

# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 14 APRIL 2025

## LATE REPRESENTATIONS SUMMARY

### **3(a) 24/80112/COND - Wintringham Park, Cambridge Road, St Neots**

There are no late representations for this item.

### **3(b) 24/00295/FUL - Land North East of Weald Farm, Cambridge Road, Eynesbury**

There are no late representations for this item.

### **4(a) 23/01002/OUT – Land North Of Lodel Farm, Overcote Lane, Needingworth – Proposed development of up to affordable 30 dwellings to include public open space, landscaping, access and associated works. Approval sought for Access to Overcote Lane only at this stage with Layout, Landscaping, Scale and Appearance as reserved matters.**

A further representation has been received in the form of an Odour Peer Review commissioned by Amber Real Estate Investment (Agriculture Ltd) received by the Local Planning Authority on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2025. This has been reviewed by HDC's Environmental Health Officer and the following comments have been received:

*"I can confirm that we have noted the points raised within the Odour Peer Review dated 4<sup>th</sup> April 2025, however we remain of the opinion that we do not have sufficient grounds to raise an objection."*

An additional representation has been received from 18 Overcote Lane raising concerns in relation to potential risks associated with inhabitants living near to chicken farms and the expansion of the chicken farm. Similar concerns have been raised previously and are addressed in Paragraphs 7.49 to 7.58 of the Officer Report for March DMC (Appendix 1).

**5(a) 24/02228/FUL – Land At 516 Great North Road Eaton Ford -  
Erection of two-bedroom barn-style property & associated works**

Members are made aware that Page 1 of the Officers report states that officer's recommendation is to approve the proposal stated as 'RECCOMENDATION – APPROVE'. **This should instead read 'RECCOMENDATION – REFUSE'.**

A late representation was received from the applicant's agent on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2025 setting out the following points:

1. Notes the erroneous recommendation of refusal on page 1 of the officers report.
2. States that the land comprised in unbound aggregate rather than vegetation.
3. Puts forward that the Conservation Officers objection ignores the fact that the site is in separate ownership, has planning permission for independent use, hosts a variety of packed/stored containers and trailers and is enclosed by a fence and gate with vehicular access granted permission by Huntingdonshire District Council.
4. That the council's trees officer removed their objection after visiting the site and observing the fencing was already in place.
5. That the above points indicate no officer has visited the site.
6. That the proposal is a sympathetically and well-designed scheme with an appropriate layout and density and would not detrimentally impact the setting or understanding of Crosshall Manor or wider locality and would be a positive addition to the street scene.

In respect of point 1, this has been noted and is changed as part of this late representation. On the site visit, the case officer and conservation officer have visited the site where vegetation was the overriding character of the land. This addresses point 2.

In response to point 3, while the site is in separate ownership and not in residential use with a gate, access and fencing exclusive to the site, it is case officers view that this does not demonstrate that a dwelling on the site would not detrimentally impact the setting of the wider St Neots

Conservation Area nor the Grade II\* Listed Building to the north which is the main contention of the application.

Please note that there are no objections in relation to tree matters. An original objection was removed by the Huntingdonshire Council's Tree Officer following confirmation from the case officer that this fence was already erected. Both the case officer and the Conservation Officer have visited the site which has informed both officers recommendation to refuse on heritage grounds (points 4 and 5).

This late representation does not alter the officers view that the heritage harm outweighs any benefits a single dwelling would yield on the site as per paragraphs 7.20-7.48 of the officer's report and subsequent reason for refusal as set out in part 9 of the same officers report.