Alconbury Parish Council

www.alconburyparishcouncil.gov.uk
Parish Clerk: Alison Brown
46 Oakdale Avenue, Peterborough, Cambs PE2 8TA
parishclerk@alconburyparishcouncil.gov.uk

To:
Endurance Estates c/o Nick Dines, Concilio

Cc:
Michelle Sacks, Chief Executive, Huntingdonshire District Council
Mike Gildersleeves, Deputy Chief Executive, Huntingdonshire District Council
Stephen Moir, Chief Executive, Cambridgeshire County Council
Emma Fitch, Service Director Environment, Planning & Economy, Cambridgeshire County Council
Paul Bristow, Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough
Ian Gardener, County Councillor, Cambridgeshire County Council
Rt Hon Ben Obese-Jecty MP
Rt Hon Steve Reed MP, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government
Spatial Planning (East Region), National Highways
Highways Department, Cambridgeshire County Council

Friday 17 October 2025 – sent by email

Dear Nick,

Following the consultation session held on 16 October 2025, we write as Alconbury Parish Council to formally restate the questions raised and to record our continuing and serious concerns regarding both the conduct of the Brampton Cross developers and the procedural handling of this proposal by Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC).

We are now advised that HDC is not considering progressing the Brampton Cross development under a Local Development Order (LDO). Instead, it appears that the developers are awaiting potential changes in national planning legislation, which may grant the Mayor of Cambridgeshire & Peterborough, Paul Bristow, new powers to determine planning decisions. We note that the Mayor's manifesto includes ambitions to stimulate economic growth across the region, which may influence the trajectory of this proposal.

In addition, the developers have indicated that they are waiting for the local government reorganisation to advance - presumably to clarify the future structure and responsibilities of HDC - before proceeding with an outline planning application.

The questions raised by the Parish Council during the presentation were necessarily high-level and preliminary. They do not represent our full or final set of requirements. The feedback from all parishes within the Brampton Cross Working Party will become more detailed and specific once the developers' current scoping assessments, particularly those concerning traffic and road infrastructure, are available for review.

Planning Route, Policy and Context

The context of this site is critical. It lies within open agricultural countryside, historically part of the Weybridge Forest landscape, and is not currently allocated for development under the Local Plan.

We therefore ask:

- What landscape and policy assessments have been undertaken since the EIA scoping to demonstrate compliance with the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)?

- How can an industrial-scale employment park be justified in this rural context, when it directly conflicts with established planning policy and character assessments?

Economic Justification – Where Is the Evidence?

- What evidence supports the claim that Brampton Cross is essential for "sustainable economic growth"?

- What data demonstrates a shortfall in commercial or warehouse capacity within Huntingdonshire?

- Have surveys been conducted on vacant and underused sites locally?

- What specific sectors or businesses has this site been marketed to?
  Without transparent data, the economic rationale remains unsubstantiated and cannot justify such a dramatic departure from policy.

Landscape and Heritage Impact

The proposal represents a profound alteration to the landscape context of the area.

- What heritage and visual impact assessments have been completed?

- How will you mitigate the visual dominance of 30-metre-high buildings visible from surrounding villages?

- What measures will preserve the agricultural and woodland character central to the identity of Alconbury and its neighbours?

Infrastructure and Transport – Not Fit for Purpose

The transport implications of this proposal are profound and cumulative. The A1 and A14 - already two of the most heavily trafficked strategic routes in the East of England - are not fit for purpose to accommodate current volumes, let alone the additional demand generated by major new logistics and employment sites.

The cumulative impact of multiple developments in and around Huntingdon, including the Hinchingbrooke Logistics Park proposal by the Spittals interchange, must be assessed in full. That proposal, together with Brampton Cross, would concentrate significant HGV and commuter traffic onto an already overloaded network. The A1, A14 and A141 corridors are routinely congested, and existing roundabouts at Brampton Hut and Buckden are operating beyond capacity. With respect, two Park & Ride sites on the outskirts of Huntingdon is not going to alleviate this situation.

Local roads are already suffering the consequences. Rat-runs are developing through small rural communities as drivers seek to avoid gridlock on the main routes, a situation that will only worsen as additional large-scale logistics schemes come forward. This pattern is visible now, even before these sites are consented.

We therefore ask:

- What comprehensive transport modelling has been undertaken that considers the cumulative impact of all known and proposed developments in the Huntingdon area?
- What funded mitigation measures will be implemented to upgrade key junctions and protect local communities from displacement traffic?
- How will you enforce HGV weight limits, prevent rat-running, and guarantee road safety for residents, cyclists, and pedestrians?

The local and strategic road network is demonstrably not fit for purpose. Approving Brampton Cross without comprehensive and coordinated mitigation would be an abdication of planning responsibility and a direct threat to public safety and quality of life.

Sustainability and Accessibility

- How does your Transport Plan align with the A141 and St Ives Improvement Scheme and Cambridgeshire County Council's wider transport policy?
- How can the site be described as sustainable when it is disconnected from population centres and overwhelmingly car-dependent?

This development contradicts local and national net-zero commitments and fails basic sustainability tests. The A141 Improvement Scheme proposal, currently under second public consultation, does not even reach this Parish, let alone Brampton Cross.

Environmental Responsibility

- What data supports your biodiversity claims for a greenfield site of this magnitude?
- Will you commit to tangible measures such as green roofs, native woodland planting, and rewilding?
- How will you achieve and verify net-zero energy standards, and what mechanism will ensure long-term environmental monitoring post-construction?

Scale, Context and Design

At over the scale of Alconbury Weald, this proposal is effectively a new town in footprint and environmental impact.

- How does the design respond to its rural context?
- Have you modelled visual impacts from surrounding ridgelines and villages?
- What safeguards exist to prevent this from becoming an industrial intrusion rather than a sensitive, landscape-led development?

Minimum Requirements for Compliance

As reiterated during the consultation, the following remain minimum requirements before any proposal of this nature could even be considered:

- Comprehensive landscape and heritage assessments.
- A transparent and robust economic needs assessment.
- Fully funded transport mitigation, including major upgrades to A14 junctions, Brampton Hut and A1 Buckden roundabouts.
- Binding commitments to protect local roads via weight limits and ANPR enforcement.
- Integration with existing CCC and HDC transport and climate strategies.
- A credible biodiversity and sustainability plan, including rewilding and woodland restoration.
- Continuous post-development monitoring of environmental and traffic impacts.

Conclusion

Until these fundamental issues are resolved, the Brampton Cross proposal remains unsustainable, non-compliant, and wholly inappropriate in context. It is greenfield Grade 2 agricultural land, not allocated for development, and reliant on infrastructure that is demonstrably not fit for purpose.

The community therefore demands full written responses to each question above, and a categorical written assurance that HDC will not seek to use a Local Development Order to sidestep proper consultation and public scrutiny.

Whilst we acknowledge your confirmation that you will meet again with the Parish Council's working group in approximately three months' time, the concerns outlined above remain significant. The ongoing uncertainty surrounding governance structures and planning responsibilities, combined with the developers' reliance on national and regional policy shifts, continues to undermine community confidence. Alconbury Parish Council therefore urges that transparent and meaningful engagement be maintained throughout this process, ensuring that local voices remain central to decisions that will shape our area for decades to come.

This letter will be published and shared with all elected representatives, statutory consultees, and the wider public.

Yours sincerely,

Tracey Gilbert

Tracy Gilbert
Chair, Alconbury Parish Council