dynamic development solutions™

Ref: KC/LH/C5190P
Date: 05/03/2025

Jason Fearn
Planning Department
Huntingdonshire District Council
Pathfinder House
St Mary's Street
Huntingdon
PE29 3TB

Via email to: DMadmin@huntingdonshire.gov.uk

Dear Jason,

Re: C5190P - 25/00341/FUL – Plot 4 Harvard Road Industrial Estate, Huntingdon, Kimbolton, PE28 0NJ

I write in relation to your letter dated 4th March 2025 regarding planning application ref. 25/00341/FUL for the Change of use of land to self-storage yard (Use Class B8) and associated works, including landscaping at Plot 4 Harvard Road Industrial Estate, Huntingdon, Kimbolton, PE28 0NJ.

The invalidation letter states the following reasons for the application being unable to be validated by the Council.

1. Require a BNG Assessment to submitted
2. Provide completed checklists – namely Biodiversity, Policy and Validation checklists
3. Fee query due to the creation of floor space rather than change of use.

As part of the original submission made via the Planning Portal (ref: PP-13791465) submitted 25th February 2025 included a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment titled *'BNG Plot 4 Harvard Industrial Estate Kimbolton Huntingdon Cambridgeshire PE28 0NJ 20-01-2025.pdf'* prepared by Arbtech inline with the latest Defra Statutory Biodiversity Metric, Arbtech have confirmed that the latest metric was used. Therefore, we are of the opinion that the invalidation requirement has already been met, thus the first point within the invalidation letter is ambiguous on what is required for validation. For your benefit, I have also re-attached the BNG Assessment in the email.

The following checklists have also been filled and attached within the accompanying email.

1. Validations Checklist
2. Biodiversity Checklist
3. Policy Checklist

With regard to the fee query, I enclose an application of August 2023 (APP/V0728/W/23/3314720) which relates to the change of use of land to a self-storage facility. The appeal states that the Council did not validate the application as they did not consider the fee of £462 was correct and that the shipping containers which would be brought onto the site and used for self-storage are buildings,

dynamic development solutions ™

and that the floorspace provided within them should be included in the calculation of the fee.

The Inspector states that there is no suggestion that the containers would need to be assembled on the site. Although there would be containers located externally without a physical attachment to the land and due to the nature of their form and construction, there would be no demolition required to allow for their removal. They could be removed quickly and easily using a crane and a lorry. It was accepted that their purpose is to provide storage space for the proposed business and in that respect, they are likely to remain on the appeal site for the duration of the business operation, which could be many years. Nonetheless, as a matter of fact and degree, the placing of the containers on the land would not amount to the erection of permanent structures.

The Inspector concluded that the containers would be placed on the site to facilitate the change of use of the land to a self-storage facility. They would not be buildings and therefore the proposal does not include works that are building operations. Consequently, the fee that is payable is that for a change of use, which is £462.

The proposed development therefore comprises a change of use and the originally paid fee is correct.

Should you need any further information please contact me directly.

Yours sincerely,

L. Hickin

Laurie Hickin MRTPI
Senior Planner

Encl.
Biodiversity Metric
Policy Checklist
Validation Checklist
Biodiversity Checklist
Appeal Decision – 3314720