



January 29th 2026

25/01922/OUT – HINCHINGBROOKE LOGISTICS PARK

As Interim Chair of the Hinchingsbrooke Residents Association I am writing to formally submit our objection to the planning application referenced above regarding the proposed Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park. While I acknowledge the potential economic and job creation benefits, I believe the proposal fundamentally contradicts the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 and poses significant risks to the local community and infrastructure.

My objection is split into 3 parts: **Conflicts with Planning Regulations, Background Comments and Request of the Development Management Committee**

A) CONFLICTS WITH PLANNING REGULATIONS

1) Loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land - NPPF

Brookfield Farm, contains a **significant proportion of Grade 2 agricultural land** according to the **HDC Land Availability Assessment (2024)** for site "The Stukeleys 5," the Council's own evidence base confirms that the majority of this site is Grade 2 land (pages 629 -631)

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 180 mandates that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural environment by **protecting the best and most versatile land.**
- I ask **has Newlands performed a robust Sequential Test to demonstrate** that there are **no available Grade 3b or lower-quality sites within the district** that could accommodate this logistics need?
- Policy requires that development be directed to land of the lowest agricultural grade. Unless Newlands can prove there is an absolute lack of Grade 3b, 4, or 5 sites (or brownfield alternatives) capable of hosting this facility, the **use of Grade 2 land is fundamentally non-compliant** with the principle of sustainable development.

The site is currently designated as open countryside and is not allocated for industrial use. Huntingdon District Council's own 2024 Sustainability Appraisal





issued a "Major Negative" score (--) for land use and soil regarding this site, specifically citing the high agricultural grade as a primary constraint.

Newlands' Environmental Statement must be examined against the as their attempt to quantify the land as "average" contradicts Huntingdon District Council's 2024 LAA findings.

The loss of Grade 2 soil is absolute and irreversible. Newlands' 'Soil Management Plan' to use BMV soil for landscaping is an insult to the national policy of protecting food security. The 'Moderate' significance claimed by Newlands ignores the cumulative loss of BMV land across Huntingdonshire.

2. Conflict with Strategic Policies and Settlement Hierarchy (LP1, LP2, LP10 & LP11)

The principle of industrial development on this greenfield site is entirely contrary to the **Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036**.

- **Countryside Designation:** Under **Policy LP2**, the site at Brookfield Farm is classified as **Countryside**. **Policy LP10** restricts development here to limited categories, such as essential rural needs (agriculture or forestry); a large-scale commercial logistics park does not meet these criteria.
- **Intrinsic Character:** **Policy LP10** and **LP11** demand that development protect the "intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside". The industrialization of 126 hectares of arable land is a direct violation of this mandate and would cause irreversible harm to the open, rural landscape.
- **Strategic Allocation:** While **Policy LP1** sets employment targets, these should be met through strategic sites already allocated within the plan, such as Alconbury Weald. The Local Plan strategy is to concentrate growth in established settlement boundaries and Strategic Expansion Locations (SELs). Granting permission here would represent a total abandonment of the settlement hierarchy. The proposal does not meet any of the exceptional circumstances for countryside development

3. Prematurity and the Local Plan Update to 2046

This application is **premature** as Huntingdonshire District Council is currently updating its Local Plan to 2046. Granting permission for a 126-hectare development of this scale now would pre-determine the spatial strategy of the new plan without necessary public scrutiny and comparative site assessments.





4. Design, Massing, and Landscape Impact (LP11, 13 & LP34)

The proposal fails to respect the **National Design Guide (2021)** and the **Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD (2017)**.

- **Scale and Height:** The proposed **24m high ridge heights** are significantly taller than existing structures in the neighbouring Hinchingsbrooke Business Park. Under **Sections 3.7 and 3.8** of the 2017 Guide, the council requires development to respond to the landform; positioning "megasheds" on this rising topography makes them appear even more intrusive.
- **Visual Impact:** Newland's **Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)** downplays the severity of the harm.
- **Heritage Assets:** The scale threatens the setting of several high-grade assets, including the **Grade I listed Hinchingsbrooke House**, the **Grade II listed church at Great Stukeley**, and the historic **Pepys House**.

5. Impact on Public Amenity and Green Infrastructure (LP7, LP17 & HU10)

- **Hinchingsbrooke Country Park:** The site is adjacent to this vital community asset. The 24/7 operation of a logistics hub is incompatible with the park's use for health, well-being, and nature conservation.
- **Park Extension:** The Local Plan (Policy **HU10/HU17**) specifically allocates land in this area for the **extension of Hinchingsbrooke Country Park**. A logistics hub would dominate the skyline and ruin the tranquil setting required for this much loved nature asset.
- **Public Rights of Way (PROW):** The user experience of PROWs on-site will transition from "open countryside" to an "industrial tunnel".

6. Biodiversity and Ecology (National Design Guide N3)

- **Ecological Connectivity:** Replacing active arable land with industrial hardstanding creates a "biodiversity island" effect, harming connectivity between the site and the Country Park.
- **Pollution:** Increased noise, light, and vibrational pollution will negatively impact the local ecological network and the nearby **Great Stukeley Railway Cutting SSSI and the SSSIs at the racecourse and Portholme**.





7. Highway Safety, Congestion and Emergency Access (LP4 and LP16)

- The addition of 2,448 HGV movements per day, using Newlands figures, to say nothing of the incremental and LGV journeys, compounded by the 1,000+ homes already planned by Bloor Homes off Spittals Way—will lead to severe congestion and safety issues. The **existing network overload prevents further sustainable growth** and the inevitable increase in Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) and other vehicle traffic on the A1307, Views Common Road and Hinchingbrooke Park Road cannot be allowed to happen. This route is not just a local street; it is a **critical artery for emergency services**. The suggestion that all traffic will go to Huntingdon using the A141 and then going along Stukeley Road is utterly unbelievable. Existing road user patterns already clearly demonstrate that traffic uses the A1307, including Hinchingbrooke Park Road, and this will clearly be the case with the Logistics Park traffic. **It creates a severe cumulative impact that the local road network simply cannot absorb.**

Effect on Emergency Vehicles Accessing Hinchingbrooke Hospital

While I understand the drive for economic growth, the specific location of HLP poses a significant and potentially life-threatening risk to patients attending Hinchingbrooke Hospital as well as adversely affecting people's daily lives as a result of increased congestion.

The Impact on Emergency Response

The proposed logistics hub will introduce a high volume of large and small vehicles into an area that already suffers from significant peak-time congestion. The implications for ambulance access are deeply worrying:

- **The "Golden Hour":** In emergency medicine, every second counts. Increased delays that will delay ambulances transporting patients in critical condition are inevitable.
- The issue with traffic on Hinchingbrooke Park Road is already known as the Executive Leader of HDC, **Sarah Conboy**, referred at the Full committee meeting of HDC in December 2025
- **Physical Obstruction:** Hinchingbrooke Park Road is constrained because it is a single access road. Traffic already blocks the paths of emergency ambulances, as there is often limited space for other cars to pull over and allow an ambulance to pass and any increase in traffic threatens lives.





Many residents have had to bump cars up kerbs and onto the pavement and grassed areas to let ambulances through. I believe the combination of commercial vehicles and employees' vehicles from HLP will further frustrate access to the hospital for emergency vehicles.

I note that in 2017 when homes were approved to be built on the former forensic laboratory site the planning officer's report that recommended approval noted that it **"can take up to an hour to leave the estate"**. There are now occasions when it can take much longer and nothing has been done to improve the situation.

A Matter of Public Safety

Hinchingbrooke Hospital serves a vast catchment area across Cambridgeshire. Any development that compromises the ability of the East of England Ambulance Service to reach the Emergency Department quickly is a fundamental safety issue. We cannot prioritize logistical convenience over the rapid delivery of healthcare.

