[redacted]

From: DevelopmentControl
Sent: 22 January 2025 22:27
To: DevelopmentControl
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 24/02343/LBC

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 22/01/2025 10:27 PM from [redacted].

Application Summary

Address:	Hemingford Park Hall Hemingford Park Common Lane Hemingford Abbots Huntingdon PE28 9AS
Proposal:	Retention of pool building, basement car park, lift and enclosure, external courtyards, pond and associated hard and soft landscaping (revised siting), phased alterations to pool building (reduction in height), removal of staircase, removal of glazed balustrade to pond and alterations to fenestration of main facade
Case Officer:	Lewis Tomlinson

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	[redacted]
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	1 Braefield Hemingford Abbots Cambridgeshire

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Dear Sirs, I have carefully read planning applications 24/02343/LBC and 24/02342/HHFUL and am resigned to the fact that HDC and the Applicant have agreed a number of criteria to move towards obtaining retrospective planning permission for the Spa building. Whilst this is progress, it is, in my opinion, to the detriment of the village. The building still is in the wrong place, is still orientated incorrectly and is served by a new road built across ancient Ridge and Furrow land. It is beyond belief that the latter is specifically excluded from this application as it undoubtedly part of the development. The Artisan document continues to be misleading. Page 10 of their document shows, I believe, the before and after height of the building. The Applicant has agreed to reduce the height by "5 courses", some 40 cms. However, the shaded area suggesting the new height shows the roof line reduced by many times the 5 courses and indicates a much lower building than will be the

case.
There appears to be no agreement on the car park. Currently, this is tarmac and I believe Heritage England have proposed a type of "grasscrete" to reduce its visual impact. In my opinion it is essential this change is enforced and is made compulsory to obtain planning approval.
Artisan, in their document, have made a point of saying there is no change of use in this application. It is vitally important to me and I suspect the whole village, that there is no change of use. I suggest that retrospective planning approval, if consented, embodies a "no change of use" clause.
In conclusion, I object to this application because it is incomplete. If agreement could be made on removing all the tarmac and replacing it with grasscrete for the car park and if a "no change of use" clause could be legally added and enforced, then my decision to object would be difficult to uphold.
Yours faithfully,
[redacted].

Kind regards