From: DevelopmentControl
To: DevelopmentControl
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 26/01897/FUL
Date: 20 November 2026 12:32:47

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 20/11/2026 12:32 PM from [redacted].

Application Summary

Address:	Land Northeast Of 2 Old Houghton Road And Southeast Of Main Street Hartford
Proposal:	Erection of a discount foodstore (Use class E) including access, parking, landscaping and other associated infrastructure and works.
Case Officer:	Angela Brockett

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	[redacted]
Email:	
Address:	46 Falcon Drive Hartford Huntingdon

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Re: Objection to Planning Application 26/01897/FUL - erection of a discount foodstore (Lidl), land northeast of 2 Old Houghton Road and southeast of Main Street, Hartford, Huntingdon Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing as a local resident to formally object to the above planning application. My objection is made on highway safety, traffic, and flood risk grounds, which are material planning considerations under the National Planning Policy Framework and Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036. I ask that this letter be formally recorded against the application, and that I am kept informed of its progress, including the target decision date and whether it will be determined by committee or under delegated powers. 1. Highway Safety and Site Access Cambridgeshire County Council, as Local Highway Authority, submitted a consultation response on 12 November 2026 stating that it is currently "unable to support the proposal." This is not a minor technical query; it identifies unresolved safety concerns that go to the heart of this application. The Highway Authority finds that the proposed access, a priority T-junction onto the B1514 Main Street, sits immediately adjacent to the existing ghost-island right-turn facility serving Owl Way. It has raised concerns about overlapping right-turn movements, driver expectancy, and an increased risk of rear-end collisions, and has required a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit before it can reach a view. The applicant's own Statement of Community Involvement says an audit has been commissioned, but no such audit appears anywhere in the published application documents.

The Highway Authority has also identified a direct contradiction in the applicant's own evidence. The Transport Assessment (Link Engineering, ref. LE26015) concludes that a 16.5m articulated delivery vehicle "can safely enter and exit the site in a forward gear." The Highway Authority's own reading of the same swept-path analysis found the opposite: inbound HGVs need the opposing outbound lane to complete the turn, risking a lorry left stationary, partly on the B1514 carriageway, while waiting to enter the site.

Given that the Local Highway Authority itself cannot yet support this application, I ask that the Council not determine it until the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and a revised, verifiable swept-path and servicing assessment have been resolved and re-consulted upon.

2. Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety

My particular concern is for vulnerable road users - elderly residents, people with mobility impairments, and children - who will need to cross the B1514 to reach the store, nearby bus stops, or the surrounding community on foot.

The Highway Authority's response sets this out in detail. It notes that no continuous, deliverable pedestrian route to the surrounding community has been shown; that the footway on the plans may not sit within land under the applicant's control or the adopted highway boundary; that no cycle access or parking has been proposed; and that it has not been demonstrated how pedestrians can safely cross the B1514 to reach bus stops on either side.

The applicant proposes a 30mph limit on this stretch of the B1514 but has submitted no speed survey data - no existing speeds, no 85th-percentile data - to show the limit would be observed or that the access has been designed around actual vehicle speeds rather than the posted limit. Ward Councillors Nathan Hunt and Jo Harvey raised the same point on 12 November 2026, describing Main Street as "a busy, fast-moving road" and noting that unresolved pedestrian safety conflicts with Neighbourhood Plan Policy TT1, which requires developments to "maximise the potential for cycling and walking."

A store drawing pedestrian traffic from a wide catchment, onto a road not shown to be safely crossable, should not be approved until safe, continuous, deliverable walking and cycling access has actually been demonstrated, not merely proposed.

3. Traffic Congestion and Rat-Running Risk

Owl Way and the surrounding Birds Estate are residential streets, not designed to carry through-traffic. Residents already report difficulty exiting Owl Way onto Main Street at peak periods. A development of this scale will add customer, staff, and delivery traffic directly adjacent to that junction, with a real risk that motorists use Owl Way and the Birds Estate as a cut-through to reach the store or avoid queuing on Main Street.

This would put children, dog walkers, and other residents at greater risk on streets never intended for commercial through-traffic. If the application proceeds, I ask the Council to require a clear, enforceable scheme - a Traffic Regulation Order, physical traffic calming, or an access restriction - to prevent rat-running through the estate, secured by condition rather than left to a voluntary Travel Plan.

4. Flood Risk and Drainage

The site lies within Flood Zone 2. The applicant's own Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report (Link Engineering) acknowledges shallow residual flooding, to a depth of around 220mm, in part of the car park during a 1-in-100-year rainfall event plus a 19% climate change allowance, relying on compensatory works and a flap valve to manage flows from an adjacent drain during high water levels on the River Great Ouse.

Surface water drainage depends on a 930m³ underground attenuation tank, pumped to an existing ditch. Modelling shows that if the pump fails, around 92m³ of exceedance flooding would occur in the HGV loading dock; the applicant's mitigation is a second, backup pump rather than a passive fallback.

This flood strategy rests entirely on mechanical, maintained infrastructure

continuing to work as designed for the lifetime of the development, with no margin beyond that pump and its backup. I have not found a substantive response from the Lead Local Flood Authority (Cambridgeshire County Council, in its surface water role, which the applicant's own report cites) anywhere in the published application documents. The Environment Agency has formally declined to comment, stating the application was wrongly referred to it. I ask that the Council not rely solely on the applicant's own consultant's assessment of flood and drainage risk, and not determine this application until a substantive, independent Lead Local Flood Authority response has been received and published for public comment.

Requested Outcome

For the reasons above, I ask the Council either to refuse this application, or at minimum not to determine it until these outstanding matters are resolved and re-consulted upon:

1. A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designer's Response addressing the site access, as requested by the Local Highway Authority.

2. A revised Transport Assessment and swept-path/servicing analysis resolving the contradiction over HGV access and the B1514 carriageway.

3. Evidence of a safe, continuous, deliverable pedestrian and cycle route to the site and nearby bus stops, including a speed survey justifying the proposed 30mph limit.

4. A substantive response from the Lead Local Flood Authority on surface water drainage and flood risk.

If, notwithstanding these concerns, the Council is minded to approve the application, I ask that it attach conditions requiring: a signal-controlled or other formally assessed pedestrian crossing facility on the B1514 near the site access; restricted delivery and servicing hours; a Construction Traffic Management Plan; and a scheme to prevent rat-running through Owl Way and the Birds Estate, secured by Traffic Regulation Order or physical measures rather than voluntary travel planning alone.

Closing

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this objection and keep me informed of the application's progress, including the target decision date and whether it will be determined by the Planning Committee or under delegated powers. I am happy to provide further detail on any of the points raised above.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

Kind regards