

Annex 1

Chequers Court Urban Design Framework:

Summary of Written Comments

The table below details the comments received in general letters and from comments or attachments from the public questionnaires.

Action Code:

- 1 Action Taken
- 2 Not within remit of IPG
- 3 No action required

Comment by:	Nature of Comment	Action	Response
Cambridgeshire County Council's Transport Assessment Team	<p>Need to ensure that alternative modes of travel other than the private car are promoted.</p> <p>Para 1.14 – insert a reference to cycles in para relating to ease of movement for pedestrians.</p> <p>Meeting the demand for car parking needs to be complemented by other schemes and initiatives to promote alternative modes of travel.</p> <p>Option 3 seeks to promote an entirely retail led redevelopment, and this will have a lesser impact on peak traffic, particularly in the morning. However, still very concerned about increase in</p>	3	Make clear that the document aims to create more car parking, as required in the Car Parking Needs Strategy, and also aims to improve access for buses and facilities for cyclists.

Comment by:	Nature of Comment	Action	Response
	quantity of parking being proposed.		
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)	<p>Considers that in such an important location, this document does not do it justice. Does not believe that the preferred option will lead to a development that the town deserves.</p> <p>Framework should see how the site can contribute to the wider surroundings, and how it can contribute to the public realm provision.</p> <p>Needs to be a clear idea of the massing of any future development and this should be illustrated in the context of its surroundings in the document.</p> <p>See “Design Reviewed – Town Centre Retail” to see best practice in retail led projects</p>	1	<p>Make changes to the preferred option to take into account comments of CABE.</p> <p>Take into account wider context.</p> <p>Clarify issues of scale and massing.</p> <p>Take into account comments contained in CABE’s document ‘Design Reviewed – Town Centre Retail’. This document concentrates on ensuring that any new retail development addresses such issues as servicing, car parking, the public realm, the wider movement framework, level changes, and townscape; and that any new development does not present blank walls, service areas and car parking entrances onto the public realm.</p>

Comment by:	Nature of Comment	Action	Response
	A mixed use proposal, such as shown in option 1, is likely to be the preferred way forward.		Mixed use in this context means mixed use throughout this relatively small town centre, with the creation of specific 'character areas' that have different dominant uses, as mentioned in the Civic Trust Regeneration Unit's report into Huntingdon Town Centre in 2000.
English Heritage	<p>No reference to PPGs 15 and 16</p> <p>Opportunities to redevelop the gateway from Chequers Court to the High Street.</p> <p>The retail led proposal fails to deliver mixed uses required by the brief.</p> <p>Generally support the brief, analysis of the site and urban design objectives, but the document does not does not logically lead from analysis to options to the preferred option</p>	1	<p>Add these references to the document.</p> <p>Make reference to the gateway between Chequers Court and the High Street.</p> <p>See response to CABE above.</p> <p>Agree that document does not logically progress from analysis to options to preferred option. Remove the first two options and concentrate on making changes to the preferred option.</p>
County Council Archaeology Department	Probability that large scale excavations on this and the other sites will lead to extensive finds. It will be necessary to house these finds, and the opportunity of developing a new facility to house these and other finds could be investigated as part of the planning obligations for any forthcoming approvals	2	These issues would be considered in the detail design stage

Comment by:	Nature of Comment	Action	Response
	Requirement to provide a detailed strategy of archaeological works		
County Museums officer	Would like a Huntingdon specific museum	2	This is a matter that will be resolved at the outline application stage
Environment Agency	<p>Reference is needed to the EA's indicative flood plain running along the northern boundary to the site along Nursery Road</p> <p>Existing ground levels should be maintained within or adjacent to the floodplain</p> <p>Contaminated land conditions should the land be discovered to be contaminated</p>	1	Document to be amended to show flood plain along inner ring road
Huntingdon and Godmanchester Civic Society	<p>Pleased to see progress being made.</p> <p>Para 1.15 – to develop a fine grained permeable network of routes – how can this be reconciled with stopping up St Germain's Way.</p> <p>Need to address the issue of the entrance to Chequers Court from High Street</p> <p>Option of roof top parking on new buildings, such as has happened on roof of Waitrose.</p> <p>No need to build retail units along back of houses on Hartford Road. Perhaps build 3 storey town</p>	1	<p>Agree to amend document to make reference to entrance to Chequers Court from High Street</p> <p>See comments from English Heritage</p> <p>Ensure that comment is made about possible use of roof top parking</p> <p>Agree with issue of no retail units along back of Hartford Road.</p>

