Cabinet	24th November 2026
Report by:	Mike Gildersleeves – Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director - Place
Lead Cllr:	Executive Councillor for Economy, Regeneration and Housing

Wards	Open / Exempt	Key Decision?
All wards in Huntingdon, St Ives and St Neots	Partially Exempt – Finance information redacted under Local Government Act 1972 Schedule 12A part 3	No

Regeneration Partnership (Capital & Centric) Gateway 1 report

Executive Summary:

This report should be read in conjunction with and seen as an extension of the "Regeneration Opportunities" report from July 2025. The work and activities undertaken by Capital and Centric having been approved via that report, in particular the work responds to recommendations a-c of that decision.

Gateway 1 of the exploratory partnership with Capital and Centric has been completed. Various sites and potential opportunities were explored. Concept designs for residential led mixed use schemes on four Council owned sites in Huntingdon, St Neots and St Ives (development of approximately 248 homes in total) have been brought forward and produced, supported by extensive surveys, pre-application advice and public engagement.

Public engagement in August 2026 generated more than 3,500 responses, with opposition ranging from 87% to 91% across the three towns. The predominant concern was the impact of redeveloping central surface car parks on accessibility, linked trips and town-centre vitality. Pre-application advice from the local planning authority underlined the same strategic issues and advised that a town-wide parking strategy should be in place before any application.

While the economic benefits assessment indicates potential Gross Value Added of £75.4 million and other positive metrics, the Gateway 1 report itself acknowledges that this does not demonstrate that these specific sites are the most appropriate vehicle for delivering regeneration. Viability is stated to require public grant support in the range of £50,000–£100,000 per plot, with no clear route to securing that support at the necessary scale evidenced. If the work were to proceed to Gateway 2, through that process, detailed discussion would need to be undertaken with Homes England (who are a C&C partner/funder on other sites) in respect of available funding routes.

Having assessed the evidence base, officers conclude that the report does not provide a sufficiently robust justification for committing further public resources to Gateway 2 on the current schemes. The scale and consistency of public opposition is focused on the fundamental choice of sites rather than design detail; unresolved strategic parking and accessibility issues remain; and the economic case does not outweigh the identified concern regarding parking function and public feedback. There may be alternatives or other opportunities that could come forward. What this work has demonstrated is that the scope for large scale, single site interventions, within the C&C model, are limited within our Market Towns and not suitable at this current juncture.

The July 2025 Cabinet decision authorised work only to the end of Gateway 1. There is no contractual or other obligation to progress further. Officers therefore recommend that the Council does not progress to Gateway 2 on the current schemes and that the existing commission is brought to an orderly conclusion, while retaining the valuable technical evidence base for any future, separately commissioned work.

However, it is considered that the general principles relating to regeneration that seeks to bring forward economic and housing led opportunities which will contribute positively and create new homes, jobs and other benefits remain relevant to the Council in respect of its ambitions for our places and communities; and remain aligned with the Councils Corporate Plan and our ‘do’, ‘enable’ and 'influence’ activities. Thus, these principles should continue to be preserved and pursued.

Recommendations

To note:

1.1. the receipt of the report at the end of Gateway 1; completion of Gateway 1 and the evidence base produced, including technical work and surveys, concept designs, pre-application advice, engagement data and the economic benefits assessment.

1.2. there is no formal decision required to cease work at the end of Gateway 1.

1.3. that the Council does not intend to progress to Gateway 2 with Capital and Centric on the current schemes, for the reasons set out in this report.

1.4. that the independent review of the Capital and Centric commission and activity will continue as a separate process and that the technical evidence base will be retained and catalogued for potential future use.

	Key Corporate Plan Priorities
1	Improving quality of life for local people: through the underlying regeneration principles of creating more vibrant, accessible market towns that support local spend, footfall and community wellbeing.
2	Creating a better Huntingdonshire for future generations: by exploring opportunities for new homes (including accommodation suited to younger people), jobs, and sustainable economic growth

	Place Strategy Priorities
1	Pride in Place: supporting the long term vitality and attractiveness of the market towns of Huntingdon, St Neots and St Ives as centres of community, social and economic life.
2	Inclusive Economy: seeking opportunities that generate new homes, jobs, local spend and Gross Value Added, while recognising that large scale, single site interventions of the type tested are currently limited.

Report Author(s)
Mike Gildersleeves, Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director – Place (Mike.Gildersleeves@huntingdonshire.gov.uk)

Pamela Scott, Head of Economy, Regeneration and Housing Delivery (pamela.scott @huntingdonshire.gov.uk)

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 This report provides Members with a summary of the Gateway 1 report produced by Capital and Centric (C&C), an assessment of the evidence base and the strength of the case for further work, and clear officer recommendations on why officers are not making a recommendation for the Council to progress to Gateway 2. The Gateway 1 report is presented as received in final form from C&C save for necessary redactions; this overarching report does provide additional commentary and professional or technical opinion from Officers.

1.2 This report also seeks to respond to the approved resolution by Overview and Scrutiny (Performance and Growth) of Cllr Martin's motion from 4/11/26 against Cabinet Procedure rule 2.7. A copy of which is attached as Appendix 9, and also the request under Cabinet Procedure rule 2.8 for the item to be placed on the agenda.

1.3 This report should be read in conjunction with and seen as an extension of the "Regeneration Opportunities" report from July 2025. The work and activities undertaken by Capital and Centric having been approved via that report, in particular the work responds to recommendations a-c of that decision. It is important to note that the July 2025 Cabinet decision authorised exploratory work only to the end of Gateway 1. Positive progression requires a new formal decision. The Monitoring Officer has advised that there is no requirement for a separate formal decision simply to stop progression beyond the current stage; that said, in the interests of transparency and openness, this report is presented along with the Gateway 1 report from Capital and Centric.

1.4 Members will also recall the consideration of, and sentiments given at Full Council in September 2026 of matters pertaining to this project and ambition following the public engagement that took place during the Summer. This report does not seek to reopen or repeat that discussion; it is simply noted here for completeness.