For many years CCC Highways have failed to organise a comprehensive Traffic Assessment on the local road network. The Logistics Park development requires that one be undertaken before Outline Planning Permission is granted, but CCC Highways have ignored this request.

I, therefore, urge the Development Management Committee to conduct a rigorous, independent **Blue Light Impact Assessment** before this application proceeds. The **current infrastructure** simply **cannot support** a high-intensity logistics operation alongside a **major regional hospital without catastrophic delays**.

8. Flood Risk and Drainage (Policy LP5)

- **Surface Water Runoff:** Converting 126 hectares of permeable land into hardstanding creates a significant risk of flooding. There is a concern that mitigation will fail to maintain "greenfield runoff rates," increasing risk to the **A141**.
- **Foul Drainage:** The site is in an **"area of serious water stress"**. Newlands has not demonstrated that the **Huntingdon (Godmanchester) Water Recycling Centre** has sufficient capacity to manage additional foul waste without increasing emergency overflows into local watercourses.



SUMMARY OF POLICY CONFLICTS

Policy Ref	Plan Objective	Nature of Conflict
NPPF	Sustainable Development	Loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land
LP 1 & LP 2	Sustainable Development / Strategy	Site is outside strategy, unallocated, and designated as Countryside.
LP 10 & LP 11	Protection of Countryside / Design	Large-scale industrialization of arable land; failure to respect rural identity.
LP 13, LP 11 & LP 34	Quality of Design / Massing & Landscape Aspect	24m height and "megashed" scale are entirely out of keeping with the area. Negative impact on the setting of Hinchingbrooke House and Great Stukeley.
LP7, LP17 & HU10	Public Amenity & Green Infrastructure	Negative Impact on Hinchingbrooke Country Park
N3	Biodiversity & Ecology	Negative Ecological Impact on the Country Park
LP4 & LP16	Infrastructure Delivery	Severe cumulative impact that the local road network simply cannot absorb.
HU 10/17	Country Park Extension	Industrial activity vs. tranquil recreational and conservation goals.
LP 5	Flood Risk & Water	Failure of Sequential Test; increased runoff and foul drainage pressure.



I note that some Planning Officers are placing less weight on the 2036 Local Plan as it is considered to be out of date. This is unacceptable. If HDC think the 2036 Local Plan is out of date they have to agree a new Local Plan. The Draft Local Plan to 2046 has not been adopted. Until it is, full weight has to be given to the 2036 Local Plan.

For the reasons stated above I urge Huntingdon District Council to **refuse** this application.

B) BACKGROUND COMMENTS

Brookfields Farm is not an appropriate site for a development of such size and scale. It is a green field located close to people's homes and near a major traffic hot spot that will affect the ability for Huntingdon people to get to and from hospital. It isn't in the current Local Plan to 2036 and officers should have said when it was first proposed that it was not a suitable site for 13 warehouses between 18.5m and 24m high, about 150m from houses across the A141.

WAREHOUSE HEIGHT

Savills UK warehouse report for 2024 states that the average eaves height in 2015 was 12.2m, 14.2m in 2022, but only 13.6m in 2023 and they state and I quote "a possible explanation being the reticence of planning departments to approve planning permission on taller units."

The new DHL warehouse at Lightning Park in Huntingdon is 12.5m high. Of the 13 proposed warehouses at Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park 2 have 24m eaves height, 7 are 21m and 4 are 18.5m. The ones nearest to Hinchingsbrooke residents are 21m high. They should be the shortest.

