

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 23rd FEBRUARY 2026

LATE REPRESENTATIONS SUMMARY

2(a) 25/01587/FUL – Demolition and part demolition of factory buildings and phased erection of 82 dwellings, access works, landscaping and associated development – RGE Engineering and Bridge Place Car Park, The Avenue, Godmanchester.

Comments have been received from HDC's Ecology Officer and are published on the planning file dated 18.02.26. Summarised as no objection subject to conditions regarding:

- BNG (including Habitat Management, Monitoring Plan, Habitat Creation etc)
- Bats – sensitive lighting plan
- Precautionary working method statement (demolition and construction)
- Ecological Enhancements

These conditions are therefore recommended to be included.

2(b) 25/00433/FUL – Proposed erection of 23 dwellings, garaging, associated roadways and landscaping.

Comments have been received from 2 neighbouring properties received 11.2.26 and 19.2.26, maintaining concern towards the development.

These concerns have been noted and addressed in the relevant sections of the report. No new objections subsequent to the published DMC report have been raised.

Revised plans have been received (18.2.26). A Planning Layout and Landscaping Plans – to address some final points raised by Urban Design Officer and Landscaping plans updated to reflect the changes. These changes are welcomed and accepted. As the landscaping plan

includes additional trees, this should be reflected in the BNG metric - officers have therefore requested an updated BNG metric. Delegated authority is sought for this to be resolved post DMC. As outlined in the report, the development will already achieve beyond the 10% mandatory requirement. This is solely to ensure the application documents all align and BNG monitoring is clear.

In addition to this, officers can confirm the BNG monitoring fee will be £6,345.50

Amendments to Officer Recommendation:

RECOMMENDATION – POWERS DELEGATED to the Head of Planning, Infrastructure & Public Protection to resolve outstanding BNG matters, and APPROVE subject to conditions and completion of a Section 106 obligation:

2(c) 25/01712/FUL and 2(d) 25/01713/LBC - 44 Huntingdon Street, St Neots - Conversion of existing building into 7 residential units and erection of 2 bungalows with associated landscaping and drainage works.

Late representation from Agent regarding applications 25/01712/FUL and 25/01713/LBC

A letter was received from the Agent on 18th February 2026, following publication of the Committee Report. The letter is available to view on the Public Access pages of the Council's website and the contents of the letter are summarised below:

1. The proposal was informed by the Council's pre-application advice and considers that its recommendations were undertaken.
2. The Committee Report states that the application site is at low risk of flooding from all sources.
3. Bin stores are shown on every Site Plan (within rear gardens of each plot).
4. In deciding to not consider / report all of the information submitted (a 'Structural Report' and 'Historic Building Assessment'),

Members will not be provided with a good understanding of the proposals.

5. Confirmation within the Committee Report that “officers consider it would be reasonable that it would be reasonable to secure details of foul and surface water disposal via planning conditions in any event of planning permission being granted”, addresses the suggestion that a Sequential Test would be required.
6. Paragraph 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework negates the need for a Sequential Test, as the application is accompanied by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment.
7. Areas of the existing building which are subject to a Change of Use are exempt from any requirement for the Sequential Test.
8. An Exception Test is not required as the proposal is within Flood Zones 1 and 2.
9. Does not feel that appropriate weight has been given to the positive aspects of the proposal.

Officer comments in relation to the statements made by the Agent

1. Officers acknowledge that pre-application advice has previously been provided in relation to the site, albeit in relation to a substantially different proposal to that which is currently being proposed. Officers do not consider that the current proposal sufficiently addresses the matters raised within the Council’s pre-application advice response.
2. Officers acknowledge the error within the Committee Report which states that “the application site is at low risk of flooding from all sources.” Amendments in respect of this are detailed below.
3. The references to bin stores on the Site Plan are not legible. Following clarification from the Agent, it is accepted that bin stores would be located within each plot, however the proposal still fails to demonstrate that adequate and accessible bin collection points could be achieved. Amendments in respect of this are detailed below.
4. In deciding to not consider / report all of the information submitted (a ‘Structural Report’ and ‘Historic Building Assessment’), Members will not be provided with a good understanding of the proposals. A Structural Report and Historic Building Assessment was received from the Agent during the course of the application (on 20th January 2026), however the additional information was not requested or formally accepted by case officer. The case officer has informed the Agent that the additional information would not have resulted in officer support for the application and

therefore the recommendation has been made on the basis of the information originally submitted.

5. The Committee Report states that “*officers consider it would be reasonable that it would be reasonable to secure details of foul and surface water disposal via planning conditions in any event of planning permission being granted.*” Planning permission should only be granted if the Sequential Test is passed.
6. Officers disagree that paragraph 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework negates the need for a Sequential Test.
7. Officers agree that areas of the existing building which are subject to a Change of Use are exempt from any requirement for the Sequential Test. However, the proposal also includes new built development within Flood Zone which does require the Sequential Test to be applied.
8. Officers acknowledge that an Exception Test is not required as the proposal is within Flood Zones 1 and 2. Amendments in respect of this are detailed below.
9. Officers have given appropriate weight to public benefits of the proposal within paragraph 7.83 of the Committee Report, however consider that the benefits are outweighed by the harm detailed within the officer report and summarised with paragraph 7.84 of the Committee Report. The identified harm includes ‘less than substantial’ harm to designated heritage assets which would outweigh the benefits of the proposal (as referenced within paragraph 7.37 of the Committee Report). For the avoidance of doubt, reference to “the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework” (contained within paragraph 7.22 of the Committee Report and recommended refusal reason 1) includes the provisions of paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that “*where a development proposal would 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 including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.*”

Amendments to Committee Reports

The following amendments are made to the Committee Reports:

1. The proposal descriptions (for 25/01712/FUL and 25/01713/LBC) do not include reference to the proposed extension to the existing building. The proposal description is amended to the following:

“Extension and conversion of existing building into 7 residential units and erection of 2 bungalows with associated landscaping and drainage works.”

2. Paragraph 1.5 of the Committee Reports (for 25/01712/FUL and 25/01713/LBC) are amended to the following:

“The application site is located partly within Flood Zone 1 (low probability of flooding from rivers and sea) and partly within Flood Zone 2 (medium probability of flooding from rivers and sea). The application site is at low risk of flooding from all other sources, according to the Environment Agency’s Flood Map for Planning Flooding and the Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment maps.”

3. Paragraphs 7.2 and 7.57 of the Committee Report (for 25/01712/FUL) are deleted, and paragraph 7.58 is amended to the following:

“It is therefore considered that the proposed development fails to pass the sequential test for flood risk, contrary to policy 5 of the Local Plan, paragraph 174 of the NPPF and guidance contained within Section 4 of the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD.”

Amendments to recommendation

The following amendments are made to the recommendation:

1. Recommended refusal reason 2 (for 25/01712/FUL) is amended to:

“The proposed development would result in the erection of new dwellings, and an extended car parking area to serve the proposed dwellings, located within Flood Zone 2. The proposed development fails to pass the sequential test for flood risk, contrary to policy 5 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036, paragraph 174 of the NPPF and guidance contained within Section 4 of the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD.”

2. Recommended refusal reason 4 (for 25/01712/FUL) is amended to:

“The proposed development fails to demonstrate that adequate and accessible waste storage arrangements could be achieved, with no bin collection points being proposed to serve the proposed dwellings, contrary to policy LP14 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 and the Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD (2017).”