy (circa 200 pupils and staff);
- Around 900 staff at Cambridgeshire Police Headquarters and 100 staff at Fire & Rescue HQ;
- Commuter traffic accessing Huntingdon town centre and Huntingdon railway station;
- Seasonal and event-related traffic associated with Hinchingsbrooke Country Park.

This convergence already creates a severe and well-documented bottleneck, with residents reporting routine delays of 30–60 minutes during peak periods, and significantly longer delays during incidents or when the strategic network is disrupted (including A14 closures).

Despite recent traffic signal changes at the junction of Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Views Common Road in November and December 2025, it is widely acknowledged that signal optimisation alone cannot resolve a junction that is operating at or beyond practical capacity.

## **2. Safeguarding and duty of care**

The Parish Council is particularly concerned that safeguarding considerations are not being afforded sufficient weight.

Hinchingbrooke Park Road and its immediate vicinity are used daily by large numbers of children travelling on foot, by bicycle and by bus to and from Hinchingbrooke School and Cromwell Academy. Increased congestion, queuing, driver frustration and the presence of additional HGV and LGV movements will materially increase risk at junctions, crossings and along pathways used by pupils.

The Parish Council considers that planning authorities have a clear duty of care to ensure that development proposals do not worsen conditions for children and other vulnerable road users. This duty extends beyond abstract modelling outputs and requires a realistic appraisal of how additional traffic will interact with an already constrained, mixed-use access corridor.

## **3. Hinchingbrooke Logistics Park – scale and traffic generation**

The Parish Council notes that the Hinchingbrooke Logistics Park proposal comprises approximately 2.2 million square feet of warehouse floorspace, operating 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, with buildings of up to 24 metres in height immediately adjacent to an established residential area.

Based on figures presented within the submitted Environmental Statement, the development is expected to generate approximately 2,448 HGV movements per day, equating to an average of 1.7 HGVs per minute, in addition to substantial LGV and employee traffic.

Provided that Hinchingbrooke Estate continues to have only a single access route, the Parish Council shares the Residents' Association's concern that the proximity and scale of this traffic generation will exacerbate an already notorious congestion problem, with direct consequences for residents, emergency response times, school travel and hospital access.

## **4. Inadequate assessment of traffic displacement and wider impacts**

A critical deficiency in the submitted Transport Assessment is the failure to assess traffic displacement and driver behaviour beyond the immediate junctions.

Experience already demonstrates that when congestion occurs at the A141/A1307 Spittals interchange, drivers actively seek to avoid the area. As congestion increases, it is entirely foreseeable that:

- Traffic diverts through Great Stukeley and Little Stukeley, placing additional pressure on village roads not designed to function as distributor routes, particularly given that the Alconbury Weald development is still ongoing;

- Commuter and HGV traffic routes via Brampton, using Huntingdon Road and Thrapston Road;
- Some drivers seek to bypass the area altogether by rat-running through Abbots Ripton and surrounding rural roads.

These impacts are not speculative; they are a predictable and already observed response to congestion in this part of Huntingdonshire. Yet they are not adequately captured within the scope of the Transport Assessment, resulting in a systematic underestimation of the true area-wide effects of the proposal.

This omission is particularly concerning given that other proposals within the North Huntingdon Growth Cluster, including the Sapley Garden Village concept (currently unallocated but promoted within the Cluster), will also exert pressure on the same network. The cumulative impact of these proposals must be assessed collectively, not incrementally.

## **5. Transport modelling and data completeness**

The Parish Council further notes and supports the concerns raised by National Highways in consultee comments submitted on 11 December 2025, which state that:

- Full modelling data has not been provided;
- Certain data entries appear identical or contain anomalous negative values; and
- Insufficient information has been submitted to properly determine highway impacts at this time.

In the Parish Council's view, this alone is sufficient reason for the application not to be determined, as the Development Management Committee cannot discharge its responsibilities without a robust and complete evidence base.

## **6. Additional concerns regarding traffic modelling assumptions**

The Parish Council wishes to highlight concerns arising from a presentation by the applicant's developers and consultants held on 27 January.

Slides shown identified a number of key junctions where traffic survey data is required, including the Brampton Hut interchange, A14 slip roads and local junctions linking the A141 to Brampton. This demonstrates the applicant's own recognition of the sensitivity of these locations.

However, the presentation also showed 80% of HGV movements are predicted to travel west from the logistics park towards Brampton Hut, despite it being shown that no completed traffic modelling or supporting data underpins this assumption.

The Parish Council considers it unacceptable for such a critical traffic flow prediction to be presented without evidence. The direction and volume of HGV movements are central to understanding impacts on the A14 and for surrounding villages.

This further reinforces concerns that the Transport Assessment is incomplete and unreliable, and that infrastructure impacts cannot be properly assessed at this stage.

Furthermore, the applicant confirmed reliance on 2011 Census data to assess worker profiles and commuting patterns, with the 2021 Census discounted due to the pandemic. This means employment travel assumptions are based on data that is now around 15 years old.

Given the scale of growth and change in and around Huntingdon over recent years, the Parish Council considers this wholly inappropriate. Using such outdated data further undermines confidence in the robustness of the Transport Assessment.

## **7. Plan-led decision making and cumulative infrastructure capacity**

The Parish Council emphasises that the Preferred Options Local Plan to 2046 explicitly identifies the North Huntingdon Growth Cluster as requiring coordinated, strategic consideration of infrastructure capacity. Granting consent for a major logistics development in advance of such coordination risks undermining the plan-led system and prejudging decisions that are currently subject to public consultation.

Major infrastructure constraints, particularly transport, cannot be retrospectively resolved once multiple large developments are consented independently.

## **Conclusion**

Alconbury Parish Council respectfully submits that the Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park application raises serious and unresolved concerns in relation to:

- Severe existing highway constraints at Hinchingsbrooke Estate;
- Safeguarding of children and vulnerable road users;
- Significant HGV and 24/7 operational impacts adjacent to residential areas;
- Failure to assess traffic displacement into surrounding villages;
- Incomplete and unreliable transport modelling; and
- The absence of a coordinated, cluster-wide infrastructure assessment, especially given HDC's own admission in the recent Sustainability Appraisal that the landscape will "fundamentally change" in the North Huntingdon area.

For these reasons, and consistent with the Parish Council's objection submitted in November 2025, Alconbury Parish Council urges Huntingdonshire District Council to

refuse the application, or at the very least defer determination pending a comprehensive, cumulative transport and infrastructure assessment aligned with the North Huntingdon Growth Cluster and the emerging Local Plan.

Yours faithfully,



Alconbury Parish Council

**From:** [REDACTED] <assistantclerk@bramptonpc.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 28 October 2025 16:32  
**To:** DMAdmin  
**Subject:** Planning application 25/01922/OUT

Good afternoon

Please see the response to the above planning application 25/01922/OUT

**Planning Application: 25/01922/OUT Brookfield Farm Ermine Street Great Stukeley Huntingdon PE28 4AB** Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for site access for construction of storage and distribution(Use Class B8), General Employment (Use Class B2), Bus depot (Sui Generis) floorspace with ancillary offices and gatehouses, provision of landscaping, access infrastructure (including new and improved vehicular access from A141, highway, parking, cycle and pedestrian access), utilities (including gas, electricity, water, sewerage, telecommunications), sustainable drainage systems, and all associated engineering works(including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and reuse of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works).

*This was discussed at length, and the committee asked the question if/why this development is needed in an area that is currently facilitating this type of major construction and asked if there had been a survey carried out to determine if there is a need here, especially when there are already vacant buildings in the area. If so, the committee would welcome the information.*

*It was felt that the area where the attenuation ponds are to be situated(North west of the site) is not enough and will make little difference to any flooding It was requested that the subject of Flooding is re-visited as the council feels that the information contained is incorrect as the flooding will affect Alconbury Brook at the southern edge of the site causing it to flood more significantly than before the development. In an effort to alleviate this further attenuation ponds should be located in this area.*

*Concerns were also raised around the underpass (walking and cycling access). This underpass could be due to potential anti-social behaviour often found in such underpasses; the committee considers a footbridge similar to A1307 will be far more suitable and ask that this is reconsidered in the application for this to be installed. In addition to this the committee have concerns on how this will be cleaned and maintained and by which party.*

*With regards to the new roundabout. The committee understands the traffic to the roundabout , is not to be controlled by traffic lights. In addition to this the committee is questioning confirmation on whether there will street lighting in this area.*

*The number of HGV's that would use Thrapston Road Brampton for access to the site is also a concern and the council would welcome clarification of vehicular movement, i.e. the number of vehicles expected per day.*

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Assistant Clerk

**Correspondence address:**

Brampton Parish Council, Brampton Memorial Centre, Thrapston Road, Brampton, Huntingdon PE28 4TB

[REDACTED]

Website: [www.brampton-cambs-pc.gov.uk](http://www.brampton-cambs-pc.gov.uk)

A copy of the privacy policy can be found on the website.

This message is confidential. If you receive this message in error, please advise the sender immediately. Internet communications are not necessarily secure and may be intercepted or changed after they are sent. Brampton Parish Council does not accept liability for any such changes. If you wish to confirm the origin or content of this communication, please contact the sender using an alternative means of communication. Attachments to this email may contain software viruses, which could damage your systems. You should virus-check any attachments before opening.

**From:** [REDACTED]@bramptonpc.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 29 January 2026 14:04  
**To:** DevelopmentControl; DMAAdmin  
**Subject:** Planning Application 25/01922/OUT- Additional Comments

**Importance:** High

**Planning Application: 25/01922/OUT Brookfield Farm, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley, Huntingdon**

**Proposal: Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for site access for construction of Storage and Distribution (Use Class B8), General Employment (Use Class B2), Bus Depot (Sui Generis) floorspace with ancillary offices and gatehouses, provision of landscaping, access infrastructure (including new and improved vehicular access from the A141, highway, parking, cycle and pedestrian access), utilities (including gas, electricity, water, sewerage, telecommunications), sustainable drainage systems, and all associated engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and reuse of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works)**

Following a meeting with the Developers on 27 January, and consideration of their presentation, the Council has further comments to add to its response dated 28 October 2025.

The Council remains concerned about the lack of car parking proposed for the site. While it acknowledges the objective of reducing car usage, there is currently no evidence to demonstrate how this will operate effectively in practice. In addition, the Council notes that modelling has been undertaken to assess the impact of construction traffic and finds this reassuring. However, no modelling has been provided to assess the highways impact once the site becomes operational and up to 2,000 people are accessing the site for work. The Council considers that this is likely to result in a detrimental impact on the roads surrounding the village.

Regards

[REDACTED]  
Locum Clerk

**Correspondence address:**

Brampton Parish Council, Brampton Memorial Centre, Thrapston Road, Brampton, Huntingdon PE28 4TB

Website: [www.brampton-cambs-pc.gov.uk](http://www.brampton-cambs-pc.gov.uk)

A copy of the privacy policy can be found on the website.

This message is confidential. If you receive this message in error, please advise the sender immediately. Internet communications are not necessarily secure and may be intercepted or changed after they are sent. Brampton Parish Council does not accept liability for any such changes. If you wish to confirm the origin or content of this communication, please contact the sender using an alternative means of communication. Attachments to this email may contain software viruses, which could damage your systems. You should virus-check any attachments before opening.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@spaldwickparishcouncil.org.uk>  
**Sent:** 28 January 2026 14:16  
**To:** DevelopmentControl  
**Subject:** Planning Application 25/01922/OUT – Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park (HLP)

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,

Apologies for the email but the website does not appear to be working.

Objection from Spaldwick Parish Council

Spaldwick Parish Council writes to formally object to this planning application and draw attention to material transport, safeguarding and infrastructure impacts.

#### 1. Existing highway constraints at Hinchingsbrooke Estate

Spaldwick Parish Council wishes to formally reference and support the detailed concerns raised by the Hinchingsbrooke Residents' Association, whose members experience the day-to-day reality of the transport network adjacent to the proposed development site.

Hinchingsbrooke Estate comprises approximately 2,000 residents living in over 800 properties, yet is served by a single vehicular access route of Hinchingsbrooke Park Road. This single route must already accommodate, often within the same peak periods:

Commuting movements of approximately 2,000 hospital staff and access for patients and visitors to Hinchingsbrooke Hospital (with circa 1,300 parking spaces); The daily arrival and departure of over 2,100 pupils and 300 staff at Hinchingsbrooke School, including significant numbers of school buses from surrounding villages; Movements associated with Cromwell Academy (circa 200 pupils and staff); Around 900 staff at Cambridgeshire Police Headquarters and 100 staff at Fire & Rescue HQ; Commuter traffic accessing Huntingdon town centre and Huntingdon railway station; Seasonal and event-related traffic associated with Hinchingsbrooke Country Park. This convergence already creates a severe and well-documented bottleneck, with residents reporting routine delays of 30–60 minutes during peak periods, and significantly longer delays during incidents or when the strategic network is disrupted (including A14 closures) which have impacted Spaldwick.

Despite recent traffic signal changes at the junction of Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Views Common Road in November and December 2025, it is widely acknowledged that signal optimisation alone cannot resolve a junction that is operating at or beyond practical capacity.

#### 2. Safeguarding and duty of care

Spaldwick Parish Council is particularly concerned that safeguarding considerations are not being afforded sufficient weight.

Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and its immediate vicinity are used daily by large numbers of children travelling on foot, by bicycle and by bus to and from Hinchingsbrooke School and Cromwell Academy. Increased congestion, queuing, driver frustration and the presence of additional HGV and LGV movements will materially increase risk at junctions, crossings and along pathways used by pupils.

Spaldwick Parish Council considers that planning authorities have a clear duty of care to ensure that development proposals do not worsen conditions for children and other vulnerable road users. This duty extends beyond abstract

modelling outputs and requires a realistic appraisal of how additional traffic will interact with an already constrained, mixed-use access corridor.

### 3. Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park – scale and traffic generation

Spaldwick Parish Council notes that the Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park proposal comprises approximately 2.2 million square feet of warehouse floorspace, operating 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, with buildings of up to 24 metres in height immediately adjacent to an established residential area.

Based on figures presented within the submitted Environmental Statement, the development is expected to generate approximately 2,448 HGV movements per day, equating to an average of 1.7 HGVs per minute, in addition to substantial LGV and employee traffic.

Provided that Hinchingsbrooke Estate continues to have only a single access route, the Parish Council shares the Residents' Association's concern that the proximity and scale of this traffic generation will exacerbate an already notorious congestion problem, with direct consequences for residents, emergency response times, school travel and hospital access.

### 4. Inadequate assessment of traffic displacement and wider impacts

A critical deficiency in the submitted Transport Assessment is the failure to assess traffic displacement and driver behaviour beyond the immediate junctions.

Experience already demonstrates that when congestion occurs at the A141/A1307 Spittals interchange, drivers actively seek to avoid the area. As congestion increases, it is entirely foreseeable that:

Traffic diverts through Great Stukeley and Little Stukeley, placing additional pressure on village roads not designed to function as distributor routes, particularly given that the Alconbury Weald development is still ongoing; Commuter and HGV traffic routes via Brampton, using Huntingdon Road and Thrapston Road; Some drivers seek to bypass the area altogether by rat-running through Abbots Ripton and surrounding rural roads.

These impacts are not speculative; they are a predictable and already observed response to congestion in this part of Huntingdonshire. Yet they are not adequately captured within the scope of the Transport Assessment, resulting in a systematic underestimation of the true area-wide effects of the proposal.

This omission is particularly concerning given that other proposals within the North Huntingdon Growth Cluster, including the Sapley Garden Village concept (currently unallocated but promoted within the Cluster), will also exert pressure on the same network. The cumulative impact of these proposals must be assessed collectively, not incrementally.

### 5. Transport modelling and data completeness

Spaldwick Parish Council further notes and supports the concerns raised by National Highways in consultee comments submitted on 11 December 2025, which state that:

Full modelling data has not been provided; Certain data entries appear identical or contain anomalous negative values; and Insufficient information has been submitted to properly determine highway impacts at this time.

In Spaldwick Parish Council's view, this alone is sufficient reason for the application not to be determined, as the Development Management Committee cannot discharge its responsibilities without a robust and complete evidence base.