1.5 Members will also be aware of the current, live petition submitted by Cllr Keane and which is currently on the Councils website. This runs fom 25/9/26 – 24/12/26 and as at the time of writing has 335 signatories. This seeks to request that Cabinet "…*formally bring to an end the current Capital & Centric regeneration proposals involving the former Cattle Market car park in St Ives, Princes Street car park in Huntingdon and Tebbutts Road car park in St Neots."*

2. BACKGROUND & CONTEXT

2.1 In July 2025 via the ''Regeneration Opportunities' report, Cabinet confirmed its commitment to exploring regeneration opportunities within the Market Towns, with a desire to bring forward projects which would bring forward economic and housing led opportunities which will contribute positively and create new homes, jobs and other benefits. These aims being aligned to both the Corporate Plan, and Place Strategy.

2.2 Further, Cabinet approved an exploratory partnership with Capital and Centric (C&C) to identify potential regeneration opportunities in the market towns of Huntingdon, St Neots and St Ives. The remit was limited to Gateway 1 (concept design) work only; progression to Gateway 2 was explicitly made subject to a further formal decision.

2.3 These decisions provide the strategic, political direction, for the overall project that has been undertaken. That report provides a clear framework, and overall risk appetite that the Council was willing to operate within. Officers have taken the work forward on this basis.

2.4 Gateway 1 has now been completed. Numerous sites were assessed across Huntingdon, St Neots and St Ives. Concept designs for residential led mixed use schemes on four Council owned sites have been produced (approximately 248 homes in total), supported by extensive technical work and surveys, pre-application advice and public engagement.

2.5 The work was commissioned following approval by Cabinet in July 2025 and continued until the Gateway 1 report was issued in November 2026. A high level description of activities is included below for reference. This includes a summary of activity leading up to the July 2025 report.

Regeneration Partnership Timeline

Huntingdonshire District Council & Capital & Centric

Market Towns Programme: Huntingdon • St Ives • St Neots

Key stages in the development of the regeneration partnership between Huntingdonshire District Council and Capital & Centric.

• Key decision / formal stage • Most recent (under review)

2024	Initial discussions began between HDC and Capital & Centric regarding regeneration opportunities in Huntingdon, St Ives and St Neots.
Early–mid 2025	Officers and members undertook due diligence, including visits to Capital & Centric schemes and engagement with other councils. Initial concept proposals developed.
16 June 2025	Notice of proposed key decision published for the Regeneration Opportunities Report.
8 July 2025	Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Performance and Growth) considered the report.
15 July 2025	Cabinet approved the initial partnership with Capital & Centric to explore regeneration opportunities in the three market towns (decision effective 26 July 2025).
16–17 July 2025	Public announcements of the partnership.
August 2025 onward	Capital & Centric appointed via Direct Award under the Bloom / NEPRO framework. Work Order put in place with formal gateway controls.
October 2025	Capital & Centric announced informal "Meet the Neighbours" drop-in events.
3–4 November 2025	Introductory "Meet the Neighbours" public drop-in events held in St Ives, Huntingdon and St Neots. No specific schemes presented.
6 November 2025	Member drop-in / briefing session held.
11 March 2026	Briefing meeting with members of the Cabinet, held with C&C.
June 2026	Cabinet and briefings on emerging plans held. Invitation to all Councillors for a wider briefing also issued and held.
w/c 17 August 2026	Public engagement events held in the three towns on early-stage concept designs.
4 September 2026	Public engagement activity closed. Feedback to inform the Stage 1 / Gateway 1 report.
11 November 2026	Gateway 1 / Stage 1 final report

Note: Highlighted rows indicate key formal decisions or gateway stages. The Gateway 1 / Stage 1 final report is currently under review by the Council.

3. INDEPENDENT REVIEW

3.1 At Full Council on 9th September 2026 it was confirmed that an independent review of the Capital & Centric proposals would be commissioned. The review is intended to establish facts, test governance and controls, assess value for money and contractual performance, and identify practical lessons. It is intended to provide independent, external, professional opinion; identify key findings and recommendations; provide assurance where applicable; and overall provide a basis upon which the Council's relevant Committees will be updated and asked to consider. This process is being managed by the Monitoring Officer, within their

responsibilities and there is a separation of duties from the management of the C&C proposals as a corporate project.

Scope of the review

3.2 The review will not be reconsidering regeneration as a policy objective or seek to redetermine the July 2025 decision; it will look to focus on the actions, activities, and decisions taken following the July 2025 decision.

3.3 This report stands apart from that review, which is to commence imminently following procurement. Whilst it is relevant to note this activity taking place; the review should have no bearing on the report presented which seeks to report on the work that was commissioned and consider the way forward. The two matters are linked, but are mutually exclusive, with different aims and objectives.

3.4 This report does not seek to duplicate the independent review process, nor does it seek to address wider questions, scrutiny or matters of political judgement which are best saved for other forum and reporting. This report simply seeks to report on the outcomes from Gateway 1, and what next steps are to be taken.

4. SUMMARY OF GATEWAY 1 REPORT

4.1 The Capital & Centric business case which was attached to and formed part of the July 2025 report, set out the proposed gateways and delivery approach; it originally programmed Gateway1 at five months duration. In practice, the inherent difficulties of coordinating multiple, complex, and partly constrained sites, including parking impacts, third-party land negotiations, heritage sensitivity and viability challenges, combined with the May 2026 local elections meant the overall Stage 1 timeline extended beyond the initial estimate.

4.2 Based on Officer experience, this was not unreasonable and was necessary to enable the exploratory nature of the work to take place to an appropriate standard. Officers did not object to this extension, given the overall political direction/mandate given by the July 2025 decision. Progress updates on this work were provided to Cabinet and wider Members at various stages throughout the period, including both before and after the May 2026 local elections, including through briefings.

4.3 The Gateway 1 report produced by Capital and Centric, which brings this stage to a close, has been submitted for consideration by HDC. This is Capital and Centric's assessment of the regeneration activity that they have undertaken and outlines the recommendations which they are making to HDC in response to the commission. The report covers the concept design work (RIBA Stages 1–2) for the three towns, the suite of technical site surveys and investigations undertaken, the public engagement events (November 2025 introductory sessions and the main August 2026 engagement activities), the pre-application advice received from the Local Planning Authority, and the resulting design revisions.