NATIONAL NEWS

It's difficult to imagine the scale of the warehouses until they're there as residents in other areas have found to their cost. Tyldesley near Manchester has featured 3 times in the last 3 months on BBC Breakfast because of the effect of new warehouses on nearby residents. The 4 warehouses there were approved by a council that must regret their decision. 2 of the 4 warehouses at Tyldesley are 18m and 2 are 10m. On BBC Breakfast on Friday 16 January 2026 the latest feature about the Tyldesley warehouses had the banner across the screen and I quote "Concerns over noise, traffic, devaluation of homes and quality of life."





I fear Huntingdon will make the national news not for its history, beauty and proximity to the countryside, but because of the cruise ship view that people will see for miles around. Places such as Alconbury, Ellington, Offord, Buckden as well as Little and Great Stukeley and parts of Huntingdon and Godmanchester that Newlands themselves say the warehouses will be visible from.

Concerns over noise, traffic, devaluation of homes and quality of life are the same concerns that I and others have about the Logistics Park proposal.

TRAFFIC

The current roads around Hinchingbrooke are over capacity. This development, and the proposed North Huntingdon growth corridor and new road layouts will increase congestion. Based on Newlands own figures there will be almost 2,500 HGV movements per day. No traffic assessment has been undertaken taking into account the effect of these additional journeys on HPR and the subsequent impact on emergency vehicles.

The Brampton Hut junction will also get more congested. When Alconbury Weald was approved it was a condition that improvements were made at Brampton Hut before work on the Weald started. We haven't even had a traffic survey about the effect of traffic on VCR and HPR despite a written request to CCC Highways asking for one.

RESIDENTS' MAIN CONCERNS

Residents are concerned that they are going to be looking out on huge cruise ship like monstrosities that result in increased noise and light pollution, have a detrimental effect on the environment and will affect their mental health. Some are already losing sleep.

Residents are also concerned about the effect on their financial situation and the prospect of their house prices dropping significantly in value.

UNDERPASS

They are also concerned about the proposed underpass by the Marriott. Many residents oppose the building of an underpass underneath the A141 to connect Hinchingbrooke Logistics Park to Hinchingbrooke.

Hinchingbrooke is a closed area, but the underpass will give rapid access to potentially criminal activity, specifically drugs running and County Lines. There





will be direct access to the A141, extremely close to A1 and A14 with a hotel carpark adjacent to the underpass and yet the underpass will have few pedestrians using it.

Other concerns include a fear of using the underpass, especially at night and if they are alone and it could easily become a target for graffiti and other anti-social behaviour. A better solution would be what Newlands originally suggested, a Toucan crossing at the new roundabout by the Marriott similar to the one at the Brampton Hut roundabout installed at the time of the A14 upgrade.

CONSTRUCTION

Whilst the A141 is being re-routed and the roundabout built the A141 between Brampton Hut and Spittals will have to be shut. It is unclear how long this will last for. Inevitably traffic that would have gone from North Huntingdon to Brampton Hut will go along the A1307 and cause even more traffic issues on HPR.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Newlands organised 2 public consultations in June, one at Huntingdon Town Council's premises and one at Hinchingbrooke Country Park. I attended both events. Because the address of Brookfield Farm is Great Stukeley and not Hinchingbrooke I believe that, like myself, many local people did not realise that this proposal would affect them. On realising the likely impact on residents of the Hinchingbrooke estate I, along with others, distributed flyers, organised meetings and set up Hinchingbrooke Residents Association in December 2025.

As Interim Chair of the Hinchingbrooke Residents Association I **requested a site visit for 15 residents and requested a meeting between residents and Newlands** to discuss their proposals. This was refused.

Although **Newlands** have engaged with statutory authorities they **have failed to engage in a meaningful way with Hinchingbrooke residents.**

Huntingdon District Council must not allow the application to proceed given this failure to engage meaningfully with residents. I further note that officers have scrutinised the plans and have familiarised themselves with the site and



surrounding area. This courtesy has not been afforded to local residents at any stage.