Comment by:	Nature of Comment	Action	Response
	<p>houses here.</p> <p>Concerned about possible demolition of Montagu Club.</p>		<p>Agree that Montagu Club should not be shown as a redevelopment site</p>
<p>CgMs Consulting (acting on behalf of ISIS Asset Management)</p>	<p>Support idea of locating additional High Street style retailers here, and other bulkier retail facilities elsewhere in the town.</p> <p>Preferred option needs to be clearer over whether figure in para 6.5 is 'gross' or 'net'.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>3</p>	
<p>FPD Savills (acting on behalf of Petros, network Rail and Reco, landowners west of the town centre)</p>	<p>Fails to promote a mixed use development, and focuses solely on retail development despite the evidence generated in the CB Hillier Parker retail study, and contrary to advice set out in national, regional and local planning policies.</p> <p>Not clear what type of floorspace is being developed.</p> <p>Fails to review the transportation issues outlined in the Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 –11.</p> <p>The brief jumps to a preferred option 3 that is not examined or explained clearly. The overriding concern addressed in option 3 is landownership control and not what is most beneficial for Huntingdon town centre.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>As stated in earlier responses, mixed use relates to town centre as a whole.</p> <p>Floorspace issue not relevant for this document</p> <p>These have now been highlighted.</p> <p>Agree with issue of preferred option. See response to English Heritage.</p>

Comment by:	Nature of Comment	Action	Response
	It assumes without justification that option 3 is the preferred option without objective debate and rational analysis, and this is not the purpose of SPG.		Agree that more analysis is required, leading to a better preferred option
1 Newtons Court	Plans do not consider trading requirements in terms of people flow for traders here. Unfair to finish at back of a huge complex.	1	Agree. See response to CABE, English Heritage and Savill's. It is important that the wider issue of pedestrian movement through and around the study area is addressed. Agree. See changes to document as highlighted in response to CABE's comments, particularly in relation to servicing.
3 Newtons Court	Access and other requirements of tenants of Newton's Court and Trinity Place have been ignored. Does not consider the pedestrian walkway through the town centre car parks. Proposals have the effect of shunting us into a blind alley.	1	Agree. See comments of 1 Newtons Court Agree. See above Agree. See above
6 Newtons Court	Proposals seem to divert customers away from this area, by removing an established public access route through into the High Street.	1	Agree. See comments of 1 Newtons Court

Comment by:	Nature of Comment	Action	Response
9-10 Newtons Court	Business relies heavily on passing trade, good vehicular access and sufficient public car parking places. The proposals seem to severely restrict this, and would be detrimental to all the shops and businesses in Newtons Court.	1	Agree. See comments of 1 Newtons Court
Carpet Supersave Warehouse	Denying public access to Newton Court from Chequers Court and car park. Taking away some of their land.	1 3	Agree. See comments of 1 Newtons Court
All of the businesses in Newton's Court	Options do not compliment existing and established retail areas in the immediate location of the proposed development. Proposals would cut off long established public access routes. The layout cuts off the Newtons Court area to a massive concrete and tarmac service area. Does not protect the individuality of the existing Huntingdon shopping experience, by providing independent retail traders in the town.	1 1 1 1	Agree. See comments of 1 Newtons Court Agree. See above Agree. See above Agree. See above
18 Hartford Road	Proposals to build to rear of property affect access and garages will disappear.	1	Amend document to provide greater clarity about HDC's aspirations for this area.

Comment by:	Nature of Comment	Action	Response
	Removal of Montagu Working Mens Club contrary to Conservation Area policy.	1	Agree that Montagu Club should not be shown as a redevelopment site
	General contradiction with Conservation area policies.	1	Removal of through traffic along Hartford Road will enhance the Conservation area
22 Hartford Road	Phase 2 has implications for access to this property.	1	Add greater clarity with regard to access issues
	In a conservation area.	1	See response to 18 Hartford Road
24 Hartford Road	Phase 1 has implications for noise and general disruption during construction.	3	For outline planning application
	Phase 2 – their property disappears!	1	See response to 18 Hartford Road
27 Hartford Road	Document not clear about how high the car park will be.	1	Agree – greater clarity required
	Not clear about traffic flows.	1	Again greater clarity required
28 Hartford Road	Phase 2 development will affect the security to the rear of property.	1	Greater clarity required on all of these issues
	‘Green’ backdrop to properties forms a green border to the conservation area	1	
	Noise	1	
	Light pollution	1	

Comment by:	Nature of Comment	Action	Response
	<p>Unclear from plans how exactly Hartford Road will be traffic calmed</p> <p>Access to existing properties is not clarified</p> <p>Scale and massing for new proposals is not clarified</p> <p>Contrary to policy P3/1</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	
45 Hartford Road	Disagrees with highway options and provides several other options	3	Noted
24 Evans Close	Generally abhor the proposals	3	Noted
5 St Mary's Street	Seems to be less pedestrian friendly	3	Noted
15 Nursery Road	<p>Concern over new junction opposite his house</p> <p>Knock whole of Chequers Court down and replace with a covered shopping centre (such as a smaller Grafton Centre)</p>	3	Noted
1 questionnaire respondent	General concerns of multi-storey car park in the town centre	3	Noted
1 questionnaire respondent	Danger of large scale buildings not in keeping with scale of town	3	Noted

Comment by:	Nature of Comment	Action	Response
2 questionnaire respondents	Car parking and bus access a priority	3	Noted
3 questionnaire respondents	Concern over traffic flows, including junction at Hartford Road and Nursery Road	3	Noted