4.4 The report also includes high level development appraisals, a summary of the economic benefits assessment, a short note on early grant-funding discussions, and a brief social-impact reference. The final section sets out town by town observations on the strength of public and planning feedback and recommends next steps before any decision on progressing further. Seven appendices are attached: successive design packs (November 2025, June 2026 and the final August 2026 versions), the full public consultation reports, the pre-application comments and responses, and the economic benefits report

4.5 Submission of the Gateway 1 report confirms that all required activities, have been completed across the three chosen Huntingdonshire market towns. The required key outputs have been delivered, including initial concept design work to RIBA Stages 1 and 2, technical work including site surveys and investigations, public engagement, and the submission of a pre-planning application to the local planning authority. As far as possible the report has been published in its entirety in the interest of openness and transparency, however some elements of the published report have been redacted on the basis of commercial sensitivity – in particular relating to value/financial information relating to land and property.

Site selection and Concept Designs

4.6 The Gateway 1 report sets out the approach taken to the identification and selection of sites (see the Initial Conceptual Design Work section). Capital & Centric examined each town in its wider context and considered a range of potential locations beyond those that ultimately formed the basis of the public consultation.

4.7 Numerous sites were assessed across Huntingdon, St Neots and St Ives. Some were progressed to concept design stage before becoming unavailable (for example, through acquisition by third parties). Others were unavailable from the outset or depended on third party acquisitions that did not complete.

4.8 The schemes presented are residential led mixed use proposals on four Council owned properties:

- Huntingdon: Princes Street car park and Huntingdon Bus Station – proposing 78 homes.
- St Neots: Tebbutts Road car park – proposing 83 homes.
- St Ives: Cattle Market car park – proposing 87 homes.

4.9 The combined total is approximately 248 apartments, together with commercial ground-floor uses, resident amenity and proposals intended to retain or replace a significant proportion of public parking. Designs were iterated during the process to respond to technical information/data and to retain more parking than earlier iterations (for example via parking decks). The reduction from earlier higher housing figures was driven by the need to retain more parking on the sites.

Public Engagement

4.10 Public engagement events have been held in November 2025 and in August 2026.

4.11 The first events in 2025 were framed as ‘Meet the Neighbours’ events and were focused on early engagement and discussion rather than specific proposals. Attendance was low.

4.12 The subsequent engagement events presented more detailed scheme options, and were held on 17, 18 and 19 August in each of the towns. The events generated a very high volume of responses, with more than 3,500 people providing feedback across the three towns. Opposition was consistently strong:

Location	Proportion opposed	Total no of responses
Huntingdon	87%	587
St Neots	89.8%	1737
St Ives	91.2%	1559

4.13 The predominant theme across all three towns was concern about the potential impact of changes to surface car parks on accessibility, convenience, linked trips and town centre vitality.

4.14 These concerns align closely with the planning authority's pre-application advice, which emphasised that parking is not solely a matter of numbers of spaces but also of location and function. The planning authority advised that a town wide parking strategy should be in place before any application, demonstrating that accessibility, vitality and performance will be maintained.

Economic Benefits Assessment

4.15 Capital and Centric appointed GC Insight to assess the economic benefits deliverable from the three schemes. The assessment forecasted that the schemes would generate:

- £75.4 million of Gross Value Added (GVA)
- 713 temporary full-time equivalent jobs and seven apprenticeships during construction
- 248 homes (approximately 25% of Huntingdonshire's annual housing target)
- Additional local spend in the economy from 360 new residents and business rates benefits
- Approximately 9,300 sq ft of commercial food and beverage space and 9,500 sq ft of public realm

4.16 The Gateway 1 report itself notes, however, that while the economic assessment makes a strong case for the value of regeneration, it does not by itself resolve whether these sites and schemes are the most appropriate way to deliver those benefits.

4.17 While the economic benefits assessment indicates potential GVA of £75.4m and other positive metrics, the report itself acknowledges that this does not demonstrate that these sites are the most appropriate vehicle for delivering regeneration.

Recommendations from the Report

4.18 Capital and Centric's overall recommendations outlined in their report, do consider the significant community and planning concerns identified, particularly regarding parking location and function, accessibility, linked trips and town centre vitality.

4.19 Capital and Centric encourage HDC to fully consider these responses and to consider changes to some of the existing proposals and potentially considering alternative sites and changes to the existing proposals that may be considered more beneficial, including greater car parking provision.

4.20 This includes the following sites and locations:

- **Huntingdon:** Former Fire Station / Brooke House (residential-led opportunity with improved connectivity) and 111 High Street (potential food & beverage destination);
- **St Neots:** Alternative approaches to the Tebbutts Road proposals given the strength of opposition to parking loss in that location;

- **St Ives:** Substantially revised approaches to the Cattle Market (or alternatives such as land adjacent to the park-and-ride) in response to strong local opposition.

5. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE C&C REPORT

5.1 The Gateway 1 report and its supporting material have generated a substantial body of technical, design, engagement and economic evidence. The following sections seek to provide an Officer assessment of the report, and its findings, and also provide other salient information and professional officer commentary in order to enable Members to make informed choices.

Specific strengths include:

- A comprehensive suite of surveys and investigations (topographic, utilities, transport, heritage, acoustic, tree, site investigations, CCTV, drainage, measured, archaeological, bat, 3D laser scan, arboriculture, drone, ground-penetrating radar, environmental noise, preliminary ecological appraisal, and additional surveys specific to Cowper House). These significantly informed the design process and remain available as a resource. Officers consider that these documents are what would professionally be expected in connection with the commission and with taking forward development proposals of the type and nature envisaged by the overall project aims.

- Concept design work to RIBA Stages 1 and 2 across all three towns, with numerous iterations responding to technical data/information, local context, heritage constraints and the need to retain more parking. These are articulated in detail in the Gateway 1 report; and reflective of what would typically demonstrate an iterative design/conceptual approach.

- Pre-application advice obtained from the local planning authority in June 2026, with a detailed Urban Design engagement response. The advice treated the proposals as strategic town-centre matters and set out clear requirements around parking location, accessibility, bus and taxi facilities, mass, scale, heritage and the need for a town-wide parking strategy. The advice is clearly presented as advice between the local planning authority and C&C and does not seek to involve itself with matters of principle, whether the proposals are a good idea or not, or overarching decisions that would fall to the Council as landowner. Further commentary on this is given later in this report,

- An economic benefits assessment by GC Insight quantifying potential GVA, temporary construction employment, council tax income, local spend and business rates benefits. These do represent significant economic benefits resulting from the development of the identified sites.

- Transparency within the report about the strength of public opposition and the planning authority's concerns regarding parking location and function. The report is open about this and recognises it as a challenge.

