[redacted]

From: DevelopmentControl
Sent: 24 March 2025 16:05
To: DevelopmentControl
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 25/00394/FUL

Categories: [redacted]

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 24/03/2025 4:04 PM from [redacted]

Application Summary

Address:	21 Church Road Great Stukeley Huntingdon PE28 4AL
Proposal:	Erection of self-build dwelling and associated development.
Case Officer:	Hannah Hodges

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	[redacted]
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	25 Church Road Great Stukeley Huntingdon

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Dear Sir/Madam Reference: 25/00394/FUL Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to comment on the aforementioned planning application relating to the erection of a self-build dwelling and associated development at 21 Church Road, Great Stukeley. We wish to raise our objections to this proposed development on the basis of the following concerns. The land for the proposed development will extend a significant distance outside of the Great Stukeley settlement boundary, a boundary with the purpose of defining the Stukeleys built up area by directing growth of the settlement so as to protect the countryside. A previous planning application at this site, 24/01009/FUL, was refused and one of the reasons was due to the proposed erection of a "pole barn" located outside of the Great Stukeley boundary. After

amendments, which included the removal of the "pole barn", the revised planning application 24/01734/FUL was approved. It would not be appropriate to now permit a far greater encroachment into land that is not designated for development and surely it would set an unnecessary precedent if it was allowed.

The proposed development will significantly reduce the existing privacy afforded the Old Vicarage house and gardens, particularly given the excessive length of the proposed development. The application mentions that on the northern boundary there is an eight metre belt of trees that provide total screening to the Old Vicarage. That statement is incorrect, especially outside of summer months, and the length of the development is over twice that of the belt of trees. The photographs and comments provided in the application only illustrate the impact on views when the trees and bushes are in leaf. They do not take into account the six plus months each year that these deciduous plantings are without foliage and provide scarce screening from the proposed development. Loss of privacy could be further exacerbated due to the proposed development being sited so close to the existing trees and bushes. It will overshadow them, leading to additional loss of foliage, poor growth, diseases and damage to root networks. The proposed two storey development will also negatively impact the well-established Old Vicarage garden closest to it due to the resulting loss of daylight and sunlight.

The application notes that the proposed property development is positioned to enjoy the countryside views. The intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside is derived from open views, something that the proposed development will curtail for others and it will certainly result in the loss of existing views of the countryside from the Old Vicarage and the Church.

The submitted biodiversity checklist is incorrect and the proposed development will have a detrimental effect on local biodiversity. The site of the proposed development and the neighbouring land is frequently visited by bats, barn owls, heron and kingfishers, all of which would be affected by the development. There are ducks and moorhen nesting in nearby ponds together with many other species of birds nesting in the trees adjacent to the proposed development. The proposed development is within six metres of a ditch and a pond that should be considered to have the potential to support the great crested newt. This pond has been described in section 4.33 of the application planning statement as "little more than a patch of damp ground". It may have dried out in the height of summer but it is certainly not for the majority of the year, yet no HSI assessment was undertaken.

It does not appear that a hydrological risk assessment has taken place to determine the consequenses that the proposed development will have on an area that already has an extremely high water table. Neighbouring land affected could be rendered waterlogged as a result of the proposed development proceeding.

In summary, the proposed new development does not contribute positively to the areas character, especially when sited extensively outside the Great Stukeley settlement boundary.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Kind regards