### 6. Plan-led decision making and cumulative infrastructure capacity

Spaldwick Parish Council emphasises that the Preferred Options Local Plan to 2046 explicitly identifies the North Huntingdon Growth Cluster as requiring coordinated, strategic consideration of infrastructure capacity. Granting consent for a major logistics development in advance of such coordination risks undermining the plan-led system and prejudging decisions that are currently subject to public consultation.

Major infrastructure constraints, particularly transport, cannot be retrospectively resolved once multiple large developments are consented independently.

## Conclusion

Spaldwick Parish Council respectfully submits that the Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park application raises serious and unresolved concerns in relation to:

Severe existing highway constraints at Hinchingsbrooke Estate; Safeguarding of children and vulnerable road users; Significant HGV and 24/7 operational impacts adjacent to residential areas; Failure to assess traffic displacement into surrounding villages; Incomplete and unreliable transport modelling; and The absence of a coordinated, cluster-wide infrastructure assessment, especially given HDC's own admission in the recent Sustainability Appraisal that the landscape will "fundamentally change" in the North Huntingdon area.

For these reasons, Spaldwick Parish Council urges Huntingdonshire District Council to refuse the application, or at the very least defer determination pending a comprehensive, cumulative transport and infrastructure assessment aligned with the North Huntingdon Growth Cluster and the emerging Local Plan.

Yours faithfully,

Spaldwick Parish Council

  
Chair of Spaldwick Parish Council

In accordance with the law, Spaldwick Parish Council only collect a limited amount of information and service provision. We do not use your data for purposes other than those specified. Spaldwick Parish Council do not use profiling, sell or pass on your data to third parties. We constantly review our Privacy Policy to keep it up-to-date in protecting your data.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received the email in error, please notify the sender and delete the email and any attachments.


# Development Management Committee

Application Ref: 25/01922/OUT



Scale = 1:12,500

Date Created: 11/03/2026



Page 87

- The Site
- Listed Buildings
- Conservation Areas
- Sites of Ancient Monuments
- County Wildlife Sites Region

General Notes


- This document is to be used for the stated purpose only and should not be used for any other.
- Dimensions are all in millimetres, unless stated otherwise.
- It is the recipient's responsibility to print this document to the correct size & scale.
- All relevant drawings and specifications should be read in conjunction with this document.
- Scaling of this document is not recommended.

Document Scale(s)

100m SCALE 15000

Key

- Proposed application boundary 311.94 ac 126.24 ha
- Applicant Controlled Land 110.89 ac 44.88 ha



Page 88



Project Name

**Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park**

Employer Project Address

**Newlands Developments** **Hinchingsbrooke, Huntingdon**

RIBA Workstage Suitability

**2 - Concept Design** **S2 - Information**

Drawn	Checked	Created	Size
<b>LM</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>29.07.2025</b>	<b>A1</b>

UMC Project Reference	Scale	LOD	LOI
<b>22573</b>	<b>1:5000</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Document Title

**Location Plan**

Document Reference

**22573 - UMC - S101 - SI - DR - A - 149**

Revision Note

**Layout amended**

Issue Date Status Current Revision

**16.09.2025** **P03**

General Notes

- This document is to be used for the stated purpose only and should not be used for any other.
- Dimensions are all in millimetres, unless stated otherwise.
- It is the recipient's responsibility to print this document to the correct size & scale.
- All relevant drawings and specifications should be read in conjunction with this document.
- Scaling of this document is not recommended.

Document Scale(s)

100m SCALE 15000

**Key**

- Proposed Application Boundary
- Indicative location of utilities infrastructure - Subject to detail design
- Existing A141 alignment and area for A141 re-alignment, principal site access works, and associated hard and soft landscaping
- Open Land / Landscaping Area - Refer to Strategic Landscape parameters plan
- Proposed A141 Underpass - linked to existing pedestrian network, to allow flexibility for tolerance
- Existing Underpass to Hinchingsbrooke Country Park
- Primary Site Access and Proposed Highway Realignment (Street Type 1)
- Movement Corridor (Street Type 2)
- Green Movement Corridor (Street Type 3)
- Indicative Car Park Access
- Indicative Service Yard Access
- Proposed PROW and Main Cycle Access (ATR 1)
- Proposed PROW (ATR 2)
- Proposed Shared Use Path (ATR 3)
- Proposed Pedestrian / Maintenance Track (ATR 4)
- Existing PROW
- Existing Bridleway

Please Note:  
- A tolerance of 25m is given to all movement routes to account for design development.



Project Name

**Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park**

Employer Project Address

**Newlands Developments Hinchingsbrooke, Huntingdon**

RIBA Workstage Suitability

**2 - Concept Design S2 - Information**

Drawn Checked Created Size

**LM MS 02.07.2025 A1**

UMC Project Reference Scale LOD LOI

**22573 1:5000 1 1**

Document Title

**Parameter Plan - Access and Movement**

Document Reference


**22573 - UMC - S102 - SI - DR - A - 0144**


Revision Note

**Key amended**

Issue Date Status Current Revision

**17.12.2025 P10**





Key	Design Code reference
	Proposed Application Boundary N/A
	Indicative location of utilities infrastructure - Subject to detail design Page 72
	Character Area: Strategic Distribution Core Page 34
	Character Area: Flexible Employment Area Page 35
	Marker Building Chapter 4
	Green Corridor - To include landscaped planting areas - Minimum widths indicated on plan Page 65-67
	Open Land / Landscaping area to include retained vegetation, mitigation mounding, proposed planting, paths, attenuation & SuDS, retaining walls, retained agricultural land, publicly accessible landscape space and other applicable features. Chapter 6
	Proposed Area for Bunding Page 59-60
	Proposed Attenuation Basins and Swales Page 63-64
	Fixed spot heights in metres above ordnance datum, identified along the ridge-line of each length of strategic bunding +/- 0.5m. Page 59-60
	Between any two consecutive spot heights marked on the ridge, the height of the bund at its ridge will be no lower than the lower of the two spot heights and no higher than the higher of the two spot heights. Page 59-60
	Proposed Woodland Biome Page 61 - 62
	Proposed Scrubland Biome Page 61 - 62
	Proposed Wetland Biome Page 61 - 62
	Proposed Meadow Biome Page 61 - 62
	Proposed locations for biodiversity ponds - Subject to ecologist specification Page 62
	Proposed locations for skylark habitats - Subject to ecologist specification Page 62
	Proposed A141 Underpass - linked to existing pedestrian network, to allow flexibility for tolerance Page 29 Page 57 - 58
	Existing Underpass to Hinchingsbrooke Country Park N/A
	Primary Site Access and Proposed Highway Realignment (Street Type 1) Page 22 Page 57 - 58
	Movement Corridor (Street Type 2) Page 23
	Green Movement Corridor (Street Type 3) Page 24
	Indicative Car Park Access Page 53
	Indicative Service Yard Access Page 48
	Proposed PROW and Main Cycle Access (ATR 1) Page 25
	Proposed PROW (ATR 2) Page 26
	Proposed Shared Use Path (ATR 3) Page 27
	Proposed Pedestrian / Maintenance Track (ATR 4) Page 28
	Existing PROW N/A
	Existing Bridleway N/A

Please Note:  
 - A tolerance of 25m is given to all movement routes to account for design development.

**UMC ARCHITECTS**

WWW.UMCARCHITECTS.COM  
 INFO@UMCARCHITECTS.COM  
 +44 (0)1938 654 854

General Notes

- This document is to be used for the stated purpose only and should not be used for any other.
- Dimensions are all in millimetres, unless stated otherwise.
- It is the recipient's responsibility to print this document to the correct size & scale.
- All relevant drawings and specifications should be read in conjunction with this document.
- Scaling of this document is not recommended.

Document Scale(s)  
 100m SCALE 1:5000

Page 90

**newlands developments**

Project Name  
**Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park**

Employer	Project Address
<b>Newlands Developments</b>	<b>Hinchingsbrooke, Huntingdon</b>

RIBA Workstage	Suitability
<b>2 - Concept Design</b>	<b>S2 - Information</b>

Drawn	Checked	Created	Size
<b>LM</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>10.10.2025</b>	<b>A1</b>

UMC Project Reference	Scale	LOD	LOI
<b>22573</b>	<b>1:5000</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Document Title  
**Regulatory Plan**

Document Reference  
**22573 - UMC - S102 - SI - DR - A - 0162**

Revision Note  
**Layout and Key amended**

Issue Date	Status	Current Revision
<b>17.12.2025</b>		<b>P02</b>

### General Notes

- This document is to be used for the stated purpose only and should not be used for any other.
- Dimensions are all in millimetres, unless stated otherwise.
- It is the recipient's responsibility to print this document to the correct size & scale.
- All relevant drawings and specifications should be read in conjunction with this document.
- Scaling of this document is not recommended.

Document Scale(s)



### Key

- Proposed Application Boundary
- Existing A141 alignment and area for A141 re-alignment, principal site access works, and associated hard and soft landscaping
- Developable Area - 18.5m Max Build Height Above FFL
- Developable Area - 21.0m Max Build Height Above FFL
- Developable Area - 24.0m Max Build Height Above FFL
- Proposed Area for Bunding
- 24.50m Fixed spot heights in metres above ordnance datum, identified along the ridge-line of each length of strategic bunding +/- 0.5m.
- 24.50m 25.50m Between any two consecutive spot heights marked on the ridge, the height of the bund at its ridge will be no lower than the lower of the two spot heights and no higher than the higher of the two spot heights.
- Area of level change - Indicative area of site contouring related to plateaus

### Please Note:

- A tolerance of variation in height to the plateaus is to be allowed for at +/- 250mm to allow for variability in material.
- For future flexibility a 25m deviation is allowed to the position of the internal boundaries between developable areas. The outer perimeter of the developable area is fixed as indicated.
- The green / movement corridors can be repositioned to suit the confirmed extent of developable area within the 25m deviation.
- Any variation in the plateau development areas and / or movement corridors shall ensure clear sight lines and visual breaks are maintained through the development areas, across connecting corridors.
- 500mm variation between the plateau level and FFL is to allow for build-up between road, footpath, unit DPC and related falls for site drainage.



Project Name  
**Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Parks**

Employer	Project Address
<b>Newlands Developments</b>	<b>Hinchingsbrooke, Huntingdon</b>

RIBA Workstage	Suitability
<b>2 - Concept Design</b>	<b>S2 - Information</b>

Drawn	Checked	Created	Size
<b>LM</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>02.07.2025</b>	<b>A1</b>


UMC Project Reference	Scale	LOD	LOI
<b>22573</b>	<b>1:5000</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Document Title  
**Parameter Plan - Site Levels and Building Heights**

Document Reference  
**22573 - UMC - S102 - SI - DR - A - 0143**


Revision Note  
**Layout and key amended**

Issue Date	Status	Current Revision
<b>11.12.2025</b>		<b>P09</b>



General Notes


- This document is to be used for the stated purpose only and should not be used for any other.
- Dimensions are all in millimetres, unless stated otherwise.
- It is the recipient's responsibility to print this document to the correct size & scale.
- All relevant drawings and specifications should be read in conjunction with this document.
- Scaling of this document is not recommended.



- ### Key
- Proposed Application Boundary
  - Indicative location of utilities infrastructure - Subject to detail design
  - Existing A141 alignment and area for A141 re-alignment, principal site access works, and associated hard and soft landscaping
  - Open Land / Landscaping area to include retained vegetation, mitigation mounding, proposed planting, paths, attenuation & SuDS, retaining walls, retained agricultural land, publicly accessible landscape space and other applicable features.
  - Green Corridor
    - To include landscaped planting areas
    - Minimum widths indicated on plan
  - Green Movement Corridor
    - No buildings to be placed in this zone.
    - Highways, landscaping and footpath permitted
    - Highway widths subject to detail design
    - To include landscaped planting areas in addition to highway verge.
    - Minimum widths indicated on plan
  - Retained Tree
  - Retained Hedge
  - Retained Tree Cluster
  - Removed Tree
  - Removed Hedge
  - Removed Tree Cluster
  - Proposed Area for Bunding
  - Proposed Attenuation Basins and Swales
- Fixed spot heights in metres above ordnance datum, identified along the ridge-line of each length of strategic bunding +/- 0.5m.
- 24.50m
  - 24.60m
  - 25.50m
- Between any two consecutive spot heights marked on the ridge, the height of the bund at its ridge will be no lower than the lower of the two spot heights and no higher than the higher of the two spot heights.
- Proposed Woodland Biome
  - Proposed Scrubland Biome
  - Proposed Wetland Biome
  - Proposed Meadow Biome

Please Note:

- All proposed strategic landscaping areas/elements are indicative and subject to detail design.
- All corridors can be repositioned to suit the confirmed extent of developable area within the 25m deviation.
- Any variation in the plateau development areas and / or movement corridors shall ensure clear sight lines and visual breaks are maintained through the development areas, across connecting corridors.



Project Name  
**Hinchbrooke Logistics Park**

Employer	Project Address
<b>Newlands Developments</b>	<b>Hinchbrooke, Huntingdon</b>

RIBA Workstage	Suitability
<b>2 - Concept Design</b>	<b>S2 - Information</b>

Drawn	Checked	Created	Size
<b>LM</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>02.07.2025</b>	<b>A1</b>

UMC Project Reference	Scale	LOD	LOI
<b>22573</b>	<b>1:5000</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Document Title  
**Parameter Plan - Strategic Landscaping**

Document Reference  
**22573 - UMC - S102 - SI - DR - A - 0145**

Revision Note  
**Layout and key amended**

Issue Date	Status	Current Revision
<b>15.12.2025</b>		<b>P12</b>

### General Notes

- This document is to be used for the stated purpose only and should not be used for any other.
- Dimensions are all in millimetres, unless stated otherwise.
- It is the recipient's responsibility to print this document to the correct size & scale.
- All relevant drawings and specifications should be read in conjunction with this document.
- Scaling of this document is not recommended.

Document Scale(s)



### Key

- Proposed Application Boundary
- Indicative location of utilities infrastructure  
- Subject to detail design
- Existing A141 alignment and area for A141 re-alignment, principal site access works, and associated hard and soft landscaping
- Open Land / Landscaping Area  
- Refer to Strategic Landscape parameters plan
- Developable Area  
- Use classes B2/B8/Sui Generis
- Area of level change  
- Indicative area of site contouring related to plateaus
- ↔ Green Corridor  
- To include landscaped planting areas  
- Minimum widths indicated on plan
- ↔ Movement Corridor  
- No buildings to be placed in this zone.  
Highways, landscaping and footpath permitted  
- Highway widths subject to detail design
- ↔ Green Movement Corridor  
- No buildings to be placed in this zone.  
Highways, landscaping and footpath permitted  
- Highway widths subject to detail design  
- To include landscaped planting areas in addition to highway verge  
- Minimum widths indicated on plan

### Note

- For future flexibility a 25m deviation is allowed to the position of the internal boundaries between developable areas. The outer perimeter of the developable area is fixed as indicated.
- All corridors can be repositioned to suit the confirmed extent of developable area within the 25m deviation.
- Any variation in the plateau development areas and / or movement corridors shall ensure clear sight lines and visual breaks are maintained through the development areas, across connecting corridors.