BUSINESS RATES

The main reason to approve the development must be the £9.8m of business rates that Newlands are quoting. The **Planning Statement** produced by David Lock Associates in December 2025 **states “approximately £9.8m rates”** and the **Hinchingsbrooke Logistics Park website** checked on January 28th 2026 **states “Approximately £9.8 million in Business Rates per year, helping Huntingdonshire District Council deliver key local services.”**

In **June** when Newlands did their public presentations that figure was **£4m**. They also quoted employment figures of **2,000**, but **changed** that to **up to 3,300**. When challenged about these figures in writing Newlands were silent, although a partial explanation was provided in writing on January 28th without any calculations.

I understand that HDC staff have, after my questioning, established that the **£9.8m pa** figure for rates is **overstated** and that **£5-£6m is more accurate**.

Statutory bodies such as Huntingdon Town Council and Parish Councils have been **misled** and in instances where they have supported the Logistics Park their support might not have been forthcoming as they know the carelessness with which Newlands bandied these figures around.

This is a **seriously misleading statement** overstating the purported economic benefits and one is left wondering **how many other statements** Newlands have made are **factually incorrect**?

B) REQUEST TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

For the reasons stated above I believe that Newlands application should be refused. However, should the DMC think otherwise I request the following:

- 1) The warehouses **nearest** to the **Hinchingsbrooke** estate should be the **lowest** height and must not be visible from residents' homes.





- 2) The 2 warehouses nearest to the estate, **2e and 3d**, should **not** be **allowed** to be built at all as they are **too close to residents' properties**.

- 3) The site should not be allowed to operate 24/7 to minimise the effect on wildlife and residents. I note that at the Blakelands development in Milton Keynes restrictions were put in place such that the site can only operate between **7 am and 9 pm Monday to Friday and 8.30 am until 8 pm at weekends and bank holidays**. I quote from a resident at that development:

“They decided therefore to approve, but only allow access for deliveries between **7 am and 9 pm Monday to Friday and 8.30 am until 8 pm at weekends and bank holidays**. Quite frankly, that has been our saviour in terms of noise disruption. The **applicant appealed right up to the planning inspectorate to ask for 24x7 access, but it was declined**. The application was for up to 35 deliveries per hour, which **would have made our life hell if that went on all through the night**.”

I ask that the **same restrictions** are put in place in this case.

- 4) That a **complete traffic assessment of the local area** is **insisted upon by the DMC**. **This should be a pre-requisite for any approval**. **Over 10 years** ago Hinchingbrooke residents suffered intolerable delays on HPR and **the situation has only worsened** since then. I wrote to Andrew Connolly of CCC Highways on January 12th 2026 requesting such a traffic assessment, but at the time of writing no reply has been received (except for explaining that he has other priorities).

- 5) The **underpass** should be **replaced** with a **Toucan crossing** in order to ensure the **safety** of people crossing and to ensure that it does not become associated with **criminal activity**. **Underpasses such as that proposed belong in the history books**.

- 6) A condition that **S106 funding** is made available to **fund**, or part fund, a **second access road** to HPR allowing traffic off the estate.



- 7) Signage – there must be **no new signage** directing people to the hospital, the railway station or Huntingdon that involves using VCR and HPR and **existing signage must be changed** so that people are directed along Brampton Road
- 8) There should be a **noise abatement condition** to minimise the effect on the residents of **Flamstead Drive**.
- 9) **Improved signage for the weight limit on the A1307** between Hinchingsbrooke Park Road and Spittals Interchange, and **enforcement through the installation of ANPR, with appropriate funding via a S106 agreement**.
- 10) It should be a condition that **no construction lorries** come along **HPR or VCR during the construction phase** and anyone involved with the construction should be prohibited from parking in or accessing Hinchingsbrooke.
- 11) That a **clear plan for the construction of A141 roundabout** and re-routing be made available and that **Hinchingsbrooke residents are given at least 20 days' notice** before any construction takes place.
- 12) **The layby on the A141** near the proposed entrance **remains so that lorries can park up there if necessary**.
- 13) The development should be known as the **Huntingdon Logistics Park, the North Huntingdon Logistics Park, Newlands Park - Huntingdon** or some other alternative name. **No-one** has ever **considered** the site at **Brookfields farm** to be **part of Hinchingsbrooke**. I note that in response to requests Newlands are now calling their development at Boxworth Newlands Park-Cambridge.
- 14) I would like **the colour of the warehouses** to be **discussed and agreed with residents**
- 15) The **historic redwood tree** on the site **should not be removed**. Planting of new trees does not compensate for this much loved tree that is visible from