- The report also identifies other sites and opportunities which the Council may wish to consider taking forward; these are captured under recommendations within the Gateway 1 report

Key challenges include:

- The scale and consistency of public opposition is very high (between 87% and 91% opposed, of just over 3,500 respondents) and is focused on the fundamental choice of sites (central surface car parks) rather than on design detail that could readily be amended through further technical work.

- Pre-application advice and public feedback both underline unresolved strategic issues around parking location, accessibility, linked trips and town-centre vitality.

- The planning authority emphasised that equivalent or better facilities must be demonstrated and that a town-wide parking strategy should be in place before any application. These are not issues that further detailed design work alone is likely to resolve.

- The economic benefits case, while positive in absolute terms, does not demonstrate that these specific sites are the best or only means of delivering regeneration benefits, nor that the benefits outweigh the identified harm to parking function and negative public feedback. The report itself accepts this limitation.

- Viability is stated to require public grant support in the range of £50,000–£100,000 per plot. No clear route to securing that support at the necessary scale is evidenced; but it is recognised that this would likely be considered in more detail under Gateway 2.

- Subsequent decisions, notably the decision not to acquire Cowper House in Huntingdon, by HDC, due to excessive costs identified by building condition surveys, have already reduced the regenerative scope of one of the schemes.

- In St Neots, Policy PT3 of the Neighbourhood Plan, which resists the loss of town-centre parking unless vitality and viability are protected, was frequently referenced in feedback and resonates with the planning authority's advice. Similar place-specific constraints apply in the other towns.

Other issues for consideration

Public Engagement

5.2 The original July 2025 report and associated business case both indicated that stakeholder engagement would be part of the commission; and as such, a deliverable expected as part of the Gateway 1, to be undertaken by C&C. This public engagement took place throughout the project in various forms as indicated elsewhere in this report; and following Member briefings in June 2026, in August 2026 C&C undertook public and stakeholder engagement - in accordance with the expectation of the commission and within the context of the expectations created by the July 2025 decision of Cabinet.

5.3 That public engagement, while extensive in volume, occurred late in the Gateway 1 process and concept schemes had already been developed to a reasonable level. Earlier "Meet the Neighbours" events in November 2025 were lightly attended and the proposed sites were disclosed primarily in discussion with attendees rather than being publicised more clearly in engagement publicity.

5.4 Clearly, based on the feedback on the schemes to date, further, intensive work would be required if the work were to progress under Gateway 2; and based on how the engagement was received locally, is a risk to progression. It must also be recognised that there was a

significant reaction on social media, and particular narratives were played out publicly and politically. Those reactions were also based on the limited information that was available in the public domain, rather than a fuller picture which is presented within the Gateway 1 report. These are all factors which would need more in-depth consideration if the proposals were taken forward.

Pre-application response

5.5 The original business case which underpinned the July 2025 report explicitly identified that as part of Gateway 1, a 'pre-planning application' submission would be made; ie a pre-application request. As such, it is in accordance with the agreed approach that a pre-application would be made to the Council as Local Planning Authority. Officers note that this has been completed, and that feedback on the proposals from the Local Planning Authority was provided. Those comments were from that area of the Council, focused on their remit.

5.6 As with any matter where the Council has both a regulatory role, and another remit (in this case a regeneration objective); Officers adopt appropriate boundaries to create a clear separation of duties and in effect create 'chinese walls' as they are commonly known – this is an approach that is adopted in many other sectors.

5.7 In this instance, the pre-application advice was between C&C as the requestor, and officers within the planning team undertaking their role on behalf of the local planning authority. The advice provided is to C&C in response to the proposals presented. How the proposer (in this case C&C) considers the advice given, and whether or not it considers it to be robust, informative, or can be addressed/overcome, is a matter for them. No elected Members were involved in this process, or privy to the advice – nor would this be expected within the normal course of events where the pre-application advice is given to any requestor. Equally, officers within the Regeneration Team were not engaged on that advice, nor the response to it, beyond general discussion in design meetings led by C&C.

5.8 In order to provide a rounded picture of the concept options, and issues that would need to be addressed, the Gateway 1 report appropriately reports on and grapples with the pre-application response and the issues it raises. C&C have undertaken some initial work to address the matters through design, and have thoughts on how the wider issues could be managed/overcome. The pre-application response forms one other element of the work, which in its widest sense, would need to be addressed if the work were to proceed.

5.9 The advice given does not, of itself, represent a basis for not moving forward, it simply seeks to advise on those matters which would require more detailed and in-depth consideration for a favourable planning decision to be made. Moreover, the grant of planning permission (if it were obtained) equally does not determine of itself that development should or should not proceed, it is step along a development journey part of a package of considerations which the Council would need to have regard to, if it determined that the project and development of the site(s) were to move forward.

5.10 However, when reviewing the advice in the wider context of the Gateway 1 report, Officers advise that the issues raised would be likely to require significant resource and additional work to overcome and note that this could have an impact on the anticipated resourcing (and financials) for Gateway 2 if the work were to proceed to that point. If the work were to cease at the end of Gateway 1, this response would still remain of relevance and use if alternative proposals were to come forward.

Evidence base and future work

5.11 The report has generated a useful body of technical survey data, concept design material, pre-application advice and quantified economic analysis. These outputs have value beyond the specific schemes proposed and should be retained. Regardless of any further involvement with Capital and Centric, the Council may wish to consider the following in due course:

- Retaining and cataloguing the full survey and technical evidence base so that it remains available to inform any future, separately commissioned work.

- Exploring alternative regeneration opportunities on sites that do not rely on the redevelopment of the most convenient central surface car parks, should Members wish to pursue town-centre investment in future.

- The Gateway 1 report itself identifies a number of other previously considered locations (including the Former Fire Station and Brook House area, and 111 High Street in Huntingdon, and land adjacent to the park and ride in St Ives) that could be re-examined in a different process. It should be noted that these properties, however, are not in the control of the District Council. Maintaining and retaining the emphasis of the original July 2025 report in relation to potential acquisitions by the Council should be preserved; to enable the Officers to be able to act on opportunities should they arise, where they align with the adopted Corporate aims and ambitions of the Council, including those of the Place Strategy.

- Using the economic benefits methodology as a reference point for assessing future proposals, while ensuring that any such assessment is balanced against community, planning and place-specific considerations.

General matters/considerations

5.12 An independent review of the Capital and Centric approach is due to commence imminently, will examine process, governance and lessons learned – this is discussed elsewhere in this report. Any decision on future work should avoid prejudicing that review.

5.13 The Council's published position, consistent with this report's recommendations, has always been that the project does not automatically progress, the Council is under no obligation to move to Gateway 2, and in the absence of a formal decision to proceed, the work can be brought to an orderly close. Members in deliberating whether the work should move forward will also recall the sentiment of Council in September 2026.

5.14 The work has considered multiple sites, across three of the four Market Towns, and demonstrates that there are limited opportunities for large scale regeneration opportunities. Whilst it may be that the opportunities for a Capital & Centric style model (i.e. new build, modern living, specially designed for a rental model for younger people) may be limited, this does not preclude other forms of regeneration. The underlying ethos of encouraging more in-town living; facilitating accommodation for younger people; to increase footfall, local spend and vibrancy; and other wider place-outcomes for our places and market towns; remain valid and relevant regeneration principles. For example it may be that a piece-meal, or cumulative collection of multiple sites approach may be more suitable; or looking at empty spaces above shops/town centre units that could be converted to residential accommodation; both of which have been successful elsewhere. Equally, in early 2026, it

was suggested by C&C in discussions that alternative approaches, such as creation of buildings which could transition between self-contained 'apart-hotel' or residential models, which would be suitable for tourists/visitors and which could support likely increased demand as a result of Universal Studios (Bedford), may be suitable and present opportunities for further exploration. Whilst not translated to the Gateway 1 report, such options do and will continue to exist.

Value for Money

5.15 In the context of this report and that officers are not recommending to progress to Gateway 2, this section addresses the expenditure incurred on Gateway 1 and whether the commissioned work represents value for money.

5.16 The appointment was made by direct award under the Bloom / NEPRO framework, which was competitively procured and uses an outcomes/consumption-based payment model. Fee levels and rates were assessed as part of the original framework tender. Progress was monitored through weekly Progress Group meetings. No material concerns about performance, delivery, cost, scope or quality were raised during the commission.

5.17 The work authorised by Cabinet in July 2025 was limited to Gateway 1 (concept design / early feasibility). Gateway 1 expenditure totalled £1,058,720.61. No further expenditure on the current schemes is proposed or has been undertaken. This is approximately 5% (£58,720.61) above the original £1 million allocation authorised in July 2025.

5.18 The overspend was reviewed and approved by Officers on the basis that the additional work contributed materially to the required Gateway 1 deliverables, and would make the outcomes under Gateway 1 more robust as a result of bringing forward some work originally considered to feature in later work under Gateway 2. This is not considered to represent a material deviation from the overall authorisation and falls within the scope of responsibility vested with Officers. In overall terms the expenditure is broadly in line with what the Council committed to in July 2025, and whilst there is a modest overspend, that of itself is not detrimental to the project or the Councils overall budget framework; it is a lawful and legitimate spend, albeit it is recognised that this is an overspend, but it is one that can and has been managed.

What the expenditure delivered

5.19 The commission was broad and looked at a range of sites/opportunities across three of the Market Towns, before settling on four Council-owned sites across three towns. The work undertaken and produced concept proposals for approximately 248 homes, together with commercial space, public realm and parking proposals. It included:

- Architectural concept design to RIBA Stages 1–2 with multiple design iterations.
- Multi-disciplinary engineering (structural, MEP, landscape).
- Extensive site surveys and investigations (topographic, utilities, archaeological, ecological, drainage, acoustic, arboricultural, ground investigation and others).
- Planning, heritage and transport advice.
- Cost planning, development appraisals and viability work.
- Project and development management.
- Pre-application engagement with the local planning authority.
- Public engagement generating more than 3,500 responses.

- An economic benefits assessment.

5.20 The scope was therefore materially broader than a pure architectural concept design appointment.

5.21 Indicative forecast construction costs for the three schemes total approximately £68 million. Against that figure:

- Gateway 1 expenditure equates to roughly 1.56% of indicative construction value.
- Expenditure per proposed home is approximately £4,270.

5.22 Architectural fees formed only part of the total (around 30%); the balance covered development management, project management, engineering, surveys, cost advice and other specialist inputs. On this high-level comparison, the overall sum is not evidently inconsistent with the scale and complexity of a multi-site, town-centre regeneration feasibility programme that included extensive surveys, public engagement and multi-disciplinary advice.

5.23 It is also pertinent to note that the above was being brought forward at pace - primarily owing to the looming impact of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). When the Council began discussions about developing and committing to this work (early 2025), the LGR landscape was still relatively immature and unclear; by the time the work formally commenced, LGR was more advanced, with an expectation of a decision at the end of 2025/early 2026, in this context, if the Council were able to be in a position to take forward any of the C&C proposals to a more advanced stage, it would have to do so promptly and before any formal Structural Changes Order or other direction from Government was made which would prevent the Council doing so.

5.24 Similarly, there was a mindfulness from both Officers and C&C regarding funding pipelines from Government (via Homes England) and the desire to bring forward schemes which could deliver homes within this current Parliament. Both of which speak to the pace required if the proposals were going to progress to on-site delivery . This context is important as it goes to the pace at which C&C were working to, with their consultant team, to develop proposals.

5.25 Within this context, it is considered that the outputs are substantial, and whilst further work would be required if the proposals were to move forward at pace to meet the timeline challenges presented by LGR, but also to deliver a substantial number of homes, on brownfield sites, within the current Parliament – and thus potentially feed into Homes England pipeline planning for funding which would be required. This is arguably more important than LGR but would also compliment the Councils ambitions under LGR as a demonstration of our ability to deliver against the national Government agenda.

Officer assessment and residual value

5.26 Officers consider that the expenditure has delivered a professionally executed body of work that met the Gateway 1 scope authorised in July 2025. The technical outputs form a usable evidence base.

5.27 However, value for money must also be judged against the outcome of the work. The process has demonstrated that the current schemes face fundamental barriers (consistent public opposition focused on site selection, unresolved strategic parking and accessibility issues, and viability requiring substantial public grant support with no clear funding route).

As a result:

- Baseline technical surveys, planning/heritage/transport advice and the general understanding of constraints retain residual value for any future work.
- Concept specific architectural design and engagement materials prepared around the current proposals have more limited continuing utility if the schemes do not progress.

5.28 It must be remembered that the Council committed to a staged process for precisely this reason, to minimise risk and exposure. This work was exploratory and limited to RIBA Stage 1 & 2 (Concept), thus, it was always the case that there was no guarantee that the work would progress, and that the Council would be left with some outputs which may or may not be useful in future - this is an accepted feature of exploratory feasibility work. Officers have acted upon the overall political mandate and direction that was given as a result of the July 2025 report and recommendations.

5.29 Whilst there has been a focus publicly on the c£1m spend, it was a figure which in July 2025 the Council considered was reasonable and comfortable with for the work that was proposed and was 'eyes open' about the work being exploratory; the work has not significantly exceeded this framework figure, and that additional spend is considered reasonable and justified against the outputs that have been delivered. In short, the Council was willing to take the limited risk, within the financial envelope, that the work may or may not progress; but some outputs would be produced; again, this is in accordance with the overall political mandate and direction that was given in July 2025.

5.30 While the overall expenditure sits within a credible range for the breadth of work undertaken, whether this represents optimal value for money based on the available evidence is subjective and will be a matter for the individual reader. As part of this report, no assessment has been undertaken to independently test or compare the individual fees, hours, rates and deliverables against comparable public-sector regeneration commissions, scope changes and residual value. It is also likely to be an area which is commented in more detail within the independent review and other political forums.

5.31 Publicly and politically, the focus recently has been on the more worked up proposals for the three car park sites – The Cattle Market, Princes St and Tebbutts Road – as these have been the only proposals which have been in the public domain and which have been put out to public engagement/ conversation.

5.32 There has been clear objection to these proposals which clearly represent a credible barrier to these proposals being taken forward. However, it is clear that if the proposals were to move forward (in full or in part) beyond Gateway 1, significant levels of additional work would be required to consider the impact of the loss/ reduction of car parking - and how this could be addressed as part of the solutions or "whole town" approaches to car parking, as well as considering the Council's recently adopted Car Parking Strategy, including its aims, objectives, and policies, as well as further public engagement.

5.33 Notwithstanding the above, whilst these three sites have been and are central to the work, and the proposed re-development schemes which have been worked up in more detail; it is clear from the Gateway 1 report that this has been an iterative piece of work, and that other sites (21 in total) were also considered by C&C. Whilst for various reasons these sites were not proposed to be taken forward, for example as a result of ownership, or not fitting the

C&C model, this context is important as it shows that the C&C work was much bigger than the "building on car parks" narrative which has played out.

5.34 It is this iterative approach, being brought forward at pace, which is reflected in the spend against the project. This is not simply a three site, three solution piece of work, delivered over a more elongated timescale. Had it been so, Officers would have reasonably expected the work to have been able to be delivered at a lower cost.

5.35 Further, C&C have also worked with HDC as a "regeneration partner", offering advice, guidance, and access via their own networks, for example one of the prospective purchases located in St Ives, referenced in the report, the Council were 'locked out' of discussions by the local agent, but following C&C discussions with their national contacts, HDC were able to enter into discussions regarding a potential purchase.

5.36 Equally, their understanding of access to funding streams (including those of Homes England, with whom they are a partner on sites such as Northstowe) has been valuable in understanding the funding context, and timelines, noting the Governments desire to secure increased housing delivery, with a focus on brownfield sites. These factors represent added value which should be accounted for in weighing up the value of the work.

5.37 Clearly the proposed sites and solutions were not well received publicly, which in turn makes it hard for those sites to progress. However, it should be noted that the report identifies that those schemes would:

- Generate £75.4m of Gross Value Added (GVA) while supporting 713 temporary Full time equivalent (FTE) jobs and seven apprenticeships, placements or traineeships during construction.
- Deliver 248 one- and two-bedroom apartments on previously developed land, which equals 25% of Huntingdonshire's annual housing target
- Add around 360 new residents and £533.9k of council tax income. The new residents' discretionary spend is estimated to generate around £3.9m directly into the towns, further supporting around 21 FTE jobs and £1.0m GVA per annum.
- Provide 9,300 sq ft of commercial food and beverage space which would support 42 FTE jobs and £2.0m of GVA per annum, and the benefit of this will allow a further 20 FTE jobs and £1.7m GVA in the wider economy, allowing around £21,200 income in business rates per annum.
- Provide 9,500 sq ft of public realm to allow for the towns to have stronger pedestrian routes and a feel of community for all town residents to benefit from.

5.38 These potential benefits are significant and should not be discounted purely on the basis of public opposition to the sites and solutions proposed. These should be weighed properly in the balance alongside the public feedback; and the overall aims and outcomes which are sought. Regeneration schemes or indeed development schemes in general are often divisive and require difficult decisions and choices to be made.

Conclusion on value for money

5.39 Whether the outcomes of this work represent value for money or whether this represents optimal value for money based on the available evidence is subjective and will be a matter for the individual reader/decision-maker/stakeholder. But this must be viewed in the context of the strategic direction given by the July 2025 report, and the principles it established.

5.40 The £1.06 million spent has produced a comprehensive Gateway 1 evidence base that aligns with the authorised scope and is not obviously excessive relative to the scale and complexity of the programme. In that limited sense, the expenditure can be regarded as reasonable. In respect of wider context, it must be remembered and recognised that undertaking exploratory and feasibility work of this nature does come with an opportunity cost – this was articulated through the July 2025 report. Officers professional understanding, there are many examples across the country where Councils and other public bodies have spent considerable sums of money on projects which have not then progressed for various reasons. Non-progression, of itself does not indicate that the work undertaken is not value for money.

5.41 The work has also established that the specific schemes tested are not viable to take forward without resolving strategic issues that further design work alone cannot address. In particular it is noted that there is considerable public angst towards the proposals and C&C (as a company); and from the information available it is clear that the opportunities for a C&C model within the Market Towns is currently limited at this present time. Continuing to Gateway 2 would not represent value for money.

5.42 Closing the commission at this point protects the residual value of the technical evidence base, limits further financial exposure, and avoids committing additional public resources to proposals that face clear and unresolved barriers. That said, in terms of what the Council set out to achieve through the July 2025 report and sought to achieve through working in partnership with C&C, it is considered that the outcomes at the end of Gateway 1 are consistent with expectation of exploratory work.

5.43 In respect of C&C as a partner, there has been wider value to the Council.

5.44 Whilst there has been local opposition to the proposals, and this has been translated into concerns regarding C&C as a company and partner for the Council; such concerns need to be managed. The report in July 2025 was clear in the reasons for choosing C&C as a partner for this work, and thus, it would not be appropriate to unpick or critique this at this stage, solely on the basis of public or political concern. The Council should be mindful of reputational impacts for C&C as a company – principally to prevent the Council being liable for claims against reputational damage.

5.45 Wider consideration can be given to this within the independent review, or scrutiny through other forums. Nor would it be acceptable to say C&C have failed to deliver, simply because the schemes were not received favourably locally or indeed that the work does not progress beyond Gateway 1. If the Cabinet determines that it does not wish to progress further, there are perfectly legitimate reasons for this, and there was no expectation that matters would progress within the July 2025 report.

5.46 Thus, it is acceptable for C&C and the Council to draw matters to an organised and orderly conclusion, without further duress or impact for either party and their organisational relationships.

5.47 It is considered that the wider principles and policy objectives as set out in the ‘Regeneration Opportunities’ report remain valid and relevant and should continue to be explored and pursued. Equally, the recommendations of the Gateway 1 report should continue to be considered in the context of future work to support our Market Towns. This remains aligned to both our Place Strategy and Corporate Plan and aligns with Government ambition at a national level.

5.48 As such, there may be alternatives or other opportunities that could come forward. What this work has demonstrated is that the scope for large scale, single site interventions, within the C&C model, are limited within our Market Towns and not suitable at this current juncture. Thus, closure of this project at the end of Gateway 1 and not progressing to Gateway 2 represents a prudent course of action.

5.49 Based on the above matters within this section and taking in all the other salient factors set out throughout this report; Officers would advise that the work does represent value for money.

6. NEXT STEPS

6.1 If the recommendations are accepted, the following next steps are proposed:

- Officers will proceed with the orderly conclusion of the existing contractual arrangements with Capital and Centric for Gateway 1, protecting the Council's legal, financial and intellectual property interests.
- No further work or expenditure will be authorised on the current schemes.
- The independent review of the Capital and Centric approach will continue as a separate process. Officers and Members will cooperate fully with it. This is being led by Monitoring Officer, with the Chief Executive as project sponsor. Findings will be reported through the appropriate routes once available.
- The technical evidence base (technical surveys, design material, pre-application advice, engagement data and economic assessment) will be retained and catalogued so that it remains available to inform any future, separately commissioned work.
- Any future proposals for regeneration of the sites proposed, or alternative sites, would be considered afresh through a new, transparent process supported by a clear business case and meaningful engagement, and would take account of the outcome of the independent review and the implications of local government reorganisation.

6.2 However, the general principles of regeneration remain relevant to the Council's ambitions for our places and communities. These principles seek to bring forward economic and housing-led opportunities that will create new homes, jobs and other benefits. They also remain aligned with the Council's Corporate Plan and its 'do', 'enable' and 'influence' activities. They should therefore continue to be pursued.

7. COMMENTS OF OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY

7.1 This item is part of a motion approved by Overview and Scrutiny under section 2.7 of the Cabinet Procedure rules. No pre-scrutiny has been undertaken or is deemed to be appropriate, given that Scrutiny have made the request of Cabinet. Further, 'call-in' does not apply as there is no formal decision to be taken

7.2 It is noted that Overview and Scrutiny (Performance and Growth) has also previously accepted an item relating to this topic as a retrospective review and this can be looked at the most appropriate juncture (likely linked to the receipt of the independent review findings).

7.3 The independent review will be reported through the appropriate committee(s) in due course.

8. POST-DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

8.1 If Cabinet accepts the recommendations, officers will:

- Proceed immediately with the orderly conclusion of the existing Gateway 1 contractual arrangements with Capital and Centric, ensuring the Council's legal, financial and intellectual property interests are fully protected.
- Catalogue and securely retain the full technical evidence base (surveys, concept designs, pre-application advice, engagement data, economic benefits assessment and related materials) so that it remains available for any future, separately commissioned work.
- Continue to support the independent review of the Capital and Centric commission as a separate process, led by the Monitoring Officer with the Chief Executive as project sponsor. Findings will be reported through the appropriate channels in due course.
- Continue to look at opportunities for regeneration, aligned with the established principles, in accordance with the Councils established priorities including as set out within the Corporate Plan and Place Strategy.

9. IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

Council Key Priorities and Performance

9.1 The recommendations align with the Council's Corporate Plan priorities relating to place-making, sustainable growth, housing delivery and vibrant market towns. By concluding the current schemes at Gateway 1 while retaining the evidence base and reaffirming the underlying regeneration principles (new homes, jobs, increased footfall and local spend), the decision supports a more realistic and publicly supported approach to delivering those priorities. It also protects the Council's ability to pursue alternative, better-aligned opportunities in the future.

Financial Implications

9.2 Gateway 1 expenditure totalled £1,058,720.61 (approximately 5% above the original £1 million allocation authorised in July 2025). The modest overspend was reviewed and approved, within Project Progress meetings held weekly between HDC and C&C, on the basis that it contributed materially to the required deliverables – and sought to bring forward some expenditure considered necessary which was originally planned to be within Gateway 2, but which was appropriate to bring forward based on site sensitivity, and which would have reduced cost under Gateway 2 if the development were to proceed.

9.3 This was a conscious decision, taken by Officers; in accordance with professional discretion and established approval arrangements. No further expenditure on the current schemes is proposed. Closing the commission at this stage limits further financial exposure, avoids committing additional public resources to proposals that face clear and unresolved barriers, and protects residual funds and intellectual property. Any future regeneration proposals would require fresh budgetary authority supported by a clear business case.

Policy Implications

9.4 The decision is consistent with the Council's adopted Place Strategy, Corporate Plan and recently adopted Car Parking Strategy. It does not alter the Council's overarching commitment to regeneration that delivers economic and housing-led benefits. Instead, it recognises that the specific sites and schemes tested through Gateway 1 are not the most appropriate vehicle for delivering those benefits at the present time, particularly given unresolved strategic parking, accessibility and town-centre vitality issues and the absence of a clear route to the public grant support required for viability.

Legal & Constitutional Implications

9.5 The July 2025 Cabinet decision authorised exploratory work only to the end of Gateway 1. Progression to Gateway 2 requires a new formal decision. The Monitoring Officer has advised that there is no requirement for a separate formal decision simply to stop progression beyond the current stage. Officers will ensure that the orderly conclusion of the existing contractual arrangements protects the Council's legal, financial and intellectual property interests. No further contractual commitments should be entered into in relation to the current concept schemes. The independent review will proceed as a separate process and will not be prejudiced by this decision.

9.6 The potential land value of other identified sites has been redacted under the Local Government Act 1972 Schedule 12A part 3 namely "Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)" as detailing the estimated value of the land may prejudice the Council in future negotiations.

Community Impact

9.7 Public engagement in August 2026 generated more than 3,500 responses, with opposition ranging from 87% to 91% across the three towns. The predominant concern related to the impact of redeveloping central surface car parks on accessibility, linked trips and town-centre vitality. The recommendation not to progress the current schemes responds directly to this clear expression of community views while preserving the technical evidence base for any future, more broadly supported proposals. Closing the commission in an orderly manner helps maintain confidence in the Council's decision-making processes.

9.8 This report also recognises the views expressed online and within Council in September 2026.

Health & Wellbeing Implications

9.9 No significant adverse health or wellbeing impacts are identified from the decision not to progress the current schemes. By avoiding the potential loss or significant reduction of convenient central parking without a robust town-wide strategy in place, the decision supports continued accessibility for residents, including those who rely on private vehicles for health, shopping and social trips. Any future regeneration proposals would be subject to appropriate health and wellbeing assessment at the relevant stage.

Environment & Climate Change Implications

9.10 The Council has a duty to deliver sustainable place-making and has adopted environmental principles and a Climate Strategy committing it to be a net carbon zero Council by 2040, an enabler of action within communities, and an encourager of climate action.

9.11 The decision recommended in this report is not to progress the current schemes. No significant environmental impacts arise from concluding the Gateway 1 commission. Any future proposals for regeneration would need to demonstrate alignment with the Council's climate and environmental commitments and would be assessed accordingly.

Equality & Diversity Implications

9.12 The Council has a statutory duty to promote equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and foster good relations in respect of the nine protected characteristics.

9.13 The decision recommended in this report is not to progress the current schemes. No adverse equalities impacts are identified from ceasing further work on these proposals. Any future regeneration proposals would be subject to appropriate equalities assessment at the relevant stage. The extensive public engagement already undertaken has provided a clear expression of community views on the current schemes.

Implications on Resources

9.14 Gateway 1 expenditure has been set out elsewhere in this report. No further expenditure on the current process is proposed. Closing the commission at the end of Gateway 1, will avoid any additional expenditure. Officer time will be required to manage the orderly close-down and to support the independent review. This is considered manageable within existing resources.

10. LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION (LGR) IMPLICATIONS

10.1 LGR was a consideration within the work undertaken during Gateway 1, in particular the impact it had on timescales and potential to bring forward development on the sites prior to any Structural Change Order being brought in to place and limiting the Councils functions and ability to take significant decisions with longer term contractual impacts.

10.2 The ongoing uncertainty surrounding local government reorganisation in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough reinforces the case for not progressing the current schemes to Gateway 2.

10.3 Further commitment of resources or longer-term contractual arrangements would risk binding a future authority to projects that face significant public opposition and unresolved strategic barriers. An orderly conclusion of the Gateway 1 commission limits residual liabilities while preserving the technical evidence base as a transferable asset for any successor authority.

11. RISK MANAGEMENT

11.1 The principal risks associated with not accepting the recommendations of this report and progressing to Gateway 2 on the current schemes are:

- Reputational risk arising from proceeding in the face of very strong and consistent public opposition and key stakeholders – noting that this is focused on fundamental site selection rather than design detail.

- Planning risk: pre-application advice indicates that a town-wide parking strategy, considering these specific proposals and demonstrating maintenance of accessibility, vitality and performance, is required before any application. Absence of such a strategy creates a significant obstacle to obtaining planning permission. These will be additional work items which may impact on the approved budget for Gateway 2. If the work were to proceed a review of the budget envelope would be recommended.

- Finance risk: Gateway 1 expenditure has exceeded the original £1m allocation by approximately 5% (£58,720.61) which can be managed within the Councils overall budget envelope. Whilst the Council has indicated a budget availability for up to a further £1m, this should be reviewed as it may be insufficient. Any further commitment would require fresh budgetary authority. Closing the commission now limits further financial exposure and allows residual funds (if any) and intellectual property to be protected.

- Opportunity cost and resource risk: further expenditure and officer time would be committed to schemes that face material unresolved strategic barriers.

- Lack of certainty and policy changes: there are significant unknowns in relation to the schemes progressing under Gateway 2 which could be impacted by time, lack of certainty of decisions, and potential policy changes. For example the recently adopted Car Parking Strategy is an updated policy position which would have to be addressed in addition to gaining planning permission etc if the development were to move forward; equally funding and development viability are uncertain at present, particularly in light of wider economic factors

- Prejudice to independent review: any decision to proceed could be perceived as pre-empting or constraining the findings of the independent review now being commissioned.

11.2 Conversely, the risk of not progressing is limited. The July 2025 decision authorised work only to the end of Gateway 1. There is no contractual or other obligation to move to Gateway 2. The technical evidence base can be retained and applied to any future, separately commissioned proposals.

12. BACKGROUND PAPERS– LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Regeneration Opportunities report – Report to Cabinet - July 2025
Full Council – September 2026
Capital & Centric FAQs - Huntingdonshire.gov.uk
ePetition - Stop the current Capital & Centric car-park proposals - Huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Document List
Appendix A: Appendix 1: C&C Gateway 1 report including:

Appendix 2: Huntingdonshire locations and approach
Appendix 3: Huntingdonshire proposal development
Appendix 4: Huntingdonshire final design pack
Appendix 5A: 240902 St Ives presentation
Appendix 5B: 240923 St Neots & Huntingdon presentation
Appendix 6a: Consultation analysis - Huntingdon
Appendix 6b: Consultation analysis – St Ives
Appendix 6c: Consultation analysis – St Neots
Appendix 7: Pre-application comments
Appendix 8: Architect and design (Shed_ pre-application response
Appendix 9: GC Insight economic report
Appendix 10: Cllr Martin's motion (4/11/26)