Project Name

**Hinchingbrooke Logistics Park**

Employer	Project Address
Newlands Developments	Hinchingbrooke, Huntingdon

RIBA Workstage	Suitability
2 - Concept Design	S2 - Information

Drawn	Checked	Created	Size
LM	MS	02.07.2025	A1

UMC Project Reference	Scale	LOD	LOI
22573	1:5000	1	1

Document Title

**Parameter Plan - Development Extents and Land Use**

Document Reference


**22573 - UMC - S102 - SI - DR - A - 0142**


Revision Note

**Layout and key amended**

Issue Date	Status	Current Revision
15.12.2025		

**P09**





	CD 116 COMPLIANCE	COMPLIANCE	ARM 1 North (A141)	ARM 2 East (Hitchingbrooke Business Park)	ARM 3 South (A141)	ARM 4 West (Development Access)
TYPE OF ROUNDABOUT	CLAUSE 2.3	ROADS WITH SPEED LIMIT OF 50MPH, A NORMAL ROUNDABOUT SHALL BE USED	NORMAL ROUNDABOUT			
ENTRY WIDTH	Clause 3.13	DUAL CARRIAGEWAY - ENTRY WIDTH SHALL NOT EXCEED 15m	8.5m	8.3m	8.6m	8.1m
LANE WIDTH	Clause 3.14	NO LESS THAN 3m AND NO GREATER THAN 4.5m	4.2m + 4.3m	3.9m + 4.4m	4.2m + 4.4m	4.0m + 4.1m
ENTRY ANGLE	CLAUSE 3.18.1	NO LESS THAN 20 DEGREES AND GREATER THAN 60 DEGREES FOR NORMAL AND COMPACT ROUNDABOUTS	37	33	37	31
EFFECTIVE FLARE LENGTH	CLAUSE 3.17.1	MINIMUM EFFECTIVE FLARE LENGTHS OF 5m IN URBAN AREAS AND 25m IN RURAL AREAS SHOULD BE USED	15.4m	17.4m	15.0m	23.3m
ENTRY KERB RADIUS	CLAUSE 3.19.3	ENTRY KERB RADIUS SHOULD BE NO LESS THAN 20m AND NO GREATER THAN 100m.	20m	20m	20m	30m
ENTRY PATH RADIUS AND DEFLECTION	CLAUSE 3.26	SHOULD NOT EXCEED 100m.	80m	48m	87m	67m
EXIT WIDTH	CLAUSE 3.28.4	EXIT WIDTH FOR TWO-LANE DUAL CARRIAGEWAY SHOULD BE BETWEEN 10m AND 11m.	10m	-	10m	-
	CLAUSE 3.28.2	EXIT WIDTH FOR SINGLE-CARRIAGEWAY SHOULD BE BETWEEN 7m AND 7.5m	-	7.5m	-	8.2m
EXIT KERB RADIUS	CLAUSE 3.29.3	NO LESS THAN 20m AND NO GREATER THAN 100m	100m	70m	60m	40m
ICD	CLAUSE 3.5.2	SHOULD NOT EXCEED 100m	73m			
CIRCULATORY WIDTH	CLAUSE 3.8.1N1	CIRCULATORY CARRIAGEWAY WIDTH SHOULD BE CONSTANT BETWEEN 1.0 TO 1.2m TIMES THE GREATEST ENTRY WIDTH	10m			

	CD 109 COMPLIANCE	ARM 1 North (A141)	ARM 2 East (Hitchingbrooke Business Park)	ARM 3 South (A141)	ARM 4 West (Development Access)
EXISTING SPEED LIMIT	-	70mph	20mph	70mph	-
PROPOSED SPEED LIMIT	-	50mph	30mph	50mph	30mph
DESIGN SPEED	TABLE 2.10	120kph	60kph	120kph	60kph
DESIRABLE MINIMUM	TABLE 2.10	1020m	-	-	-
ONE STEP BELOW DESIRABLE MINIMUM	TABLE 2.10	-	-	720m	-
SUPERELEVATION	TABLE 2.10	5%	-	7%	-
PERMITTED RELAXATIONS	TABLE 4.5	-	-	1 STEP	-

	CD 127 COMPLIANCE	ARM 1 North (A141)	ARM 2 East (Hitchingbrooke Business Park)	ARM 3 South (A141)	ARM 4 West (Development Access)
PROPOSED CROSS SECTIONS	FIGURE 2.1.1N1a - 2.1.1N1h	D2AP	-	D2AP	D2UAP
PROPOSED LANE WIDTHS	FIGURE 2.1.1N1a - 2.1.1N1h	3.65m	-	3.65m	3.65m
PROPOSED HARD STRIPS	FIGURE 2.1.1N1a - 2.1.1N1h	1.00m	-	1.00m	-
MINIMUM CENTRAL RESERVE WIDTH	FIGURE 2.1.1N1a - 2.1.1N1h	2.50m	-	2.50m	2.50m
PROPOSED VERGE WIDTH	FIGURE 2.1.1N1a - 2.1.1N1h	2.50m	-	2.50m	2.50m



- KEY:-**
- PLANNING BOUNDARY
  - EXISTING HIGHWAY BOUNDARY
  - PROPOSED HIGHWAY BOUNDARY
  - PROPOSED ADOPTED CARRIAGEWAY CONSTRUCTION: PAVED ASPHALT
  - PROPOSED FOOTWAY
  - EXISTING CARRIAGEWAY TO BE REPLACED BY VERGE
  - PROPOSED GRASSED / HOGGIN LEGAL FOOTPATH
  - PROPOSED GRASS VERGE
  - PROPOSED STREET LIGHTING COLUMN
  - PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNS (SEE NOTE 13)
  - PROPOSED VEHICLE RESTRAINT SYSTEM (SEE NOTE 12)
  - EXISTING FOOTPATH (PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY)
  - PROPOSED FOOTPATH (PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY)
  - PROPOSED UNSEGREGATED SHARED-USE FOOTWAY / CYCLE TRACK (PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY)
  - PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY TO BE DIVERTED
  - EXISTING BRIDLEWAY (PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY)
  - PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN ROUTES

- NOTES:-**
1. THIS DRAWING SHOULD BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALL DRAWINGS, DESIGN DOCUMENTS AND CCC'S HOUSING ESTATE ROAD CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATION CURRENTLY DATED JANUARY 2023, AS WELL AS SUBSEQUENT REVISIONS OF THIS SPECIFICATION.
  2. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN MILLIMETRES UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
  3. ALL LEVELS ARE IN METRES RELATIVE TO ORDANCE DATUM NEWLYN UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
  4. ALL COORDINATES ARE IN METRES RELATIVE TO ORDANCE SURVEY NATIONAL GRID.
  5. THE GEOMETRIC DESIGN HAS BEEN UNDERTAKEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS:-
    - DMRB CD109 - 'HIGHWAY LINK DESIGN';
    - DMRB CD116 - 'GEOMETRIC DESIGN OF ROUNDABOUTS';
    - DMRB CD127 - 'CROSS-SECTIONS AND HEADROOMS'
  6. ALIGNMENT OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAY BOUNDARY BASED ON HIGHWAY BOUNDARY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL, DATED 15/01/2025. INTERPOLATED AND ALIGNED TO PHYSICAL FEATURES ON THE TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY.
  7. PROPOSED HIGHWAY BOUNDARY BASED ON THE PROPOSED ROUNDABOUT BEYOND THE EXISTING HIGHWAY BOUNDARY, AS WELL AS VISIBILITIES ON THE APPROACH TO THE ROUNDABOUT.
  8. EXISTING POSTED SPEED LIMIT OF THE A141 IS NATIONAL SPEED LIMIT (70mph). CCC HAVE RECOMMENDED THAT A TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO) WILL BE REQUIRED TO REDUCE THE SPEED LIMIT TO 50mph.
  9. EXISTING TOPOGRAPHY AS PER TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY CONDUCTED BY STAFSURY REF. 14053. ISSUED TO STANTEC ON THE 21/02/2025.
  10. FOR GEOMETRIC PARAMETERS, REFER TO STANTEC DRAWING 332611944\_STN\_HGN\_XX\_DR\_CH\_0104 - GEOMETRY.
  11. FOR PROPOSED CROSS SECTIONS, REFER TO STANTEC DRAWING 332611944\_STN\_HGN\_XX\_DR\_CH\_0110 - TYPICAL SECTIONS.
  12. EXTENT OF VEHICLE RESTRAINT SYSTEMS TO BE DETERMINED AT DETAILED DESIGN STAGE UNDER RRRAP.
  13. LOCATIONS OF TERMINAL SPEED LIMIT SIGNS AND ADVANCE DIRECTION SIGNS ARE INDICATIVE. FINAL POSITIONS AND NUMBER OF SIGNS TO BE SUBJECT TO DETAILED DESIGN.
  14. EXACT POSITIONING OF STREET LIGHTING SUBJECT TO DETAILED DESIGN.
  15. PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY DIVERSIONS ARE SUBJECT TO DETAILED DESIGN.

Rev.	Description	Drawn	Date	Chkd
P3	UPDATED PROW EASTERN ARM	KM	29.09.2025	BH
P2	UPDATED FOLLOWING DLA COMMENTS	LS	19.09.2025	BH
P1	UPDATED FOLLOWING STAGE 1 RSA	LS	29.08.2025	BH
P0	FIRST ISSUE - RSA	AF	02.07.2025	BH

**HINCHINGBROOKE LOGISTICS PARK**

**STANTEC UK LTD**  
<https://www.stantec.com/uk>


**PROPOSED ROUNDABOUT ACCESS GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLAN**

Drawing Status: FOR PLANNING  
 CAD Reference: 332611944\_STN\_HGN\_XX\_DR\_CH\_0101.dwg  
 Drawn: AF  
 Date: 02.07.2025  
 Scale: 1:@ A0 1:1000



Project No: 332611944 Drawing No: STN\_HGN\_XX\_DR\_CH\_0101 Rev: P3

© Crown copyright and database rights 2023. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Ordnance Survey 10002432

PLAN 1:1000



**PLAN**  
1:200




**LOCATION PLAN**  
1:10000

**NOTES :**


- 0100.1 THIS DRAWING IS BASED UPON PRELIMINARY DATA AND IS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY.
- 0100.2 DO NOT SCALE FROM DRAWINGS.
- 0100.3 THIS DRAWING IS BASED UPON THE FOLLOWING SUPPLIED DIGITAL INFORMATION:
  - © CROWN COPYRIGHT AND DATABASE RIGHTS 2023. ORDNANCE SURVEY 100022432.
  - EXISTING TOPOGRAPHY AS PER TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY CONDUCTED BY STAFSURY REF. 14053, ISSUED TO STANTEC ON THE 21/02/2025.
  - GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLAN: Drg. REFERENCE 332611944\_STN\_HGN\_XX\_DR\_CH\_0101.
- 0100.4 UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE, ALL DIMENSIONS ON STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS ARE IN MILLIMETRES. ALL CHAINAGES ARE SHOWN IN METRES.
- 0100.5 ALL LEVELS ARE IN METRES AND RELATIVE TO ORDNANCE DATUM (NEWLYN).
- 0100.6 THE GEOMETRY DEPICTED IN THIS DRAWING HAS BEEN DETERMINED FROM THE FOLLOWING:
  - THE DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION / HIGHWAYS ENGLAND DESIGN MANUAL FOR ROADS AND BRIDGES.
- 0100.7 PROPOSALS INDICATED ARE PRELIMINARY. FULL DETAILED DESIGN SUBJECT TO AIP AND TECHNICAL APPROVAL PROCESS

**KEY:**

- DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY
  - EXISTING HIGHWAY BOUNDARY
  - PROPOSED HIGHWAY BOUNDARY
  - PROPOSED VEHICLE RESTRAINT SYSTEM
- EXISTING UTILITIES:
- OR — OPENREACH



**SECTION 01**  
1:100



**ELEVATION 02**  
1:100

Rev	Description	Drawn	Date	Chkd
P02	AMENDED FOLLOWING COMMENTS FROM DLA	KAI	19-09-25	JCS/SW
P01	FOR PLANNING	CRD	01-09-25	JCS/SW







**HINCHINGBROOKE LOGISTICS PARK**

**STANTEC UK LTD**  
<https://www.stantec.com/uk>

**HINCHINGBROOKE A141 UNDERPASS  
GENERAL ARRANGEMENT**

Drawing Status: FOR INFORMATION  
 CAD Reference: 332611944-STN-SBR-XX-DR-CB-2500.dwg  
 Drawn: CRD  
 Date: -  
 Scale: 1: @ A1 As Indicated

Project No: 332611944  
 Drawing No: STN-SBR-XX-DR-CB-2500  
 Rev: P02



**KEY:**

- HIGHWAY BOUNDARY
- PROPOSED BLISTER TACTILE PAVING
- STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE (SSD) TO ROUNDABOUT GIVE WAY LINE (SSD = 160m) - DESIGN SPEED 85kph

**NOTES:**

- ALIGNMENT OF HIGHWAY BOUNDARY BASED ON HIGHWAY BOUNDARY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CCC, DATED 20th AUGUST 2025.
- DESIGN SPEED / SSD BASED OFF EXISTING SPEED LIMITS TO BE CONFIRMED BY SPEED SURVEYS.
- FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHEME PROPOSALS, INCLUDING DRAINAGE, UTILITIES, ROAD RESTRAINT SYSTEMS AND EARTHWORKS, ARE TO BE UNDERTAKEN AT THE DETAILED DESIGN STAGE.
- VEHICLE TRACKING HAS BEEN UNDERTAKEN AT 15kph USING LIMITED TURNING FOR DYNAMIC EFFECTS.

**LARGE CAR (2006)**

OVERALL LENGTH	5.079m
OVERALL WIDTH	1.822m
OVERALL BODY HEIGHT	1.525m
MIN BODY GROUND CLEARANCE	0.315m
MAX TRACK WIDTH	1.831m
LOCK TO LOCK TIME	4.00s
KERB TO KERB TURNING RADIUS	5.900m

**MAX (LEGAL LENGTH (UK)) ARTICULATED VEHICLE (16.5m)**

OVERALL LENGTH	16.500m
OVERALL WIDTH	2.550m
OVERALL BODY HEIGHT	3.881m
MIN BODY GROUND CLEARANCE	0.411m
MAX TRACK WIDTH	2.500m
LOCK TO LOCK TIME	5.00s
KERB TO KERB TURNING RADIUS	6.530m

0 10 20 30 40 50m  
SCALE 1:500

PO	BB	25.03.02	BH	JSH	
Rev	Description	Drawn	Date	CHK	Appr

**HINCHINGBROOKE PARK**

**newlands developments**

**STANTEC**  
www.stantec.com/en

**OFFSITE MITIGATIONS  
A141/WASHINGLEY ROAD/LATHAM ROAD**

Drawing Status	TECHNICAL APPROVAL
CAD Reference	332611744
Drawn	BB
Date	2025.03.02
Scale	1:500 @ A0
Project No	332611944
Drawing No	57N-HGN-A141RS-DR-CH-1001_P01
Rev	

**KEY:**









- HIGHWAY BOUNDARY
- STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE (SSD) TO PRIMARY SIGNAL (SSD = 160m - DESIGN SPEED 85km/h)
- STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE (SSD) (SSD = 160m - DESIGN SPEED 85km/h)
- PRIMARY TRAFFIC SIGNAL
- RED TACTILE PAVING (CONTROLLED CROSSINGS)

**NOTES:**

1. ALIGNMENT OF HIGHWAY BOUNDARY BASED ON HIGHWAY BOUNDARY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CCC, DATED 20<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2023.
2. DESIGN SPEED / SSD BASED OFF EXISTING SPEED LIMITS. TO BE CONFIRMED BY SPEED SURVEYS.
3. FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHEME PROPOSALS, INCLUDING DRAINAGE, UTILITIES, ROAD RESTRAINT SYSTEMS, AND EARTHWORKS, IS TO BE UNDERTAKEN AT THE DETAILED DESIGN STAGE.
4. VEHICLE TRACKING UNDERTAKEN AT 15km/h USING LIMITED TURNING FOR DYNAMIC EFFECTS.

