From: DevelopmentControl
To: DevelopmentControl
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 25/00350/REM
Date: 27 September 2025 14:23:54

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 27/09/2025 2:23 PM from

Application Summary

Address:	Alconbury Weald Ermine Street Little Stukeley
Proposal:	Reserved Matters Application relating to the approval of appearance, layout, landscape, access and scale in respect of the construction of green, grey and blue infrastructure including all ancillary and associated engineering and earthworks including substations and foul pump station pursuant to outline planning permission ref. 19/01341/OUT
Case Officer:	Aaron Sands

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	
Email:	
Address:	9 Collinson Crescent Sapley Huntingdon

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Opposition to the Redevelopment of the Former RAF Alconbury Base I would like to express my strong opposition to the proposed redevelopment of the former RAF base. This site is not just disused land-it holds deep historical and cultural significance, both locally and nationally. To allow its redevelopment risks permanently erasing a key part of our area's heritage. Once lost, this history cannot be recovered. Many residents believe it should be preserved or repurposed in a way that honours its past, such as a heritage site, museum, or community space. Beyond heritage, the proposed development raises serious practical concerns. Local infrastructure-particularly roads, schools, and healthcare facilities-is already under pressure. Adding a substantial new housing or commercial development risks overwhelming these essential services and lowering the quality of life for existing residents. There are also environmental implications to consider. Former RAF sites often include green space and support diverse wildlife, including protected species. Redevelopment could lead to irreversible environmental damage. I urge the council to reject this redevelopment proposal and instead explore alternatives that protect our heritage, respect our environment, and serve the long-term interests of the community. At the very end of it, it's just a awesome place with alot of history that we should be aiming to preserve and utilise as a historic landmark as opposed to

redeveloping it. We don't want it, we don't need it (the redevelopment that is).

Kind regards