DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 16th November 2026

FURTHER LATE REPRESENTATIONS SUMMARY

25/01694/OUT Outline planning application (phased development) for the erection of up to 600 dwellings including 40% affordable, a community hub site including car parking and mobility hub. Public open space including green and blue infrastructure, incorporating footpaths, cycle ways, biodiversity improvements and habitat creation; associated drainage and landscaping including new and existing trees and hedgerows, utilities and other infrastructure. All matters reserved except for means of vehicular access from Priory Hill Road and associated highways works to Mill Lane/Priory Hill/Huntingdon Road - Land Adjacent St Neots Reservoir, Priory Hill Road, St Neots

1. Additional representations

Additional late representations/material have been received following publication of the Late Representations Report on 13.11.2026 as follows:

a) 1 no. further representations from a neighbour;
b) Report from Historic England.
c) Emails from Cllr Claffey (Great Paxton Ward and Great Paxton Parish Council) and Cllr Bond (Great Paxton Parish Council) and letter of objection from Great Paxton Parish Council.
d) Email from a resident of the wider district regarding the Screening Opinion

These representations are available to view in full via Public Access and copies have been provided to DMC members directly (electronic copies will be sent by email in advance of the Development Management Committee (DMC) meeting, alongside this report. Hard copies will also be made available at the DMC meeting).

The matters raised within these representations are summarised below and an officer response is provided where relevant.

a) **1 no. further representations from a neighbour**

A further representation from a neighbour has been received by the LPA (received 13.11.2026). The matters raised in these representations are summarised under the headings below and an officer response is provided.

Bat surveys

The further late representations continue to suggest that the council has insufficient information relating to bats.

This matter was addressed in detail by the Late Representations report.

To confirm, there are no bat roosts on the application site. Whilst tree T43 contains features which could be suitable for bats, there is no evidence that bats have used the tree to date. Further surveys of T43 are to be secured by condition prior to commencement of any development and the Council's Ecologist is satisfied such a condition is lawful and justified.

Little Paxton Bridge

The further late representations continue to suggest that the application will result in a severe impact upon Little Paxton Bridge.

This matter was addressed in detail by the Late Representations report. The Highway Authority are satisfied that the proposed development will not result in a severe impact upon Little Paxton Bridge. No mitigation for the proposed development is justified for Little Paxton Bridge.

Wastewater Treatment Works

The further late representations continue to suggest that the proposed residential development would prevent the expansion of St Neots Wastewater Treatment Centre.

This matter was addressed in detail by the Late Representations report.

To confirm, Anglian Water, Bloor Homes and the Council's Environmental Health Officer agree that, in principle, the WRC can be expanded without adversely impacting the residential amenity of any future residents of the proposed development.

Archaeology

The further late representations question why officers have not afforded weight to archaeological harm arising from the loss of the iron age remains in the overall planning balance.

The County Archaeologist and Historic England are satisfied that the iron age remains are not of national significance. There are many examples of such finds regionally and nationally.

The iron age finds are to be preserved by record (secured by condition). This means that the archaeology will be excavated by professional archaeologists and following scientific analysis, a clear and detailed record of the finds will be published and made publicly accessible.

Whilst it is accepted that excavating the archaeology could be considered as 'harmful', the County Archaeologist is satisfied that this harm is neutralised by the preservation by record.

On this basis and as reflected in the Officer report, Officer's judgement is that harm to archaeology is not a matter to be weighed within the overall planning balance as it is attributed neutral weight.

b) <u>Report from Historic England</u>

A report was published by Historic England (HE) on 13.11.2026, after the late reps report was published.

This report has been generated as a result of a direct application to HE from an interested individual which sought the Iron Age remains identified on site be scheduled as an Ancient Monument. This application to HE is governed by separate legislation outside of the planning system and is an independent process led by HE with the decision made by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and therefore HDC officers had no involvement in this process.

The report published by Historic England on 13.11.2026 confirms that DCMS have rejected the request to schedule the application site and recommend that the archaeological remains be managed through the planning system. As already noted, the county archaeologist has recommended conditions to secure archaeological mitigation.

c) <u>Emails from Cllr Claffey (Great Paxton Ward and Great Paxton Parish Council) Cllr Bond (Great Paxton Parish Council) and a letter from Great Paxton Parish Council</u>

Further late representations have been received as follows:

- 2no. emails from Cllr Claffey (dated 13.11.2026)
- 1 no. email from Cllr Bond (dated 15.11.2026)
- 1 no. letter from Great Paxton Parish Council (received 16.11.2026)

Officer note: As reflected in the Officer report, representations previously received from Cllr Claffey (25.09.2026) are summarised at paragraph 5.2. No previous correspondence had been received from Great Paxton Parish Council or Cllr Bond, however an officer response to the points raised is provided below, where these have not already been directly addressed within the Officer report.

Question whether highway impacts upon Great Paxton / Little Paxton Bridge / and assumptions made within the Transport Assessment regarding Great Paxton have been adequately assessed by the applicant/Highway Authority

Highway Authority Officers have looked at this application extensively and are satisfied that the submitted Transport Assessment has been prepared using a nationally accepted methodology (using the most up to date data available).

The assumptions regarding trip distributions are all set out within the Transport Assessment and technical notes prepared in support of the application (and publicly accessible on the online file) and have been reviewed by the Highway Authority, National Highways and Active Travel England (as technical specialists).

The Highway Authority are satisfied that a limited number of trips generated by the proposed development could head north, through Great Paxton. The Transport Assessment does not anticipate significant impacts upon any junctions within Great Paxton and account has been taken of highway safety data.

No further pedestrian or cycle improvements are proposed along Huntingdon Road north of the applicant's proposed works, as the key desire lines and destinations for development-related pedestrian and cycle trips are towards the existing facilities, amenities, and schools within St Neots. The Highway Authority advise that Great Paxton is beyond reasonable walking distance from the residential area of the proposed development and therefore do not consider that any off site works in Great Paxton are justified.

Impacts upon Little Paxton Bridge were addressed in detail by the Late Representations report and are addressed again above in response to the further late neighbour representation received.

As noted within the officer report, National Highways, Active Travel England and the Highway Authority offer no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions and obligations, as have been detailed within the Officer Report.

Question whether S106 obligations / infrastructure impacts upon Great Paxton been adequately addressed including doctors, dentists and schools

The catchment schools for the proposed development are all located within St Neots.

The ICB has identified the GP surgeries most likely to be impacted by the proposed development as Buckden & Little Paxton Surgeries and Almond Road Surgery, and has requested financial contributions towards these.

No consultees have identified an impact upon existing infrastructure within Great Paxton which would justify off site works or obligations being secured as part of the application.

d) <u>Email from a resident of the wider district regarding the Screening Opinion</u>

A late representation was received 12.11.2026 (after the Late Representations report was finalised) from an interested resident in the district who has raised concern about the publication of the Screening Matrix which was undertaken to accompany the EIA Screening Opinion for this application (reference 25/70051/SCRE).

In response to the questions raised by this representation, it is confirmed that the Screening Matrix was published as a public document on 08.06.2026, prior to this the matrix had been completed but was saved internally on the file.

Officers are satisfied that this did not prejudice any interested parties and has no bearing upon the determination process for the application before DMC this evening.