Lewis Tomlinson
Planning Dept
Huntingdonshire District Council
St Marys Street
Huntingdon
Cambs PE29 3TN

GamPlan Associates
Chartered Town Planners
Development Consultants

11th August 2025

Dear Lewis

ERECTION OF THREE-BEDROOM BUNGALOW WITH GARAGE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS (INC NEW PLANTING AND CREATION OF OFF-STREET PARKING AND TURNING TO BOTH EXISTING AND PROPOSED PROPERTIES)
LAND AT ACKERMAN STREET / SIMPKIN CLOSE, EATON SOCON, ST NEOTS, CAMBS
HDC REF 25-0756FUL

I write with reference to the above application and having now had the chance to read the report being presented to the forthcoming DMC meeting write to you as the third Case Officer to handle the application. Ahead of responding to the report to be presented to members, I would again repeat the invitation made to the previous Case Officer to visit the site in person, with my strong belief being that anyone seeking to comment upon proposals can only do so properly having visited the site and been able to appreciate relationships with neighbouring properties and the wider locality. I have also attached previous correspondence with the previous (second) Case Officer for ease of reference, and have taken the liberty of attaching an updated version of Section Drawing **JLG1002/NB/03 rev A**, which adds in the position of the proposed car barn to show the bungalow would sit well 'behind' that structure outlined within the report as not causing any loss of existing residential amenity.

I'm obviously disappointed about the recommendation, particularly given that the previous exchanges set out very clearly that there would be no loss of views of the

listed building and that a rear view is only a very recent construct brought about by the redevelopment of the wider application site and the submitted Sections show the bungalow would have a softer relationship with neighbouring properties than the car barn accepted at paras 7.34 & 7.35 of not having any adverse impact upon those neighbouring homes. However, and notwithstanding the **rigorous process of Assessment, Involvement, Evaluation and Design** and very careful consideration of the relationship with both neighbouring properties and the site's wider context, there is obviously scope to revisit the proposals with regards to matters of siting, roofscape or detailing if this would help further ameliorate the already harmonious relationships with neighbouring properties.

I would also question whether the 'loss of light' stated at para 7.33 was calculated with reference to the very clear guidance and requirements set out within **BRE209 "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice" (2022)** or is in fact little more than a guess? If calculations regarding e.g. **Vertical Sky Components** at each property have been made, I would expect them to be included within the report. If not, it would mean that if this element is to be contested at appeal it would require my client to commission such a report at a potential cost of several thousand pounds; which doesn't sound **'reasonable'** to me.

I obviously welcome the confirmation within the report that the site is an appropriately and sustainably located parcel of land with no identified flood risk, such that residential redevelopment would accord with the thrust of relevant local planning policy and national guidance. Not only was the scheme designed with close liaison with the Local Highways Authority to ensure appropriate on-site parking & turning for vehicles, but also allows for access alterations which not only improve the geometry and achievable visibility into the highways, but also allows for safe & convenient bin store & collection points off the highway to serve both the existing and proposed properties.

In summary, the DMC report demonstrates how the engagement with stakeholders at design and review stages helped inform and shape the proposals; with recommendations of **APPROVAL** / 'no objections' from the Town Council, County Highways & Archaeology, HDC Trees, Landscaping, Env Health and other statutory undertakers. As such, the proposals, which raise no concerns regarding the principle of residential redevelopment, the sustainability of the site, the nature or quantum of development proposed, Biodiversity, Trees, Flood Risk, Adaptability or water efficiency should be considered as according with the aims and requirements

of the National Planning Policy Framework, HDC Local Plan, Design Guide and Neighbourhood Plan and also to represent **Good Design**.

In the circumstances I would suggest withdrawing the application from consideration at DMC to allow clarification of issues raised and any reasonable concerns to be easily addressed in line with suggestions outlined above..

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss any aspects of the proposals or should you feel you require any additional details, and I look forward to discussing this letter and the application with you at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely



Simon Richardson
GamPlan Associates

GamPlan Associates 11 Rowan Gardens Gamlingay Cambridgeshire SG19 3LU
office@gamplan.co.uk ☎ 01767 651701 07515 995537