Max Legal Length (UK Articulated Vehicle) 18.75m  
 Overall Width 2.55m  
 Overall Height 4.00m  
 Min Body Ground Clearance 0.11m  
 Max Track Width 2.50m  
 Lock to Lock Tyre 6.00m  
 Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius 6.50m

Large Car  
 Overall Length 4.800m  
 Overall Width 1.700m  
 Overall Height 1.500m  
 Min Body Ground Clearance 0.100m  
 Track Width 1.700m  
 Lock to Lock Tyre 4.000m  
 Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius 4.200m



0 10 20 30 40 50m  
SCALE 1:500

POI	FIRST ISSUE	JS	20.03.2023	BN	JSH
Rev	Description	Drawn	Date	CHKD	Appr

**HINCHINGBROOKE PARK**



**newlands developments**

**STANTEC**  
www.stantec.com/en

**OFFSITE MITIGATIONS**  
A141 / ERMINE STREET ROUNDABOUT

Drawn/Issued: 30/01/1944  
 Date: 25  
 Date: 2026-03-02  
 Scale: 1:500 @ A0


Project No: 332611944  
 Drawing No: STN-HGN-A141RB-DR-CH-1000-P01



- KEY:-**
- HIGHWAY BOUNDARY
  - STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE (SSD) TO PRIMARY SIGNAL (SSD = 215m - DESIGN SPEED 100kph)
  - STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE (SSD) TO PRIMARY SIGNAL (SSD = 160m - DESIGN SPEED 85kph)
  - INTERVISIBILITY ZONE
  - PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY (AS PER CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S INTERACTIVE MAPPING)
  - PRIMARY TRAFFIC SIGNAL
  - RED TACTILE PAVING (CONTROLLED CROSSINGS)

- NOTES:-**
1. ALIGNMENT OF HIGHWAY BOUNDARY BASED ON HIGHWAY BOUNDARY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CCC, DATED 20<sup>th</sup> AUGUST 2025.
  2. DESIGN SPEED / SSD BASED OFF EXISTING SPEED LIMITS. TO BE CONFIRMED BY SPEED SURVEYS.
  3. FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHEME PROPOSALS, INCLUDING DRAINAGE, UTILITIES, ROAD RESTRAINT SYSTEMS, AND EARTHWORKS, IS TO BE UNDERTAKEN AT THE DETAILED DESIGN STAGE.
  4. VEHICLE TRACKING UNDERTAKEN AT 15mph USING LIMITED TURNING FOR DYNAMIC EFFECTS.

Page 98




**DESIGN RISK**

1 SOUTHBOUND A141 CARRIAGEWAY TO BE WIDENED IN ORDER TO ACCOMMODATE 2No. LANES. NORTHERN VERGE MAY POTENTIALLY REQUIRE SUPPORT FROM A RETAINING STRUCTURE IN ORDER TO ENSURE THE FOOTPRINT OF THE SCHEME CAN BE PROVIDED WITHIN THE EXTENT OF THE EXISTING HIGHWAY BOUNDARY.

**DESIGN RISK**

2 THE EXISTING SIGNALISED JUNCTION AT A141 / KINGS RIPTON ROAD INCLUDES A TOUCAN STYLE CONTROLLED CROSSING ON THE WESTERN ARM. HOWEVER, THE OFF CARRIAGEWAY FACILITIES ON EITHER SIDE OF THE CROSSING CURRENTLY ONLY CATER FOR PEDESTRIANS. IN ACCORDANCE WITH LTN 102 GUIDANCE, TOUCAN CROSSINGS SHOULD BE DESIGNED AS STRAIGHT-THROUGH CROSSINGS TO IMPROVE DIRECTNESS AND ACCESSIBILITY FOR BOTH PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS. THIS ASPECT REQUIRES FURTHER DISCUSSION WITH CCC'S LOCAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH CURRENT DESIGN GUIDANCE AND INTEGRATION WITH WIDER ACTIVE TRAVEL OBJECTIVES.

PLEASE NOTE, CCC'S 'LOCAL CYCLING AND WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN' (LCWIP) IDENTIFIES ROUTE 12 AS A PRIORITY CORRIDOR FOR ACTIVE TRAVEL, WITH ALIGNMENT PASSING THROUGH THIS JUNCTION. ENHANCING THE CROSSING TO SUPPORT BOTH PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE MOVEMENTS WOULD DIRECTLY SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF ROUTE 12 AND CONTRIBUTE TO THE STRATEGIC AIMS OF THE LCWIP. AS SUCH, THE PRELIMINARY DESIGN CURRENTLY RETAINS A TOUCAN CROSSING TO MAXIMISE CONNECTIVITY FOR FUTURE USERS OF LCWIP ROUTE 12.



Rev	Description	Drawn	Date	Chkd
P02	SWEPT PATHS ANALYSIS ADDED		27.02.2026	JSH
P01	FIRST ISSUE		29.08.2025	JSH

**LAND NORTH-WEST OF HINCHINGBROOKE**

**newlands developments**


**STANTEC UK LTD**

<https://www.stantec.com/uk>

**PROPOSED SIGNALISED JUNCTION - A141 / KINGS RIPTON ROAD**

Drawing Status: CONCEPT  
 CAD Reference: -  
 Drawn: JS  
 Date: 29.08.2025  
 Scale: 1: @ A0 1:500

Project No: 332611944-STN-HGN-A141-DR-CH-0001  
 Drawing No: P02



© Crown copyright and database rights 2025. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Ordnance Survey AC0000805122



Dear Councillor

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - MONDAY, 23 MARCH 2026**

I am now able to enclose for consideration at the above meeting the following reports that were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

**Agenda Item  
No.**

**LATE REPRESENTATIONS(Pages 3 - 40)**

This page is intentionally left blank

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2026

### LATE REPRESENTATIONS SUMMARY

2(a) 25/01922/OUT - Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for site access for construction of Storage and Distribution (Use Class B8), General Employment (Use Class B2), Bus Depot (Sui Generis) floorspace with ancillary offices and gatehouses, provision of landscaping, access infrastructure (including new and improved vehicular access from the A141, highway, parking, cycle and pedestrian access), utilities (including gas, electricity, water, sewerage, telecommunications), sustainable drainage systems, and all associated engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and reuse of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works). The proposed development is phased with each phase being a separate and severable part of the development - Brookfield Farm, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley, Huntingdon, PE28 4AB.

1. **County Council (Transport Assessment Team):** No objection subject to conditions.

Notes that the A141 between the proposed site access and the A141/B1514 roundabout (the “BP Garage” roundabout where the A141, Main Street and Huntingdon Road meet) is heavily congested with extensive queuing. After observing traffic conditions in person, the County Council advises that the applicants transport assessment has significantly under-representing congestion and delay on the local transport network in the base case and is therefore not appropriate for use in the assessment of the traffic impacts of the development proposals. This renders any “monitor-and-manage” approach inappropriate.

Following numerous discussions the Local Highway Authority has confirmed that the only acceptable option would be for the applicant to

deliver mitigation prior to any occupation and not leave this to a later date. The applicant's modelling of the proposed mitigation (i.e. the three junction capacity improvements on the A141 set out in the main report) shows to the County Council's satisfaction that this would have a positive impact on traffic flows through the three junctions. Planning rules require a development to mitigate its impact only and not fix existing problems.

Consequently, whilst agreement has not been reached over the base model and what it shows, the Local Highway Authority is content that the mitigation proposed by the applicant would mitigate the development's impact at the three junctions on the A141.

*Officer note: The Transport Assessment Team's recommended conditions are already including within those listed in the main report. Offsite highway improvement works, bus service provision and footway/cycleway links are proposed to be secured by Section 106 agreement, as set out in the main report.*

**2. County Council (Highway Development Control):** No objection subject to conditions.

Confirms that Stage One Road Safety Audits have demonstrated acceptable improvements could be accommodated within the adopted highway boundary. Recommends additional conditions.

*Officer note: The Local Highway Authority's recommended highway development management conditions are already including within those listed in the main report. Offsite highway improvement works are proposed to be secured by Section 106 agreement, as set out in the main report.*

**3. County Council (Rights of Way):** No objection subject to a condition.

*Officer note: An additional condition is recommended accordingly to safeguard the existing public right of way that crosses the site.*

**4. County Councillor Liam Beckett:** Objects on four main grounds, which can be summarised as:

- Excessive building heights and unacceptable visual/amenity harm
- Transport Assessment is incomplete and unreliable
- Severe impacts on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road, emergency access and the A141 corridor
- Unassessed impacts on the A1 Buckden roundabout and wider strategic network

If Members are minded to grant outline permission, requests conditions in respect of:

- Reduced building heights (to 18m)
- Restrictions on operating hours, limited to 07:00 to 21:00 Monday to Friday and 08:30 to 20:00 weekends and bank holidays
- A continuous acoustic barrier along the eastern (A141) site boundary
- Upgrades to the Views Common Road/Hinchingsbrooke Park Road junction
- Blue light impact assessment prior to commencement
- ANPR enforcement of the existing 7.5T weight limit on Views Common Road
- Full new Transport Assessment

*Officer note: The late representation raises no new material considerations not already assessed within the main report, other than the request for a “Blue light impact assessment” which has not been sought by any of the emergency services.*

**5. Hinchingsbrooke Residents Association:** Continues to object on the grounds set out in the main report, which can be summarised as:

- Conflict with Local Plan and Irreversible Damage to Landscape Character
- Acoustic Reflection and Noise Pollution
- Technical Failures and Cumulative Impact
- Public Safety and Fear of Crime
- Impact on Hinchingsbrooke Country Park
- Traffic Impact, Access to Hinchingsbrooke Hospital and Public Safety

If Members are minded to grant outline permission, continues to request conditions in respect of:

- Reduced building heights (to 15m)
- Reduction in the size and height of Unit 2E
- Restrictions on operating hours, limited to 07:00 to 21:00 Monday to Friday and 08:30 to 20:00 weekends and bank holidays
- Omission of the proposed A141 footway/cycleway underpass
- Traffic enforcement measures, including ANPR on Views Common Road
- Noise Reduction, including restrictions on reversing beepers

*Officer note: The late representation raises no new material considerations not already assessed within the main report. Officers note that the Residents Association circulated their letter direct to Development Management Committee members on Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> March, and that the detailed wording of the conditions recommended in the main report was sent to the Residents Association last week.*

**6. HDC Economic Development Team:** Reiterates their strong support.

Understands that the developer is currently in detailed and active discussions with five established local businesses seeking to expand within Huntingdonshire and relocate to the site, thus responding directly to identified and immediate business need. Enabling these businesses to expand locally is critical to maintaining economic momentum within the district and minimises the risk that they may need to relocate outside the District. The proposal represents a clear and immediate opportunity to support business expansion, safeguard and create jobs, and reinforce Huntingdonshire's position as a competitive location for investment and growth.

*Officer note: The applicant has been asked for information on the local businesses who have expressed an interest in relocating to the site, but is under Non-Disclosure Agreements which currently prevent them from doing so.*

**7. Applicant:** Has submitted a final pre-committee letter outlining that:

- National Highway's holding objection has been lifted
- The Local Highway Authority's holding objection has been removed
- The Rights of Way Officer's holding objection has been lifted
- The additional *Accurate Visual Representations* submitted in response to the Hinchingsbrooke Residents' Association's request demonstrate, in the applicant's opinion, that glimpse views of the development would not be out of character and that any visual effects would be "moderate adverse" as set out in their detailed Environmental Statement
- A recent report published by the British Property Federation (a not-for-profit membership organisation representing the UK real estate industry) titled *The Infrastructure of Everything* may be relevant

The applicant has also submitted a cross-section drawing which compares the separation distances in the proposed development to

those at a scheme a Tyldesley (Lancashire) cited as similar by the Residents Association in their recent leaflet-drop.

*Officer note: No additional assessment is considered necessary in response to the applicant's letter. Hinchingsbrooke Residents Association had not had sight of the cross-section comparison drawing, which was received after their letter had been submitted.*

## **7. Other**

As a point of clarification, paragraph 7.2 of the main report should read:

7.12 Taking all the above into account, and noting the words “will be supported” in Policy LP18 compared with “where possible” in LP10, the proposed development is considered to comply with the spatial strategy of the Development Plan when read as a whole. Officers do not consider that loss of agricultural land overrides the support in principle conferred by Local Plan Policy LP18.

**2(b) 25/00892/OUT - Outline application with all matters reserved except for access via Peterborough Road for the demolition of 107 Peterborough Road, and the development of up to 185 dwellings (Use Class C3), public open space and associated infrastructure – Land West of Peterborough Road, Farcet.**

A representation has been received regarding the proposed off-site highway improvements works on St Marys and Vicarage Gardens, and how this would result in the loss of layby and green verges but also create conflict between users. Paragraph 7.45 of the report provides commentary on these works:

7.45 *To further improve routes to Farcet CofE Primary School for pedestrians and cyclists, the applicant proposes to widen the existing footway on the northern side of Vicarage Gardens between the raised table crossing on the B1091 Peterborough Road and Farcet CofE Primary School to a 4m wide segregated*

*footway/cycleway to better facilitate travel to Farcet CofE Primary School from the site by active travel modes. Such works are acceptable subject to their detailed design.*

All of the off-site highway improvements work that are proposed as part of the application fall within highway land. Members should note that the Highway Authority benefits from permitted development rights to carry out maintenance or improvements on land within ownership/control.

These particular off-site highway improvements works will further improve routes to Farcet Primary School. In this case, the works on Vicarage Gardens would result in the loss of a layby and green verges but this is balanced against the accessibility and safety improvements for the users (children and parents travelling to Farcet Primary School). The majority of properties have off-road parking in the form of driveways. Officers disagree that there would be any additional conflict between users, as currently car users have to be mindful of pedestrian and cyclists (given the fact they have to cross the pavement from driveways to the highway), and especially of children given that a primary school is located on the road. Officers consider that the benefits of the provision of the footway/cycleway outweigh any harm caused by the loss of the layby and green verge.

The applicant has carried out a Road Safety audit for the proposed mitigation on the Peterborough Road southern arm of the Whittlesey Road/ Peterborough Road/ A605 roundabout. Peterborough City Council have reviewed this and have confirmed they are happy.

The applicant has also provided clarification to the Ecology Officer on the BNG baseline. The Ecology Officer is now content on BNG matters. Given that this outstanding matter is resolved, Officers no longer request delegated authority on this.

The recommendation is therefore amended to:

RECOMMENDATION - APPROVAL subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 obligation relating to affordable housing, BNG monitoring, provision of open space and wheeled bins, and subject to conditions.

**2(c) 25/00017/FUL - Installation of cooling pond with ancillary equipment, new bund and ground-mounted solar panels (Retrospective) - The Old Hangar, Sibson Airfield, Sibson, Peterborough, PE8 6NE.**

There are no late representations for this item.

## **Brookfield Farm Ermine Street Great Stukeley**

**25/01922/OUT**

### **TRANSPORT COMMENTS**

**PREPARED BY: Transport Assessment Team**

**AUTHOR: Andrew Connolly**

**CHECKED BY: Jez Tuttle**

**DATE: 18 March 2026**

### **Background**

The applicant has sent over a number of emails containing additional information and TN05, TN06 and TN07.

**Having reviewed the planning application and additional information, the Highway Authority has the following comments to make.**

The Highway Authority has undertaken two site visits to observe traffic conditions at peak times on the A141, between the proposed site access and B1514 roundabout. It has been observed that this part of the network is heavily congested with extensive queuing. The reason the Highway Authority has concluded that this is a queue of vehicles is because vehicles cannot enter or exit the roundabout of the A141 with Washingley Road due to a queue of vehicles extending back from the A141 through the roundabout. This queue is caused by the next junction along the A141, which is the Ermine Street/Stukeley Road roundabout. There are no other junctions between these two roundabouts which take priority over the A141 that would cause queuing. If vehicles cannot enter or exit a roundabout in free flow due to vehicles in front of them, then they are likely in a queue. Queueing simply means flow is restricted and delay is accumulating.

The traffic count data and subsequent modelling work undertaken by the applicant and contained within the original TA says that this part of the network is not congested and there is little to no queuing. After observing traffic conditions in person, it is clear that the applicants transport assessment is significantly under-representing congestion and delay on the local transport network in the base case and is therefore not appropriate for use in the assessment of the traffic impacts of the development proposals.

The applicant was suggesting a monitor and manage approach but given the TA has not accurately shown the developments impacts, this is not an acceptable approach.

The network is already over capacity therefore its unclear what trigger(s) could be used for the commencement of the mitigation works.

Following numerous discussions with the applicant and the planning authority it was decided that the only option that would be acceptable to the Highway Authority would be for the applicant to deliver mitigation prior to any occupation and not be left to a later date.

Technical note 05 and 06 model various junctions and scenarios. Technical note 07 has undertaken new capacity testing of three junctions within the study area, the A141 with Ermine Street, the A141 with Washingley Road and the A141 with Kings Ripton Road. These three junctions and the A141 with Huntingdon Road junction, which hasn't been assessed are the main junctions which the development will have an impact at. TN07 has also assessment what effect the mitigation will have on the operation of the junctions. Due to the time pressure put on the Highway Authority, it has not been possible to assess the impact of this development on the highway network as thoroughly and robustly as the Highway Authority would have liked.

Due to the aforementioned time pressures, the Highway Authority has not been able to fully assess the modelling contained within TN07, but the base model (2025) does show queuing of 205 PCU's, which equates to around 1.2km of queuing on the A141 northern arm. The Highway Authority observed queuing of around 900m on this arm. The modelling is therefore much more robust when compared to the original base model which showed just a few vehicles, acknowledging that it now shows a potential 'overestimate'. When modelling the proposed mitigation, TN07 does show that the mitigation will have a positive impact on traffic flows through the three junctions. Planning rules require a development to mitigate its impact only and not fix existing problems.

Whilst agreement has not been reached over the base model and what it shows, the mitigation proposed by the applicant will mitigate the developments impact at the three junctions. This has been demonstrated by the modelling contained within TN07. The applicant has agreed to direct delivery of the mitigation, although it will need to stagger delivery on the ground, along with the construction of the proposed site access roundabout.

**For the above reasons the Highway Authority does not wish to object to the planning application subject to the following -**

1. Prior to first occupation of any units, the applicant shall deliver on the ground a grade separated crossing of the A141 to Hinchingsbrooke, which shall include but not be limited to, access for walking and cycling, lighting and CCTV. Details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

2. Prior to first occupation of any units, the applicant shall provide a bus service from the site to Huntingdon town centre. The bus service shall run from the agreed start date until the development is fully occupied. Prior to first occupation details on start date, routing and frequency shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
3. Prior to the commencement of development, the layout and design for the off-site highway improvement works at the junction of the A141 with Ermine Street/Stukeley Road as shown indicatively on drawing No. STN-HGN-A141RB-DR-CH-1000-P02, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The junction works shall be delivered on the ground within 12 months of the site access roundabout being completed.
4. Prior to the commencement of development, the layout and design for the off-site highway improvement works at the junction of the A141 with Washingley Road/Latham Road as shown indicatively on drawing No. STN-HGN-A141RB-DR-CH-1001 P01, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The junction works shall be delivered on the ground within 12 months of the site access roundabout being completed.
5. Prior to the commencement of development, the layout and design for the off-site highway improvement works at the junction of the A141 with Kings Ripton Road as shown indicatively on drawing No. 332611944-STN-HGN-A141-DR-CH-0001 Rev P03, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The junction works shall be delivered on the ground within 12 months of the site access roundabout being completed.
6. Prior to first occupation of any units, the applicant shall be responsible for the provision and implementation of an Overarching Travel Plan to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall include suitable measures and incentives to promote sustainable travel and shall be monitored annually with all measures reviewed to ensure targets are met. Further more Travel Plans will be required as each phase/unit comes forward on the site.

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

<p>To James Croucher Huntingdonshire District Council Pathfinder House St Marys Street Huntingdon PE29 3TN</p>	<p><b>Place &amp; Sustainability Highway Development Management</b> Cambridgeshire County Council West Highways Division Huntingdon Highways Depot Stanton Way Huntingdon Cambs PE29 6PY</p>
<p><b>App Reference:</b> 25/01922/OUT</p>	
<p>Date In: 16/03/26 Date Out: 18/03/26</p>	<p><b>Contact:</b> Robin Hobbs</p>

**RE: *Application description***

**Proposal:** Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved except for site access for construction of Storage and Distribution (Use Class B8), General Employment (Use Class B2), Bus Depot (Sui Generis) floorspace with ancillary offices and gatehouses, provision of landscaping, access infrastructure (including new and improved vehicular access from the A141, highway, parking, cycle and pedestrian access), utilities (including gas, electricity, water, sewerage, telecommunications), sustainable drainage systems, and all associated engineering works (including demolition of existing structures and buildings, breaking-up and reuse of hardstanding and ground remodelling and enabling works)

**Location:** Brookfield Farm Ermine Street Great Stukeley Huntingdon PE28 4AB

Following the most recent submissions regarding the offsite works not associated with the access I would reiterate my previous comments below with additional comments regarding the remote mitigation measures proposed.

- I note that the rights of way team and transport assessment team have commented and have raised further requirements they will respond separately.
- The design is dependent on traffic regulation orders to reduce the speed details have been provided from Cambs Constabulary regarding the proposed changes to the surrounding roads speed limits to which they appear relatively supportive.

- That proposed is of such a complex nature with embankments, vehicle restraint system and an underpass. These details are relatively acceptable and the applicants are indicating that the in-detail elements such as drainage underpass and earthworks will be as part of the in-detail design and as such I would request a condition that no works are undertaken on site until the offsite works have been agreed in detail with the LPA in consultation with the Highway Authority. They have also indicated that they are willing to cover the cost of the 278 works vetting which will require specialist input.
- The stage 1 Audit and response have been supplied inclusive of the consultant's response to it, which does not indicate any issues which cannot be mitigated, and is therefore acceptable.
- Details have been provided for drainage of the proposed infrastructure in principle however as above the detail will need to be provided at during the stage 2 safety audit process inclusive of existing drainage and any proposal relating to it. The LLFA will comment regarding discharge rates etc and be satisfied that these are acceptable.
- Assessment of the existing layby usage has been provided along with reasons why they consider that this is no longer a requirement given the other facilities located within the location and that this is no longer a trunk road which are accepted.

Mitigation measures drawings have now been submitted, and I would make comment accordingly.

- The offsite mitigation measures have all been subject to stage 1 (in principle) safety audits in relation to the alterations proposed at Washingley Road, Kings Ripton junction and A141 Ermine Street Huntingdon.
- The stage one (in principle) safety audits have all been subject to internal reviews with The Highway Authorities own safety audit team, which concluded that while there were no major issues with that proposed, changes would be required to be acceptable. The changes required would all be within the current limits of the adopted highway and therefore could be provided by the applicant.

Because of the tight timescales subjected to this application it has not been possible to amend the drawings finalising the eventual amendments. This is not the recommended approach and does introduce risk which the LPA must be comfortable with. Our preference would be to defer determination until all issues are resolved and we have agreed drawings which are able to be conditioned.

- Given the above while the Highway Authority have no objections to the proposed offsite works a condition requiring them to be subject to a further stage 1/2 safety audit process, and detailed plans to be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority prior to any construction on site taking place.

Providing that the Local Planning Authority is happy to append such a condition the highway Authority would have no objections to the proposed offsite mitigation works. It's important to note that the broad principle of the mitigation strategy is agreed but design layout changes would be required as a part of any such discharge of conditions application.

Following a review of the documents provided to the Highway Authority as part of the above planning application, the effect of the proposed development upon the Public Highway should be mitigated if the following conditions form part of any permission that the Planning Authority is minded to issue in regard to this proposal:

- HDMC 01 Prior to the commencement of the development full details (in the form of scaled plans and/or written specifications) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to illustrate the following:
- a) The layout of the site, including roads, footways, cycleways, buildings, visibility splays, parking provision and surface water drainage.
  - b) The siting of the buildings and means of access thereto.
  - c) Visibility splays
  - d) Parking provision
  - e) Turning Areas
  - f) Loading Areas

- HDMC 31 Prior to the construction of the development hereby permitted the off-site highway works related to the access of the site based on drawing STN\_HGN\_XX\_DR\_CH\_0101 rev P3 shall be completed to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to ensure that the highway network is adequate to cater for the development proposed.

HDMC 31 Prior to the commencement of development, layout and design for the off-site highway improvement works at Ermine Street Roundabout, Washingley Road roundabout and A141 Kings Ripton signalised junction as shown indicatively on STN-HGN-A141RB-DR-CH-1000 rev P02, STN-HGN-A141RB-DR-CH-1001 rev P01 and STN-HGN-A141RB-DR-CH-0001 rev P03 respectively [insert plan references] shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a submission must include a combined Stage 1 and 2 Road Safety Audit. The junction works shall be delivered on the ground within 12 months of the site access roundabout being completed.

.”

Reason: to ensure that the highway network is adequate to cater for the development proposed.

## INFORMATIVES

The applicant should be informed that in order to carry out the works within the highway a short form **Section 278 agreement** will need to be entered into with the highway authority. [Highways development - Cambridgeshire County Council](#)

The applicant should be informed that in order to carry out the works within the highway, a **Stage 2 Road Safety Audit** will need to be carried out prior to any works being undertaken and that a **Section 278 Highways Agreement** will need to be entered into with the Highway Authority for the construction of the offsite alterations. [Highways development - Cambridgeshire County Council](#)

## James Croucher

---

**From:** Katharine Barnes (she/her) <katharine.barnes@cambridgeshire.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 18 March 2026 14:33  
**To:** Warren Cull; David Akam; Dan Wiggs  
**Cc:** Ben Taylor; Adam Davies; James Croucher  
**Subject:** RE: 25/01922/OUT - Hinchingbrooke Logistics Park - CCC PROW comments [Filed 06 Mar 2026 11:51]

Hi Warren,

Thank you for getting back to me so promptly, and for confirming the below.

I am satisfied that we can work with our colleagues in HDM regarding the underpass, and so would ask for our objection to be modified as the below:

### **Standard Public Rights of Way Condition**

DMapC 02 Prior to the commencement of any works that would result in the permanent obstruction of an existing public right of way the replacement routes must be approved by the Local Highway Authority, certified and confirmed by order.

Reason: To ensure that that public rights of way are open to the public

Kind regards,  
Kat

**Kat Barnes** (she/her) [Why have I put this here?](#)  
**Definitive Map Officer**  
**Place and Sustainability**

**Definitive Map Officer**

**Asset Management, Design and Delivery Service**

[Cambridgeshire County Council](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#)

Call me through Microsoft Teams on 01480 377607

Write to me at:

Box STA2101, Highways Depot, Stanton Way, Huntingdon, PE29 6PY



**Infrastructure & Project Delivery**

This page is intentionally left blank

Date: 19/03/2026  
Contact: 07312 081892  
Email: liam.beckett@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

**Liam Beckett County Councillor**  
**Brampton & Buckden Division**  
New Shire Hall, Emery Crescent,  
Enterprise Campus, Alconbury Weald, PE28 4YE

## **Planning Application 25/01922/OUT - Newlands Park, Brookfield Farm, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley**

Dear Development Management Committee Members,

I am writing to submit a formal objection to planning application **25/01922/OUT** for the proposed Newlands Park (formerly Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park) at Brookfield Farm. Having reviewed the officer's report, the Environmental Statement, and the technical consultee responses, I believe the application conflicts with several key policies of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

My objection focuses on four principal areas:

1. **Excessive building heights and unacceptable visual/amenity harm**
2. **A fundamentally incomplete and unreliable Transport Assessment**
3. **Severe impacts on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road, emergency access and the A141 corridor**
4. **Unassessed impacts on Buckden Roundabout and the wider strategic network**

I also include a final section recommending **necessary conditions** should the Committee be minded to approve the application.

### **1. Building Heights - Conflict with LP10, LP11, LP12 and LP14**

The proposed building heights of **18.5m, 21m and 24m** are wholly inappropriate for a site located:

- **150m from residential properties** (DMC Officers Report: "the closest proposed building would be not less than 150m away", quoting the report)
- **Immediately adjacent to Hinchingsbrooke Country Park**, one of the district's most sensitive landscape assets
- **On rising ground**, increasing visual prominence

The Council's own Landscape Consultant confirms that even after revisions:

“Residual moderate adverse landscape and visual effects would remain, for up to Year 15 post-development.”

(DMC Report, Landscape section)

Place Services similarly concluded that the height reductions were limited, and localised visual harm remains moderate adverse even at Year 15.

This directly conflicts with:

#### **LP10: The Countryside**

Requires development to respect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. A 24m skyline of industrial buildings cannot be reconciled with this requirement.

#### **LP11 & LP12: Design Context and Implementation**

Require development to respond positively to local character. The officer report acknowledges that the massing will remain visually intrusive for at least 15 years.

#### **LP14: Amenity**

Requires development to avoid oppressive or overbearing relationships. A 24m ridge height, on elevated plateaux, within 150m of homes, **is inherently overbearing.**

#### **LP34: Heritage Assets**

Historic England confirms the scheme causes *less than substantial harm* to the Grade II\* Church of St Bartholomew and other listed assets.

This harm must be given **great weight**.

#### **Why 24m is unnecessary**

The applicant has already agreed to **21m maximum** at their Cambridge site. Many comparable logistics parks operate successfully at **15 - 18m**.

There is no functional requirement for 24m buildings here, and the applicant’s justification (“commercial drivers”) is not a material planning consideration.

#### **Requested modification:**

A site-wide height cap of **18m**, which would materially reduce visual harm and bring the scheme closer to Local Plan compliance.

## 2. Transport Assessment - Incomplete, inaccurate and unsafe

The Transport Assessment (TA) is not fit for purpose. This is not an opinion; it is the view of the **Highway Authority itself**.

The County Council's Transport Assessment Team states:

"The applicant's transport assessment is significantly under-representing congestion and delay... and is therefore not appropriate for use."

*(Highways Response, p.1)*

They further confirm:

"The network is already over capacity... the TA has not accurately shown the development's impacts."

*(Highways Response, p.1)*

This is a fundamental failure under:

### **LP16: Sustainable Travel**

Requires full consideration of transport impacts. The TA demonstrably fails this test.

### **LP17: Vehicle Movement**

Requires safe and suitable access for all users. Without accurate modelling, this cannot be demonstrated.

### **NPPF paragraph 116**

Development should be refused where residual cumulative impacts are severe. Without a reliable TA, severity cannot be assessed.

### **Missing or flawed assessments include:**

- **No modelling of Buckden Roundabout**, despite being a known over-capacity junction and a major HGV route. National Highways has not completed a traffic assessment regarding the impact on Buckden Roundabout.
- **No modelling of A1307 / Views Common Road / Hinchingbrooke Park Road**, despite CCC previously requiring it.
- **No modelling of the A1307**, because the applicant asserts - without evidence - that no traffic will use the A1307. The assertion is very likely untrue – anecdotally a simple google maps or apple maps search will direct traffic towards the site via the A1307.
- **Use of 2011 Census data** for worker travel patterns, which the Highway Authority notes is inappropriate and outdated.
- **No assessment of traffic displacement** into Great Stukeley, Little Stukeley, Brampton, Abbots Ripton or rural lanes - despite multiple parish councils raising this as a predictable outcome.

This is not a minor technical gap. **It is a systemic failure that makes the application unsafe to determine.**

### **3. Severe Impacts on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Emergency Access**

Hinchingsbrooke Park Road is already a single-access estate serving:

- 800+ homes
- Hinchingsbrooke Hospital
- Hinchingsbrooke School (2,100 pupils)
- Cromwell Academy
- Police HQ
- Fire HQ
- Country Park visitors

The DMC report acknowledges:

Residents report routine delays of 30 - 60 minutes... emergency vehicles already experience delays.

A video submitted to the Council shows an ambulance unable to exit the estate due to congestion.

I am personally familiar with this congestion too, having first experienced it when my daughter was admitted to hospital in 2024. A trip home to Offord Cluny to collect clothes took over 2 hours due to congestion leaving Hinchingsbrooke Road.

The development adds:

- **2,448 HGV movements per day**
- **5,000 - 7,500 total daily vehicle movements**
- **24/7 operations**

This is incompatible with:

#### **LP12: Design Implementation**

Requires safe access for emergency vehicles.

#### **LP14: Amenity**

Requires protection from noise, disturbance and traffic impacts.

#### **NPPF paragraph 135(f)**

Requires developments to avoid undermining community safety.

The Highway Authority confirms:

“This part of the network is heavily congested with extensive queuing... the TA significantly under-represents congestion.”

Without a **Blue Light Impact Assessment**, the application cannot be safely approved.

#### 4. Unassessed Impacts on Buckden Roundabout and the A1/A14 Corridor

Buckden Roundabout is already a recognised congestion hotspot. The development will generate:

- A high proportion of **southbound HGVs**
- Additional LGVs and employee traffic
- Increased pressure on the A1 and A14 corridors

Yet National Highways has not completed a traffic assessment regarding the impact on Buckden Roundabout.