miles around.

16) **Footpath** – Newlands have proposed linking a proposed underpass to Flamsteed Drive with a new cycleway/footpath. The HRA, on behalf of **Hinchingsbrooke Residents**, object to this proposal and **request that other options are considered**. The other options, placed in order of residents' preference, are detailed more fully in another resident's letter. In summary, these options are:

A. Connect cycleway/foot path between Business Park entrance (via barrier entrance) and Parkway - utilising pavements that follow the road through the Business Park.

B Connect cycleway/foot path between Business Park entrance (via barrier entrance) and Parkway utilising the existing public footpath that runs in between the back of Hinchingsbrooke Estate and the back of Hinchingsbrooke Business Park.

C. Connect cycleway/foot path between Business Park entrance and existing pathway that leads from the Business Park roundabout and on to Flamsteed Drive.

There are multiple reasons for the residents' objection to Newlands' current proposal, and the residents' counter proposal. In summary they include:

A The loss of trees, or current height of trees, at the boundary line to Hinchingsbrooke Estate will result in the loss of a natural filter that currently captures pollutants from traffic on the A141 and entrance to/exit from the Business Park.

B. The loss of trees, or current height of trees, at the boundary line to Hinchingsbrooke Estate will result in the loss of what is a natural, visual screen of the A141 and entrance to/exit from the Business Park.

C. Flamsteed Drive and particularly Cromwell drive are not suitable routes for a busy cycleway/footpath.

D. While limited access into Hinchingsbrooke Estate can be a hinderance for residents when the local road network is congested, the proposed cycleway/foot path, leading from the A141 will potentially lead to higher





insurance premiums; home building and contents insurance as well as car insurance.

E. Both the proposed underpass and a very visible access into Hinchingbrooke Estate directly from the A141 could potentially lead to 'unwanted visitors' in and around the estate.

17) I note that on page 29 of Stantec's Lighting Impact Assessment they state that residential occupants **within Hinchingbrooke Suburb** within approximately 250m from the eastern boundary of the Site "Visual – Given the dense trees and vegetation, **direct views of the Site will be non-existent**". Having not been afforded a chance to view the site I do not understand how this is possible, but I ask that a **severe, say £5m, penalty** be payable to affected residents **should this not be the case** if the warehouses are built. Given Newlands failure to make accurate statements about the rates that Huntingdon District Council will earn from the development my **request is reasonable** and entirely **within Newlands' gift to avoid**. I ask that any such clause be carefully drawn up by Huntingdon District Council.

I confirm that **I wish to speak at the DMC meeting** at which the proposed development is discussed.

CONCLUSION

To conclude the Hinchingbrooke Logistics Park is the **wrong development in the wrong place**. The **height is excessive**, the **traffic impact is unsustainable**, and the **proximity to homes, the Hospital and the Country Park is reckless**.

The **safety of Huntingdonshire residents** is put **at risk** by the failure to acknowledge the difficulties **emergency vehicles** have accessing the hospital and the failure to conduct a proper traffic survey on the local road network, The **cause** of the regular **traffic jams** on Hinchingbrooke Park Road **must be investigated, understood and rectified BEFORE any development** that might cause **additional delays for emergency vehicles is approved**.





Yours sincerely,



John Greenhalgh
Interim Chair
Hinchingbrooke Residents Association

