[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 10 July 2025 09:41
To: DMAdmin
Cc: [redacted]; Deputy Clerk
Subject: Planning Comments

Dear Planning Authority,

This application has already been submitted:

1. Ref 25/01086/S73: The Portfolio had no objection to the variation of condition, as long as the Conservation Officer is happy with the proposed change, then this request is recommended to be **APPROVED**.

Applications that we have prepared comments for (due to the response date and a cancellation of a meeting, the Town Clerk, at the request of the Portfolio, confirmed these recommendations to Huntingdonshire District Council, using his delegated powers):

1. Ref 25/01117/HHFUL: The Portfolio has no option but to **RECOMMEND REFUSUAL** due to the files being corrupted and inaccessible on the HDC system. This application should be resubmitted in full.

2. Ref 25/00854/FUL: The Portfolio considers this to be a commercial application and is surprised that Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) has accepted it as a domestic Full Housing Application. There appears to be a clear intent to operate a business from the premises. Anyone familiar with Chadley Lane will know that parking is already extremely limited, making it unsuitable for commercial use. The additional traffic and parking requirements associated with a dog grooming business would only exacerbate the issue. Furthermore, the comments from Environmental Health are concerning. Given the close proximity of this proposed development to neighbouring properties, it is reasonable to assume that noise levels may be significant, especially with multiple dogs on-site. There is also insufficient detail provided regarding how the dogs will be washed, particularly in terms of sustainability and waste water disposal. Crucially, there are no proposed restrictions on opening hours, days of operation or how the number of dogs groomed will be monitored or limited. This lack of clarity raises serious concerns about the scale and impact of the proposed use. For these reasons, the Portfolio **RECOMMENDS REFUSUAL** of this application.

3. Ref 25/01164/HHFUL: The Portfolio had no objection, due to the size of the extension not being excessive compared to the original conservatory, therefore we recommend **APPROVAL**.

4. Ref 25/80198/COND: The Portfolio is concerned about the proposed variations to conditions, given that this area experienced flooding in 2022 and remains at high risk from multiple sources — including overtopping of Stony Brook, rising groundwater and river flooding. The site lies on the edge of Bell Isle, which further increases its vulnerability. It is therefore essential that these variations are clearly demonstrated not to be at risk themselves and importantly, that they do not increase flood risk to surrounding properties. Given the complexity and the significant level of research required to properly assess the implications, the Portfolio makes no formal comment at this stage. We **NEITHER SUPPORT NOR OBJECT** to the variations to the conditions but believe further investigation and evidence are necessary to provide assurance regarding flood risk impacts.

Any issues please do get in touch. May you confirm receipt of this email.

[redacted]
Town Clerk

Godmanchester Town Council |Town Hall | 1 Post Street | Godmanchester | PE29 2NB
[redacted]

Godmanchester T
Town Hall. Post Street. Godmanchester

Disclaimer
The information contained in this communication to the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorised to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived.