From: DevelopmentControl
To: DevelopmentControl
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 26/00204/NMA
Date: 14 March 2026 22:25:45

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 14/03/2026 10:25 PM from [redacted]

Application Summary

Address:	Land East And West Of Edison Bell Way Huntingdon
Proposal:	Non-material amendment of 20/02613/FUL (phased residential development of 178 dwellings with access, car/cycle parking, landscaping and associated works) to relocate the THGA1 flat block (plots 158-163) and amendment of balcony support structure to minimize impact on nearby RPA's
Case Officer:	Hannah Guy

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	[redacted]
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	9 Brampton Road Huntingdon

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Once more the developer is trying to abuse due planning process. The planning outcome letter of the previous NMA (25/01639/NMA) clearly stated 'the proposal is not acceptable as a non-material minor amendment as it involves more than a very small change. If you wish to pursue the amendments you must submit a fresh planning application for the whole development.' Yet here we are 6 months later with the same NMA proposal type to completely move the footprint of the building in relation to our property. I refer to our previous comment, all of which still stands 'Privacy will be affected as window locations have moved in respect to our property. Flats will be looking directly into our bathroom and toilet windows, as well as our [redacted] bedrooms. Assessment of the reduction of light into our property is also not being considered which will have impact. In addition this has direct impact and change on the previously mandated gate at the end of the trim trail which we went to planning committee over, where councillors unanimously voted in our favour leading to conditions.' In addition this time, the developer plans to remove a tree (previously protected, but deliberately allowed to be overrun with Ivy. The pathing and boundary arrangements appear changed. As stated many times, we do not object to the land being built on, we merely seek a solution that respects our house that has stood for 126 years, our family privacy and not simply the developers bank balance. We would, as stated many times be willing to sit with planners and developers and come to an amicable compromise. We be submitting a full history of evidence to the council planners alongside this complaint. Also ready for the ombudsman if this is allowed through. We have already notified local councillor/mayor and are ready and prepared for legal objection. We ask that the developer work with us rather than try to hide major

changes in such and underhand manner.
[redacted] (9 Brampton Road)

Kind regards