This is a clear breach of:

##### **LP4: Infrastructure Delivery**

Requires adequate capacity in the strategic network.

##### **NPPF paragraph 104**

Requires developments to consider cumulative impacts on the wider transport network.

Until National Highways completes a full assessment, the application is premature.

#### 5. Additional Material Conflicts with the Local Plan

##### **Loss of tranquillity and landscape character (LP10, LP11, LP12)**

The Council’s Landscape Consultant confirms long-term loss of tranquillity.

##### **Heritage harm (LP34)**

Historic England identifies less-than-substantial harm to multiple listed buildings.

### **Tree loss (LP31)**

The proposal removes a Category A Giant Redwood and a linear woodland belt.

### **Cumulative impact not assessed (LP2, LP18)**

The site sits within the emerging North Huntingdon Growth Cluster.

The application is premature without a cluster-wide transport and infrastructure assessment.

## **6. Requested Conditions if the Committee is Minded to Approve**

If approval is granted, the following conditions are essential to mitigate harm:

### **1. Building Height Cap: Maximum 18m**

Justification:

- Reduces visual harm
- Aligns with comparable Newlands schemes
- Supports LP10, LP11, LP12, LP14 and LP34

### **2. Restricted Operating Hours**

**07:00 - 21:00 only (Mon-Fri)**, no 24/7 operations. **08:30 – 20:00** Weekends and bank Holidays, no 24/7 operations.

Justification:

- Protects residential amenity (LP14)
- Reduces night-time noise and light pollution
- Reduces air pollution
- Supports bat protection and dark skies

### **3. Mandatory Noise Reduction Measures**

A continuous acoustic barrier along the **eastern boundary** facing Hinchibrooke and restrictions on tonal reversing noise at unsociable hours (i.e. applicable beyond the hours

suggested in the section (2) above, if this condition is not applied)

Justification:

- Required to meet BS4142 thresholds
- Supports LP14 and NE3

#### **4. Upgrade of Hinchingsbrooke Road / Views Common Road Junction**

A full junction capacity upgrade must be secured via S106.

Justification:

- Multiple parish councils and the HRA identify this as a critical bottleneck
- Required to maintain emergency access (LP12)

#### **5. Blue Light Impact Assessment**

Must be completed and approved before any development commences.

#### **6. ANPR Enforcement of Weight Limits**

To prevent HGVs using Views Common Road or residential streets.

#### **7. Full, independently verified Transport Assessment**

Including:

- Buckden Roundabout
- A1307
- Hinchingsbrooke Park Road
- J13/J14
- Traffic displacement modelling

## **Conclusion**

The application, in its current form, is **not compliant** with the Huntingdonshire Local Plan or the NPPF.

The evidence from the Council's own consultees - particularly the Highway Authority - demonstrates that the Transport Assessment is incomplete and unreliable, making the application unsafe to determine.

The scale, height and massing of the proposed buildings cause unacceptable visual, amenity and heritage harm.

The impacts on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and emergency access are severe and unmitigated.

The absence of thorough, accurate modelling for the A1307 is a **critical omission**:

- 2,448 HGV movements per day
- 5,000 - 7,500 total daily vehicle movements
- 24/7 operations

**Any error in the traffic modelling - even a small one - risks creating serious danger for the public.** If HGVs divert through Brampton or along the A1307 (a high possibility given a simple test on google maps demonstrates this), they will be travelling through residential streets used daily by families, schoolchildren and vulnerable road users. These routes already struggle with ordinary traffic levels; adding the volumes predicted for this development would push them beyond safe capacity. **The applicant simply can't mitigate this risk** – it would be impossible to completely ensure that all signage makes it certain that the operations would not impact the local residents that have elected me to represent them.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Committee **refuse** the application, or at minimum **defer** it pending completion of the missing assessments.

Yours sincerely,

**Cllr Liam Beckett**

County Councillor for Buckden & Brampton



March 18th 2026

## **Formal Objection: Planning Application 25/01922/OUT – Newlands Park, Huntingdon (formerly known as Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park)**

To the Members of the Development Management Committee,

The Hinchingsbrooke Residents' Association wishes to register a formal objection to the outline planning application for the proposed development at Brookfields Farm (Newlands Park- Huntingdon).

We recognise the need for employment land within Huntingdonshire. However, we do not consider this site to be suitable for development on the scale proposed. In our view, the application conflicts with the currently adopted HDC Local Plan to 2036, creates unacceptable impacts on nearby residents, and raises serious concerns regarding traffic, public safety and access to Hinchingsbrooke Hospital.

Our objections are set out below.

### **1. Conflict with Local Plan and Irreversible Damage to Landscape Character (LP2, LP10, LP11, LP12, LP14, NE2 & NE3)**

The site lies within land designated as Open Countryside and is not allocated for industrial use in the Stukeleys Neighbourhood Plan.

The proposed warehouses, with eaves heights of 18.5m, 21m and 24m, would be substantially larger than the precedent already set on the nearby Hinchingsbrooke Business Park and would be visible over a wide area, including from residential streets. The warehouses would create a sense of enclosure for residents, many of whom choose to live on the estate because of the open countryside location.

We enclose a scale representation of the visual impact of the development and how it will dwarf residents' homes looking from Parkway towards Flamsted Drive (using an image provided this week by Newlands which we have zoomed in).

The excessive height and massing would result in an unacceptably overbearing impact, a significant loss of natural light, and a detrimental increase in noise and light pollution, as a result of the impact from the 24 hour activities proposed as a result of the proposed development devaluing the amenity for neighbouring residents.

The application acknowledges that there will be residual landscape harm for a prolonged period, which reinforces the concern that the scale of the proposal is not appropriate for this location.

### **2. Acoustic Reflection and Noise Pollution (LP14)**

The site is located close to established residential areas, in some cases within approximately 150 metres.



The scale and height of the proposed warehouses, positioned opposite the existing Business Park, raises the risk of increased noise through reflection and amplification of traffic noise from the A141 and surrounding road network. We do not consider that this potential cumulative impact has been fully assessed.

We also note that comparable Newlands developments elsewhere at Thrapston and proposed at Cambridge are located significantly further from residential properties.

### 3. Technical Failures and Cumulative Impact (LP18)

The application relies heavily on the proximity of the existing Hinchingbrooke Business Park to justify development at Brookfields Farm. However, the two sites are physically separated by the A141 and are not part of the same employment area. The creation of a roundabout and an underpass do not make them integrated.

We also have concerns regarding flood risk, drainage capacity and the cumulative impact of development.

### 4. Public Safety and Fear of Crime (BE1)

The proposal includes the construction of an underpass to support pedestrian and cycle movement.

We are concerned that an underpass will feel unsafe, particularly outside daylight hours, and may discourage use rather than encourage Active Travel. The inclusion of an underpass increases the risk of anti-social behaviour and more serious crime, including County Lines activity, directly impacting the safety and security of the local residential environment.

We request that the underpass is replaced with a Toucan crossing like the one at the Brampton Hut roundabout installed as part of the A14 changes

### 5. Impact on Hinchingbrooke Country Park (HU10)

Huntingdonshire District Council is currently investing £2.9m in improvements to Hinchingbrooke Country Park with the stated aim to protect its tranquillity and enhance biodiversity.

The proposed development would introduce large-scale industrial activity operating across extended hours close to the park boundary. We are concerned this will adversely affect wildlife, including protected species, reduce the quiet recreational value of the park and the wider aims of the Council's investment in the park.

### 6. Traffic Impact, Access to Hinchingbrooke Hospital and Public Safety (LP12)

A major concern relates to the effect on the local road network serving Hinchingbrooke Hospital.

Hinchingbrooke Park Road already experiences congestion at peak times and residents regularly observe delays affecting emergency vehicles, often being forced to mount kerbs to allow ambulances to pass.



Planning reports as far back as 2017 (development of the former forensic laboratory) acknowledged it could take an hour to exit the Estate; this situation has only worsened subsequently.

We estimate the development will generate 5,000 -7,500 additional daily vehicle movements, including 2,448 HGVs (based on Newlands' data - over 11% of the old A14's HGV volume). We do not consider that the current road network can safely accommodate this increase without risk of delay to emergency services. It is noted that in January 2025 CCC Highways required a traffic assessment on Views Common Road and Hinchingbrooke Park Road. It is unclear why that position has changed.

A video taken earlier this month <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3XJgpTUcLkE> shows the issues already faced by emergency vehicles trying to get off the estate on weekdays during termtime.

Given the proximity of a major hospital, we request a specific and independent assessment of the impact on emergency vehicle access is required before any decision is made. We believe it raises issues for public safety under policy LP12; We further request a Blue Light Impact Assessment be undertaken to confirm the development will not compromise emergency response times.

## 7. Requested Conditions if Permission is Granted

If the Committee is minded to approve the application, we ask that the following conditions are imposed to reduce the impact on nearby residents and emergency services:

- 1) **Maximum building height** to be limited to 15 metres, (it is noted that at their proposed Cambridge site, Newlands have agreed already to a maximum height of 21 metres before their application is submitted)
- 2) **Reduction in the size and height of Unit 2E**, with increased separation from existing housing, to reduce visual and residential impact. It is the **largest and most visually** intrusive unit yet is positioned closest to Hinchingbrooke residents: we request that it is pushed back 100 metres. It is fundamentally unfair that smaller units are placed near the Brampton Hut roundabout simply to satisfy CCC Highways' desire to protect the views of passing motorists (which was a statement made by Newlands at a meeting with the Friends of Hinchingbrooke Country Park in November 2025). The amenity of local residents must be prioritised over the aesthetic preferences of transient traffic and they should not be forced to live under a 43.75 metre AOD ridgeline.
- 3) **Restrictions on operating hours**, limited to 07:00 to 21:00 Monday to Friday and 08:30 to 20:00 weekends and bank holidays to reduce the noise and air pollution impacts.
- 4) **Removal of the proposed underpass** and replacement with a controlled surface crossing (as per that installed at Brampton Hut when the A14 changes were made).
- 5) **Traffic enforcement measures**, including ANPR on Views Common Road, to prevent HGV use so as to prevent congestion so that emergency vehicles and residents are not delayed.
- 6) **Noise Reduction**, including restrictions on reversing beepers (tonal reversing) if you choose not to restrict operating hours as requested in 3) above.

# Hinchingbrooke Residents' Association

Together for a better Hinchingbrooke



The Residents' Association considers that the scale, location and traffic impact of this proposal makes it unsuitable for this site. In particular, the potential effect on access to Hinchingbrooke Hospital requires further independent assessment before any decision is made.

We therefore ask the Committee to refuse the application, or at the very least to require further evidence on emergency vehicle access and impose strict conditions to protect residents, the Country Park and emergency services.

Yours faithfully,



John Greenhalgh  
Chair

## Exhibit List: Evidence of Conflict (Application 25/01922/OUT)

Exhibit ID	Type of Evidence	Purpose / Policy Conflict	Key Observation from Evidence
Ex-01	Photographic Overlay	LP 11 & LP 14 (Scale/Amenity)	Demonstrates how the 21m warehouse behind Flamsteed Drive will dwarf residential homes for those nearest to the development
Ex-02	Video Footage See You Tube link above)	LP 12 (Public Safety)	Shows emergency vehicles currently struggling to exit the estate during term-time, requiring a Blue Light Impact Assessment.



## **Economic Development Team**

18.03.26

### **Planning application: 25/01922/OUT – Newlands Outline Planning Application**

Further to our previous representation, we write to provide additional economic development comments following new information shared by the applicant.

We understand that the developer is currently in detailed and active discussions with five established local businesses seeking to expand within Huntingdonshire and relocate to this site. This is a significant and material factor, demonstrating that the scheme is not speculative in nature, but instead responds directly to identified and immediate business demand within the district.

From an economic development perspective, this level of confirmed interest provides strong assurance that the proposed employment floorspace will be taken up and utilised, supporting the retention and growth of existing businesses. Enabling these businesses to expand locally is critical to maintaining economic momentum within the district.

If suitable space is not available within Huntingdonshire, there is a clear risk that these businesses may need to relocate elsewhere to accommodate their growth requirements. This would result in the loss of jobs, investment, and associated economic activity from the district. Supporting this application therefore plays an important role in ensuring that this growth is retained locally and continues to benefit Huntingdonshire's economy.

It is also important to note that these businesses have specific operational requirements, including the need for buildings to be delivered by the end of 2028 and designed to accommodate modern working practices. The parameters set within this application, including building heights, are therefore fundamental to ensuring that the development can meet these needs and support productivity improvements.

The delivery timescales associated with developments of this nature are considerable, with significant lead-in periods required for the discharge of conditions, site preparation, infrastructure provision, and construction. As such, timely approval of this Outline Planning Application is essential to ensure that the scheme can come forward within the required timeframe and that these businesses are able to commit to the district with confidence.

In this context, the proposal represents a clear and immediate opportunity to support business expansion, safeguard and create jobs, and reinforce Huntingdonshire's position as a competitive location for investment and growth.

We therefore wish to reaffirm and strengthen our support for this application, recognising the tangible economic benefits it will deliver and the clear evidence of market demand already in place.

This page is intentionally left blank

Mr James Croucher  
Interim Development Management Team Leader  
Strategic Team  
Pathfinder House  
Huntingdonshire District Council  
St Mary's Street  
Huntingdon  
PE29 3TN

19<sup>th</sup> March 2026

Dear James,

HDC ref: 25/01922/OUT

**RE: NEWLANDS PARK HUNTINGDON: FURTHER APPLICANT UPDATE**

Our ref: NLA001/DA

Further to our previous letter of 5<sup>th</sup> March 2026, we write with a further and final update from the Applicant, on a number of matters, ahead of the scheduled 23<sup>rd</sup> March Planning Committee.

**National Highways holding objection lifted**

We are delighted to report that National Highways confirmed by email on 9<sup>th</sup> March that it is lifting its holding objection, having now been satisfied that the modelling of the A1/A141 Brampton Hut junction is representative and that the mitigation identified (in the form of amended white lines) is suitable. A planning condition has been requested to secure this mitigation, and is accepted by the Applicant.

**CCC Highways holding objection lifted**

We are also pleased to report that Cambridgeshire County Council (as the Local Highways Authority) has also removed its holding objection to the application. This is the result of weeks of collaborative and proactive engagement between the Applicant and CCC on the detailed design of off-site mitigation at the Ermine Street, Washingley Road, and Kings Ripton Road junctions of the A141, which will provide adequate mitigation for the proposed development (when assessed cumulatively with other committed developments) by delivering a step change in highway capacity.

This is accompanied by an offer from the Applicant to directly deliver and fund all of these works (under a Section 278 process) as soon as practicable, in accordance with a programme to be agreed and signed off by HDC and CCC. This means that there is no longer any reliance on any highways mitigation schemes being delivered by other committed developments (despite those developments having made commitments to do so under a 'Monitor and Manage' approach as part of their respective planning permissions). These works, together with Newlands' commitment to directly deliver them, are to be secured by planning obligations and conditions. Newlands' delivery of the mitigation schemes at these junctions means that the Section 106 funding secured for the same/similar works from other developments would remain available for other highways and transport infrastructure or other public benefits.

**DAVID LOCK ASSOCIATES LIMITED**

50 North Thirteenth Street  
Central Milton Keynes  
Buckinghamshire  
MK9 3BP

☎ +44 (0) 1908 666276

✉ [mail@davidlock.com](mailto:mail@davidlock.com)

🌐 [www.davidlock.com](http://www.davidlock.com)

VAT Reg. No. 486 0599 05.  
Registered in England No. 2422692.  
Registered Office as above.

### **CCC PRoW holding objection lifted**

Likewise, we were pleased to note that CCC's Definitive Mapping / Public Rights of Way team have removed their holding objection subject to the imposition of a standard condition requiring diversion due process to be followed.

### **Additional Views and Sections**

Newlands has prepared verified images from the viewpoints requested by the Hinchingsbrooke Residents Association, which were submitted earlier this week and uploaded to HDC's Public Access portal.

This demonstrates that the scheme would not be visible at all from the chosen locations within Hinchingsbrooke Country Park nor Bliss Close. Glimpses of the scheme may be possible through the thicket of trees adjacent to the A141 at the back of Flamsteed Drive, though it should be noted that the trees are not in leaf and that this view over the A141 is not considered to be sensitive in landscape terms.

The maximum 21m height parameter envelope of Plateau B is partially visible above the tree line from the selected location at the top of Flamsteed Drive, meaning that the top of a building here may be visible depending on final siting and height. For this reason, a rendered image of a 21m building (based on the illustrative masterplan layout and reflecting the Design Code principles) is also provided to give a representation of potential visual impact. The building sits beneath the rooflines within the foreground, and the recessive colour banding is effective in reducing the perceived massing of the building. This location is one of, if not the only elevated location within the Hinchingsbrooke neighbourhood with a long view corridor towards the Site. The kinetic experience is also important here because, as one travels further westward down Flamsteed Drive, the building would become less visible due to perspective.

It is important to note that none of these viewpoints were sought by Places Services or the Council's conservation officer when scoping the LVIA exercise. Glimpses of employment buildings are not out of character for the area, noting that the tops of buildings within Hinchingsbrooke Business Park are visible from several vantage points located within the Hinchingsbrooke residential estate. Notwithstanding that, FPCR can confirm that their assessment of these views does not change the conclusions set out in the Environmental Statement, which judged there to be moderate adverse visual effects upon residents east of the A141 (Flamsteed Drive/Dyson Close).

As stated in our previous letter, we have also produced the enclosed illustrative sections that show how the scheme would relate to the nearest residential properties, compared to the Tyldesley scheme in Manchester. HRA have stated that Newlands' proposals will give rise to similar visual impacts to this scheme, but this is evidently not the case. Whilst our maximum height parameter is 3 metres higher than the buildings at Tyldesley, the proposed buildings will be over 4 times further away from the nearest residential property at Hinchingsbrooke. Within this intervening space there is existing and proposed banks of trees and the A141 dual carriageway.

### **Strengthened support from HDC Economic Development Team**

We were pleased to note the additional and strengthened letter of support from Huntingdonshire's economic development officers, asserting that the development is not speculative but will meet the immediate needs of several established local businesses seeking to expand within Huntingdonshire, and commending the application for timely approval.

### **BPF I&L Publication**

On Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> March, the British Property Federation (BPF) published its latest report on the importance of the Industrial and Logistics (I&L) sector, titled "The Infrastructure of Everything". This refers to the I&L sector as "the critical infrastructure underpinning the UK's Industrial Strategy" and highlights the significant contribution it makes to the IS-8 key sectors identified in the Government's Industrial Strategy. In total, the IS-8 sectors combined purchased £250 billion worth of inputs from the I&L sector, which is equivalent to 22% of their overall inputs. This is highly relevant given those sectors make up 5 of the 6 high-growth priority sectors outlined in the CPCA Local Growth Plan (namely Life Sciences, Defence, Advanced Manufacturing, Digital Technologies, and Clean Energy). Newlands Park Huntingdon

will therefore be instrumental in delivering the aims of the CPCA Local Growth Plan (which itself is a precursor to the forthcoming CPCA Spatial Development Strategy).

The report helpfully shines light on the sectoral diversity within the I&L sector which is often overlooked in terms of the variety of jobs it offers and the social value and upward social mobility it generates.

...

For avoidance of doubt this letter is accompanied by the following:

- Illustrative residential sections (22573-UMC-SI01-SI-DR-A-0175-P05)

If you have any final queries or require further clarification or details ahead of Planning Committee on Monday, please do not hesitate to contact myself or Andy Fisher of this office.

Yours sincerely,


David Akam  
Associate

Email: [DAkam@davidlock.com](mailto:DAkam@davidlock.com)


cc: Ben Taylor and John Barker, Newlands Developments  
Andy Fisher, DLA

General Notes

- This document is to be used for the stated purposes only and should not be used for any other.
- Dimensions are all in millimetres, unless stated otherwise.
- It is the recipient's responsibility to print this document to the correct size & scale.
- All relevant drawings and specifications should be read in conjunction with this document.
- Scaling of this document is not recommended.



**Tyldesley Residential Section C-C**  
1:500



**Tyldesley Residential Section D-D**  
1:500

**Hinchingsbrooke Residents' Association**  
www.hinchingsbrookeResidents.org  
hello@hinchingsbrookeResidents.org

**Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park**

The above image comes from Tyldesley, Manchester where 18 metre tall warehouses now dominate the skyline, and the news.

The Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park proposal is extremely similar:

- 13 warehouses across 2.2 million square feet of greenfield land directly over the A141 from the Hinchingsbrooke estate.
- 18 metre to 24 metre tall warehouses, visible from homes.
- 24/7 operation, meaning continuous full, road and air pollution.
- Estimated to be 2400 HGVs per day.
- Commuter footpath access through Flamsted Drive via an Underpass.

Public comments close January 28th so you still have time to let your view be known!

Simply send an email including your name and address to [Development.Control@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:Development.Control@huntingdonshire.gov.uk) quoting planning reference: **25/01922/OUT** and let them know what you think. Please cc: [hello@hinchingsbrookeResidents.org](mailto:hello@hinchingsbrookeResidents.org) so we can support!

www.hinchingsbrookeResidents.org | hello@hinchingsbrookeResidents.org

**MEET THE NEW NEIGHBOURS**

Read more about the HLP proposal and the potential impact on Hinchingsbrooke

Don't have time for an email? Complete our survey on the website, it only takes a few seconds.


Our Next Meeting: **Monday 2nd Feb 2026 7:30pm**

Meeting at: **The George Hotel, George St, Huntingdon PE29 3AB in the Manchester Room**


The next meeting of the HRA has been kindly hosted by The George for our convenience. We'll be formally electing the new committee, and hosting an open floor for residents issues and concerns. **Hope to see you there!**



**Key Plan**  
1:10,000



**Section A-A**  
1:500



**Section B-B**  
1:500

Project Name			
Land North West of Hinchingsbrooke, Huntingdon			
Employer		Project Address	
Newlands Developments		Hinchingsbrooke, Huntingdon	
RIBA Workstage		Suitability	
Drawn	Checked	Created	Size
LM	MS	04/02/2026	
UMC Project Reference		Scale	LOD
22573			
Document Title			
Residential Section			
Document Reference			
22573 - UMC - SI02 - SI - DR - A - 0175			
Revision Note			
Plan amended			

Issue Date	Status	Current Revision
12.03.2026	Feasibility	P05

## Lewis Tomlinson

---

**From:** Lewis Tomlinson  
**Sent:** 02 April 2026 17:04  
**To:** Lewis Tomlinson  
**Subject:** RE: 25:01922/OUT Brookfield Farm, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley, Huntingdon, PE28 4AB.

---

**From:** LEE, Deborah (NORTH WEST ANGLIA NHS FOUNDATION TRUST) <[deborah.lee21@nhs.net](mailto:deborah.lee21@nhs.net)>  
**Sent:** 24 March 2026 15:53  
**To:** Mike Gildersleeves <[Mike.Gildersleeves@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:Mike.Gildersleeves@huntingdonshire.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** HLP

Dear Mike

I understand that the planning application for HLP was deferred yesterday pending further information being put before the council.

We have developed a close and positive working relationship with the local residents' association, who were keen for us to consider raising an objection to the proposal for the Logistics Park. We declined to do this on the basis that the technical assessments provided in support of the proposal, particularly the transport analysis, did not indicate that the development would generate material additional traffic impacts on Hinchingsbrooke Park Road or Views Common Road, which would have directly affected hospital operations.

Given this context, we did not consider it appropriate for the Trust to commit further resources to re-run or challenge that analysis unless there was clear evidence of a direct and demonstrable impact on the hospital.

As a statutory planning authority, Huntingdonshire District Council is responsible for assessing the adequacy of those technical submissions, in association with the County Council, and determining whether any further mitigation is required. However, we note that this Business Park site is included in the Council's emerging local plan allocation and this anticipated growth will therefore be included in our assessment of future traffic movements associated with the Hospital Redevelopment if planning permission is granted.

In respect of the impact on blue light vehicles, we are not best placed to assess or comment upon this, but you may wish to speak to the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust who operate the ambulance service. A spokesperson for the EEAST, did comment yesterday that they have no evidence of this development having any impact on emergency vehicle response to date, but you may wish to follow up on this.

We absolutely recognise the traffic congestion in and around the hospital, and the resulting impact on staff and visitors. One of our key priorities for the redevelopment of Hinchingsbrooke Hospital is to improve congestion on the hospital site and to improve traffic flows in and out of the site and specifically Hinchingsbrooke Park Road. Our plans include creating a second access road on to Views Common Road, with the aim of improving flows in and out of the site and segregating flows for emergency vehicles. Initial feedback to these plans has been positive and we continue to work closely with local residents, parish councils, the planning authority and other local stakeholders including the Ambulance Trust

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me

KR

D

Deborah Lee

Senior Responsible Officer (SRO), Hinchingsbrooke Hospital Redevelopment Programme

Contact :Deborah.lee21@nhs.net

Support : [Rosalind.cullen@nhs.net](mailto:Rosalind.cullen@nhs.net)

Please note my working days are Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and I will be working hard not to review emails outside of these days. If you need to reach me outside of these days please contact Rosalind Cullen

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

This message may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient please:

- i) inform the sender that you have received the message in error before deleting it; and
  - ii) do not disclose, copy or distribute information in this e-mail or take any action in relation to its content (to do so is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful).
- Thank you for your co-operation.

NHS.net Connect is the secure email, collaboration and directory service available for all NHS staff in England. NHS.net Connect is approved for exchanging patient data and other sensitive information with NHS.net Connect and other accredited email services.

For more information and to find out how you can switch visit [Joining NHS.net Connect - NHS.net Connect Support](#)

## Lewis Tomlinson

---

**From:** Lewis Tomlinson  
**Sent:** 02 April 2026 17:10  
**To:** Lewis Tomlinson  
**Subject:** RE: EEAST Letter

---

**From:** Zoe May <[Zoe.May@eastamb.nhs.uk](mailto:Zoe.May@eastamb.nhs.uk)>  
**Sent:** 02 April 2026 09:33  
**To:** Lewis Tomlinson <[Lewis.Tomlinson@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:Lewis.Tomlinson@huntingdonshire.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Glenn Young <[Glenn.Young@eastamb.nhs.uk](mailto:Glenn.Young@eastamb.nhs.uk)>; Media <[Media@eastamb.nhs.uk](mailto:Media@eastamb.nhs.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: EEAST Letter

Your attachments have been security checked by Mimecast Attachment Protection. Files where no threat or malware was detected are attached.

---

Hi Lewis

Apologies for the delay in responding. Please find attached the response I prepared for our CEO in relation to the logistics park to the residents' association.

EEAST does not have any objections to the logistics park as we do not believe lorries will impact the traffic leading out of Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and surrounding roads.

Whilst the residents' association raised concerns about delays to ambulances due to increased traffic from local workers getting to the new logistics park, as part of the NHS England, national and local government drive to sustainable transport, EEAST would encourage local workers to use sustainable methods of travel eg walking, cycling, bus and shared travel.

I explored with Hinchingsbrooke Hospital the use of emergency services access via the industrial estate, and they have no plans to explore this opportunity as it is a private road. NWAFT will liaise with EEAST when they have made progress with the potential new access point onto Views Common Road.

I have not heard back from my EEAST colleagues, or contacts at Cambridgeshire police and fire service to see if they have ever used the exit point through the bollards to the industrial estate and then onto the A141. I will follow this up in a couple of weeks, as I know a number of colleagues are on annual leave over the Easter break.

I hope this response provides sufficient information to enable the Council to respond to the applicant and for members to review the application at the next planning meeting.

Regards

Zoë

Zoë May  
Head of Business Relationships



**NHS**  
East of England  
Ambulance Service  
NHS Trust

Tel: 07874 643007

Email: [zoe.may@eastamb.nhs.uk](mailto:zoe.may@eastamb.nhs.uk)

Website: [www.eastamb.nhs.uk](http://www.eastamb.nhs.uk)



[X \(formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#)

## Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived

This email transmission and all attached files contain information intended for the designated individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of this email or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete the original message without making any copies. This email transmission and all attached files contain information intended for the designated individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of this email or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete the original message without making any copies.

## Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived

This email transmission and all attached files contain information intended for the designated individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of this email or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete the original message without making any copies. This email transmission and all attached files contain information intended for the designated individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of this email or its attachments is strictly

prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and please delete the original message without making any copies.

Mr Lewis Tomlinson  
Senior Planning Officer  
Pathfinder House  
Huntingdonshire District Council  
St Mary's Street  
Huntingdon  
PE29 3TN

8<sup>th</sup> April 2026

Dear Lewis,

HDC ref: 25/01922/OUT

Our ref: NLA001/DA/AF

**RE: NEWLANDS PARK HUNTINGDON: APPLICANT RESPONSE  
TO DEFERRAL**

We write on behalf of the Applicant, *Newlands Property Developments (Huntingdon) Limited* (or 'Newlands'), in relation to the deferral of Outline Planning Application ref 25/01922/OUT at Huntingdonshire District Council's (HDC's) Development Management Committee (DMC) on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2026.

We understand that the two Reasons for Deferral ('RFDs') have now been formalised, through agreement with Cllr Davenport-Ray (who proposed the motion to defer), and read as follows:

- 1. A consultation response from the NHS reflecting on whether there would be an impact on their operations in the area that would be created by a potential increase in traffic movements because of this application.*
- 2. Traffic modelling of the impact on traffic on the junction of Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Views Common Road that would be created by the traffic movements in the area from the application.*

Looking back at the debate during DMC and the specific context within which these RFDs emerged and were formulated, it is clear that the two are inextricably linked to one primary issue: existing congestion at the Views Common Road and Hinchingsbrooke Park Road crossroads, the impact of that congestion on emergency vehicle access to and from Hinchingsbrooke Hospital, and whether or not this would be exacerbated by the Proposed Development.

**DAVID LOCK ASSOCIATES LIMITED**

50 North Thirteenth Street  
Central Milton Keynes  
Buckinghamshire  
MK9 3BP

☎ +44 (0) 1908 666276

✉ [mail@davidlock.com](mailto:mail@davidlock.com)

🌐 [www.davidlock.com](http://www.davidlock.com)

This letter sets out the Applicant's position on and response to these RFDs. It does so primarily through chronologising, summarising, clarifying, and referencing documentation that was available to the public and Members on 23<sup>rd</sup> March in respect of the transport assessment, stakeholder engagement and formal consultation processes undertaken. It does not introduce any new information or evidence provided by the Applicant that is not already in the public domain, reflecting the view from officers from both HDC and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) at the DMC that no further information was required.

As no new information from the Applicant nor any scheme amendments have been necessary to address the two RFDs, we request that the application is taken to the next available DMC taking place on 20<sup>th</sup> April 2026.

The rest of this letter addresses the two RFDs.

1. *A consultation response from the NHS reflecting on whether there would be an impact on their operations in the area that would be created by a potential increase in traffic movements because of this application.*

First and foremost, it was not within the Applicant's gift to obtain a consultation response from the NHS, nor is it a statutory requirement at any stage of the planning process. Nevertheless, we can confirm that Hinchingsbrooke Hospital (along with all other business and residential addresses within Hinchingsbrooke) was sent a leaflet advertising the pre-application stage public consultation events that took place last Summer. The planning application itself was advertised via site notices, press adverts, neighbour notice letters and other formal (LPA-led) and informal (Applicant-led) media channels. As such, the Hospital had equal and ample opportunity as any other party to engage and comment should they have wished to do so. It is a reasonable assumption to make that the Hospital were aware of the Newlands Park Huntingdon proposals as they are, themselves, an active developer partaking in the emerging Local Plan, in which they have a draft allocation, and on which they provided detailed representations. In doing so, they chose not to comment on the draft allocation for Newlands Park Huntingdon, nor indeed commented on the planning application itself.

An indication of the forthcoming redevelopment proposals at Hinchingsbrooke Hospital is provided within the formal Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Request and Opinion, available on HDC's Public Access system, under reference 25/70078/SCOP. The Scoping Report submitted by the NHS sets out an intention to acquire land to the immediate south of the Hospital, currently under the ownership of the police, and to use this land for a car park and new vehicular access directly from Views Common Road: creating the ability for emergency vehicles to bypass Hinchingsbrooke Park Road, if necessary.

Notwithstanding the above, reflecting its role as the planning authority, **HDC has obtained confirmation from both Hinchingsbrooke Hospital and the East of England Ambulance Service (EEAS) that they have no objection to the Newlands Park Huntingdon proposals.** Their recent consultation responses also re-affirm their intent to mitigate the emergency access issues with a new access from Views Common Road via the constabulary land, and updates that they have been in pre-application discussions with HDC and the local community regarding these proposals.

We acknowledge that the Hospital's redevelopment proposals do not yet have any planning status (with neither a planning permission nor a Local Plan allocation) and, as such, our application places no reliance on such a scheme coming forward. Crucially, however, **the NHS, CCC (as Local Highways Authority) and HDC Planning Officers are all in agreement that Newlands Park Huntingdon would not have any exacerbating impact on current emergency access issues.**

As an aside, we understand that emergency vehicles are permitted to utilise the private road through Hinchingsbrooke Business Park to access the A141, albeit this does not necessarily always occur due to the barrier. The recent response from the ambulance service suggests that the NHS are in discussions with the Business Park on this matter. It is therefore Newlands' opinion that, in the eventuality that emergency vehicles are able to rely on this route, the proposed all-movements roundabout on the A141 will enhance ambulance access to and from the hospital via the Business Park. Ambulances may also benefit from the increased highway capacity at the various A141 junctions to the east that will arise from the off-site mitigation works committed to by Newlands.

2. *Traffic modelling of the impact on traffic on the junction of Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Views Common Road that would be created by the traffic movements in the area from the application.*

As aforementioned, the two RFDs are inextricably linked. Therefore, given Hinchingsbrooke Hospital and EEAS' no-objections to the Proposed Development, in terms of impact on operational grounds, alongside CCC maintaining no objection on highways grounds, we

consider this second RFD to be obsolete. This is because, in the absence of any objection from the Hospital/EEAS, all of the necessary highways information was before Members (within the submitted Transport Assessment and summarised in Paragraphs 7.15 to 7.26 of the Officer's report) at the DMC, and was confirmed to be agreed both in writing and verbally at the DMC itself by CCC's Highways Officer.

We do appreciate the volume and technical complexity of the transport modelling process and its associated documentation. Therefore, to aid understanding, we felt it would be helpful to chronologise and explain the process below.

1. The calculation of the potential number of Development trips passing through any part of the network is the product of a combination of:
  - The Development trip generation assessment (calculated using the industry-standard TRICS trip rate database for similar-scale, similar-use developments); and
  - A calculation of where these development trips are going to travel to/from (the trip distribution assessment); followed by
  - An assessment of the routes these trips use in their journeys around the local network (the trip assignment).
2. Stantec set out the proposed methodology in the Pre-Application Transport Scoping Note, a copy of which is provided at [Appendix 1.1 of the Transport Assessment](#). This was issued to CCC on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2025. CCC confirmed that this was acceptable by email on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2025.
3. Due to their distinctly different travel characteristics and patterns predicted on the Development, and to improve the sensitivity of the traffic impact assessment, two separate distribution and assignment assessments were undertaken for the staff (travelling by light vehicles) and supporting delivery vehicles (the heavy vehicles).
4. The basis of the staff movement assessment (the light vehicles) was set out in Section 7 of the agreed Scoping Note, and is summarised as follows:
  - The trip distribution assessment used, as a proxy, the 'Journey to Work' data derived from the 2011 Census.
    - Despite its age, this is universally considered the best available source as the transport aspects of the 2021 Census were heavily compromised by the COVID-19 Pandemic. In fact, it is considered to overestimate car ownership and trip volumes, as it pre-dates present day patterns of remote/flexi working. In any case, there is no more recent, industry-accepted data available for the Applicant to use.
  - This considered where the people who work in the local Huntingdonshire area live, to predict the numbers travelling to distinct destination areas.
  - The light vehicle trip assignment for each destination was derived by reviewing the peak hour traffic conditions and suggested travel distances and route choices set out by Google Maps. The movements to each area, passing through each junction, were accumulated to provide the trip assignment.
5. The basis of the delivery vehicle assessment (the heavy vehicles) was also set out in Section 7 of the agreed Scoping Note, as follows:
  - As the delivery destinations would reflect the final occupiers' business, there is no data available to refer to.
  - As such, the heavy vehicle distribution and assignment was estimated, reflecting typical Logistics Park travel patterns in this region. This assignment reflected hauliers' preference for efficient and fast strategic highway routes, their respect for the legal weight limits on other routes, and the preference for these large vehicles to avoid congested and constrained routes.

6. The traffic flow assignments were shown figuratively by light vehicles and heavy vehicles in Appendix I of the approved Transport Scoping Note (26<sup>th</sup> February 2025), which was also included at [Appendix 5.4 of the submitted Transport Assessment](#). As shown on the trip assignment flow diagram, no vehicles pass through the A1307 View Commons Road / Hinchingsbrooke Park Road junction. This is because:
  - There are quicker, less congested, and more direct alternative routes for the light vehicles for staff traveling between the Development and west / central Huntingdon than along the A1307 Corridor. These alternative routes include along the Inner Ring Road, Stukeley Road, and the A141 around the north of Huntingdon (especially with the mitigations proposed by Newlands improving movements through key junctions along the A141);
  - Heavy goods vehicle operators are aware that, in addition to the immediate penalties and fines for violations of weight limits, such as are imposed on Views Common Road, these convictions would impact their operator licence suitability – ultimately preventing them from operating; and
  - The A141- A14 route is a quicker route to the A14 Junction 24 (Cambridge Services) than along the A1307 Corridor. As such, heavy vehicle movements would not typically travel southwards on the A1307 even if there was no weight limit restriction.
7. As the incentives behind individuals' journeys are varied, it is accepted that there may in fact be a minimal number of car trips passing through this junction to and from the Development. For instance, a resident of the Hinchingsbrooke Park Road Estate travelling to the Development by car (instead of using the more convenient active travel connection being provided) or a driver diverting through this junction as part of a linked-journey to drop children off at the School or other passengers at a place of work - before continuing to the Development. If such journeys exist, the number of these journeys would be small, and are not 'new' to this junction (for example anyone coming from Hinchingsbrooke likely already travels to a different place of work through the Views Common Road / Hinchingsbrooke Park Road junction). Accordingly, the trip assignment of zero is robust in transport modelling terms for this junction.
8. Nonetheless, the number of trips passing through this junction clearly does not meet CCC's assessment threshold of 30 or more two-way development generated vehicle movements in any peak hour (as stated by Mr Connolly of CCC during the DMC). This threshold is set out in recent CCC guidance (*Transport Assessment Requirements, January 2024*) and also aligns with adopted National Highways guidance in its *Protocol for Dealing with Planning Applications (August 2010)*, which assumes the impact of a trip generation of 1 additional vehicle every two minutes is imperceptible and well within the daily variation of traffic flows. As a result, CCC has not sought a detailed junction capacity assessment here as part of the main Transport Assessment.

To summarise, the Views Common Road / Hinchingsbrooke Park Road crossroads was duly considered as part of the transport assessment process. The reason it did not proceed to the detailed transport model is due to the lack of trips linked to the Development that would travel through it. The methodology and procedure underpinning this aligns entirely with adopted guidance, was not and is not disputed by the Local Highways Authority or National Highways either at the EIA Scoping or planning application stage.

To be abundantly clear, because there are no vehicles routing through this part of the network from the Development, any further detailed modelling of this junction in isolation (or indeed a full re-run of the Transport Assessment model with this junction incorporated) would be a wholly futile exercise. It would only serve to highlight the known existing traffic issues, whilst demonstrating that the Proposed Development would not exacerbate them. In accordance with CIL regulations, Newlands is only able to deliver (or contribute towards) mitigation directly related to the impact of the Proposed Development, rather than fix existing problems on the network (no matter how close). Accordingly, no developer contributions to this part of the network have been requested by the Local Highways Authority nor the Local Planning Authority (though substantial works have been requested and duly committed to by Newlands to mitigate predicted impacts of the Proposed Development on other parts of the network).

Notwithstanding these conclusions, the Applicant acknowledges the existing traffic issues at this junction and is sympathetic to the concerns and frustrations of nearby residents. It is

hoped that the following measures will indirectly result in less vehicles routing along Views Common Road and Hinchingsbrooke Park Road:

- Any Hinchingsbrooke residents taking employment in the Proposed Development are likely to utilise the underpass, thereby reducing vehicular out-commuting from the Hinchingsbrooke estate.
- Lower likelihood of commuter 'rat-running' down Views Common Road from the A141 due to the net additional highways capacity around the north of Huntingdon created by the off-site improvements being committed to by Newlands.

In addition to the above, Newlands is committed to a signage strategy, including enhanced weight limit signage in relation to Views Common Road, and a Travel Plan to reduce car trips to and from the Proposed Development. These are already secured in the list of proposed conditions and obligations in the Officer's Report. The routing of construction-stage HGVs will be controlled by the Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (in accordance with the already-submitted CEMP Framework) pursuant to condition. HDC will consult with CCC Highways (along with other statutory and key stakeholders at its discretion) on the discharge of these conditions.

To give an added layer of comfort to Members and residents, Newlands is willing to commit to an **Operational Management Plan (OMP)** pursuant to a suitably worded planning condition. Our proposed condition wording would be as follows and this reflects wording agreed on another of Newlands' permitted schemes:

*"Prior to occupation of any warehouse building hereby permitted, an Operational Management Plan will be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Local Highways Authority). The Operational Management Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:*

- Details of HGV routing (including preferred and barred routes and pre-programming of navigation aids);*
- Measures to manage HGV movements during peak periods (Monday-Friday AM Peak (0800-0900) and PM Peak (1630-1800)); and*
- Details of staff shift changes which seek to minimise the effect during peak operational periods of the surrounding highway network.*

*The OMP should include detailed proposals for ensuring the HGV routing is adhered to."*

As a final word of comfort, we reiterate the fundamental efficiency imperatives of modern industrial and logistics operators to utilise the strategic road network (the A1(M) and A14, via the A141), and to do so outside of peak hours. Indeed, the shift changeover times of logistics operators (typically 6am, 8am, 2pm, 10pm) deliberately avoid rush hours. Moreover, Newlands (whose business model involves long-term retention of the freehold, and leasing of buildings to occupiers) has a commercial prerogative to ensure the successful functioning of the Site, with transport and accessibility being the most fundamental component of an industrial and logistics development. Failure to achieve this (either for lorries or employee vehicles) would render the Site unattractive to occupiers and make it difficult for Newlands to let the buildings.

To that end, the Site has been carefully selected for its transport credentials, and has been appraised by HDC as an appropriate location for industrial and logistics in the emerging Local Plan. A substantial amount of specialist transport planning and highways engineering work, in collaboration with HDC, CCC, and National Highways, has been undertaken to ensure it functions optimally from a transport perspective. This work will continue throughout the construction and operational stages, and Newlands would be happy to establish a **Residents Liaison Group** to ensure communication channels are available to interested residents and other parties as the scheme progresses.

Lastly, we would like to take this opportunity to remind Members of the considerable socio-economic and environmental benefits that would arise from the Proposed Development, and we remain grateful for Officers' proactive and collaborative approach to this planning application. If you have any queries or require further information to continue to be able to recommend the application for approval, please do not hesitate to contact myself, Adam Davies, or Andy Fisher.

Yours sincerely,

David Akam  
Associate

cc: Ben Taylor and John Barker, Newlands Developments  
Andy Fisher, Adam Davies, DLA

## Lewis Tomlinson

---

**From:** Andrew Connolly <Andrew.Connolly@cambridgeshire.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 09 April 2026 14:57  
**To:** Lewis Tomlinson  
**Cc:** Jez Tuttle (Guest)  
**Subject:** RE: Newlands Park Huntingdon - Applicant Response to Deferral

Dear Lewis,

Thank you for your email and attached letter from the applicant.

The Highway Authority did not request any additional information, however the information submitted by the applicant is noted and the content of the letter confirms their approach which has previously been agreed by the Highway Authority. The applicant has included detailed information on the developments impact on the surrounding road network, this included trip rates, distribution and junction impacts using industry standard methodology and software. The Highway Authority only requires junction modelling where a development will generate 30 or more new trips in either peak hour at a junction. The Hinchingsbrooke Park Road / Views Common Road signal junction did not trigger this requirement.

The Highway Authority are satisfied, therefore, we do not require any further information or modelling, it would be for members to decide whether the information that has been submitted by the developer is sufficient to address their concerns and make an informed decision on the planning application.

Many thanks

**Andrew Connolly**  
**Principal Transport Officer – Major Development**  
**Transport Assessment Team**  
**Place & Sustainability**  
**Cambridgeshire County Council**  
**New Shire Hall, Emery Crescent**  
**Enterprise Campus, Alconbury Weald**  
**Huntingdon**  
**PE28 4YE**

*Please note we charge for pre application planning advice. For more information and a copy of the charging schedule please visit <https://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/business/planning-and-development/developing-new-communities>*

---

**From:** Lewis Tomlinson <Lewis.Tomlinson@huntingdonshire.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 08 April 2026 12:13  
**To:** Andrew Connolly <Andrew.Connolly@cambridgeshire.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** FW: Newlands Park Huntingdon - Applicant Response to Deferral

**CAUTION:** This email originates outside of Cambridgeshire County Council's network. Do NOT click on links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this email to be suspicious and wish to report it, please visit the CCC Intranet and search for 'SPAM' for instructions on how to do so.

Hi Andrew,

Please find attached a letter from the applicant which sets out their position on the two reasons for deferral.

We can discuss at 1.30.

Lewis

---

**From:** David Akam <[DAkam@DavidLock.com](mailto:DAkam@DavidLock.com)>

**Sent:** 08 April 2026 11:54

**To:** Lewis Tomlinson <[Lewis.Tomlinson@huntingdonshire.gov.uk](mailto:Lewis.Tomlinson@huntingdonshire.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Ben Taylor <[ben.taylor@newlandsuk.com](mailto:ben.taylor@newlandsuk.com)>; John Barker <[john.barker@newlandsuk.com](mailto:john.barker@newlandsuk.com)>; Warren Cull <[warren.cull@newlandsuk.com](mailto:warren.cull@newlandsuk.com)>; Hopkins, John <[john.hopkins@stantec.com](mailto:john.hopkins@stantec.com)>; Andrew Fisher <[afisher@davidlock.com](mailto:afisher@davidlock.com)>; Adam Davies <[ADavies@davidlock.com](mailto:ADavies@davidlock.com)>; Asha Clulow-Siford <[AClulow-Siford@DavidLock.com](mailto:AClulow-Siford@DavidLock.com)>

**Subject:** Newlands Park Huntingdon - Applicant Response to Deferral

Your attachments have been security checked by Mimecast Attachment Protection. Files where no threat or malware was detected are attached.

---

Dear Lewis,

Please see attached letter which sets out the Applicants' position on, and responds to, the two reasons for deferral.

This can be published on public access, and sent to CCC Highways for comment if you consider appropriate to do so.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any queries.

Kind regards,

**David Akam**

Associate Planner

 +44 (0) 1908 666276

 [dakam@davidlock.com](mailto:dakam@davidlock.com)

 [davidlock.com](http://davidlock.com)

 +44 (0) 7301 571377

**David Lock Associates Limited**

50 North Thirteenth Street | Central Milton Keynes | MK9 3BP



We are proudly measuring and reducing our carbon footprint with the Planet Mark Business Certification



## Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived

The information in this email could be confidential and legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee and they will decide who to share this email with (if appropriate). If you receive this email by mistake please notify the sender and delete it immediately. Opinions expressed are those of the

individual and do not necessarily represent the opinion of Cambridgeshire County Council. All sent and received email from Cambridgeshire County Council is automatically scanned for the presence of computer viruses and security issues. Any personal data will be processed in line with the Data Protection legislation, further details at [www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/privacy) Visit [www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk](http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk)