

## ANNEX 1

## ANGLIAN HOUSE, HUNTINGDON URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK RESPONSES

- 1 – action taken  
 2 – not within the remit of this document  
 3 – no action taken

Respondent	Resp no.	Address	Comm No.	Comment	Response	Action
Anon	1		1	Access down passageway between 101 and 103 High Street to Cromwell Mews and Lloyds Bank car park is very poor. Please improve situation by requiring better management of Lloyds Bank car park.	This issue is noted but does not fall within the remit of this document.	2
			2	Retain footpath behind Cromwell Mews	This is not a public right of way but it is intended to create a footway link from Grammar School Walk into the site.	3
Mr & Mrs E. Power	2		3	2 storey development will have less impact on our property than 2/3 storey proposed.	Document already reflects need to respond to adjoining property in terms of scale	3
			4	Ambury Road South: congested due to reduced width by car parking hindering 2 way traffic on blind corner	Any development and access proposals will need to assess highway usage in this area and make off-site improvements where necessary.	3
			5	Ambury Road South: Delivery vehicles take up most of road when turning into High Street premises	Any development and access proposals will need to assess highway	3

					usage in this area and make off-site improvements where necessary.	
			6	Ambury Road South: supermarket delivery vehicles mistake this road for St Germain Street and then have to reverse back onto the ring-road	This issue will be passed to the Local Highway Authority for their consideration	1
			7	Ambury Road South: congested due to continuous flow of traffic serving several premises	Any development and access proposals will need to assess highway usage in this area and make off-site improvements where necessary.	3
			8	Ambury Road South: vehicles using Nat West bank car park as short-cut into High Street	This issue will be passed to the Local Highway Authority for their consideration	1
			9	Ambury Road South: blind corner needs clearer road-markings to avoid accidents	This issue will be passed to the Local Highway Authority for their consideration	1
			10	Ambury Road South: Pedestrians and cyclists have no provision along south wall of Anglian House, or street lighting	Improvement of this situation may be considered as part of the planning obligations for the development of this site	3
			11			
Ben Wrighton, Donaldsons	3	48 Warwick Street, London	12	Figure 1 – plan should provide road names and identifies three different parts of the Framework area.	Details added	1
			13	Para 1.2 – whilst acknowledging the comprehensive approach, a statement should be	Text added as follows: 'although the Framework	1

				made which does not preclude individual proposals from proceeding within the Framework area.	promotes a comprehensive approach to the development of this area, it does not preclude individual proposals that conform with the principles from proceeding.'	
			14	Para 1.2 – AWG office has a gross area of 57000ft	Text amended	1
			15	Para 2.1 – reference to financial contributions should read 'planning obligations' at this stage and should be placed in para 6.5	Agreed. Text relocated	1
			16	Para 2.3 – the implications of the TPO on the adjoining land should be explained.	Text added: 'the location of built form must respond accordingly to ensure that the tree is not affected by the re-development.'	1
			17	Reference to trees could be combined for clarity. Also, reference to BS 5837 is needed.	Agreed. Reference added.	1
			18	Figure 15 has no key for the green-circled dots.	Diagram re-drafted and key added.	1
			19	Para 3.1 refers to the area behind Ambury House as 'particularly important' although this does not feed into later proposals. What is the implication of the importance?	Amend text to 'particularly interesting'	1
			20	Para 3.2 - Figure ground. The site does not only relate to the rear of High Street properties but also to larger sites to the north. A wider context plan would assist in explaining this.	Figure ground plan extended to help clarify this issue	1
			21	Figure 10 suggests that historic plots should be carried into the new development. This is not the most effective way of achieving a suitable relationship	This is not the intention of the graphic. However, to avoid confusion, the diagram will be amended	1

					and the key clarified	
			22	Para 3.5 – the figure reference should be 8, not 6.	Text corrected	1
			23	Para 3.5 – colour rendition between public buildings and offices is not clear.	Diagram amended	1
			24	Second stanza of para 3.6 should clarify that the AWG lies outside the Env Agency flood zone.	Text added: 'The land included within the Framework area lies outside the Environment Agency flood zone.'	1
			25	Para 4.3 – 'car parking should be considered'. Parking rationalisation is not necessary as part of a comprehensive development of the site.	Text added: 'considered in the long term as part of future enhancement of the town centre'	1
			26	Figure 12 – location of proposed spaces seems to rely on existing AWG landscaping. This should not necessarily determine appropriate built form.	Not agreed. Mature landscaping is a fundamental contributor to the character of this part of the town. It should therefore be a starting point for layout proposals where trees are of merit and healthy, and do not restrict otherwise more positive built form.	3
			27	Figure 12 – further justification of these spaces should be provided.	Text added to explain rationale for each proposed space – see annex 2	1
			28	Figure 12 – extent of central space appears excessive and may have implications for site coverage and viability. This requires clarification.	These are indicative areas. However, diagram has been altered to reduce central space	1
			29	Figure 18 – zone E suggests that the space runs from the north to the south boundaries. Too large.	Agreed. Diagram altered to more clearly identify	1

					courtyard space	
			30	Figure 12 – suggest that focus of public space is provided alongside St Germain Walk instead of centrally.	Not agreed. There are two opportunities here, both of which should be considered as detailed proposals evolve	3
			31	Figure 14 – question necessity of ‘positive frontage’ along Ambury Road lane. This section of red line should be removed or re-labelled.	Agreed. Text amended to ‘positive edge treatment’	1
			32	Para 4.8 – B1 office and live-work accommodation may not be viable in this location, based on demand.	It is not certain that this is the case, therefore the land use proposal stands	3
			33	Para 4.8 – identify potential for small scale A3 or possibly retail A1 close to the southern corner of the site. These uses would animate frontages and draw people towards the park.	Agreed. Reference to A3 or A1 added	1
			34	Para 5 – potentially unhelpful to provide design options in a UDF as they may restrict solutions. If these are to remain then their status as illustrative should be clarified.	Graphics which encapsulate the foregoing principles are helpful to all parties in the consultation process. They do not restrict alternative approaches. Text added to clarify indicative status. See annex 2.	1
			35	Para 7 – recommend reference to potential for developing all or parts of the site in line with the comprehensive approach, and that any proposals should be commercially and financially viable.	Agreed. Text added. See annex 2.	1
Environment and Transport Division	4	HDC	36	St Germain Street car park is included in figure 1 but not thereafter. It should be shown throughout	Agreed. Car park included more positively in figures	1
			37	Should figure 1 include the Probation Service building itself?	No. This is not within the remit of the Framework	2

			38	Figure 2 – is the wall to the car park listed?	No but the wall along the north side of Ambury Road is listed. Graphic added	1
			39	Figure 4 caption – correct spelling	corrected	1
			40	Para 3.6 flood risk assessment required	Text added: 'a flood risk assessment will be required with any future applications for planning permission.'	1
			41	Figure 5 – amend caption from Figure 7	amended	1
			42	Figure 6 – add car park use	added	1
			43	Figure 10 – include links to ring road/Ambury Road (north)/High Street (north west)	Links added	1
			44	1.1 add text 'development should seek to improve pedestrian links between the town centre, town park and residential and commercial/educational/recreational areas of Huntingdon to meet broader transport aspirations in the Market Town Transport Strategy (MTTS) '	Text added as stated	1
			41	2.1 amend wording to read 'it is highly likely that a contribution towards the Market Town Strategy will be required; whilst traffic impact is of course a material consideration and mitigation will always be expected in this context, the development should contribute in terms of delivering sustainable infrastructure in general and reduce the need to travel by car.'	Text added as stated	1
			42	3.3 add text 'perceptual barrier between town centre, park and residential areas on the north side of the ring road.'	Text added as stated	1
			43	3.3 Grammar School Walk has no legal designation as a cycleway and must be upgraded if it is to be used as such	Noted	2
			44	MTTP proposals to improve Ambury Road South	Noted	2

				for cycle use.		
			45	3.4 the adequacy of the existing movement framework to cater for a different forms of development will have to be tested in the form of a Multi Modal Transport Assessment and scoped by CCC.	Reference to MMTA included in 4.4	1
			46	3.4 parts of Ambury Road South close to High Street are too narrow for cycle use	Point made in 3.4	3
			47	3.4 add text 'new development should contribute to and enhance the existing road/pedestrian and cycle networks'.	Text added	1
			48	4.3 too early to speculate on the form and location of accesses into the site. This should be informed by eventual built form and highway studies.	Text added – see annex 2	1
			49	Is there any potential access into the site from St Germain Street?	Not appropriate due to conflict with pedestrians	3
			50	4.4 Ambury Road South should be examined for positive walking and cycling links	Noted	2
			51	6.3 – add 'the form/adequacy of the highway layout should reflect the findings of the MMTA'	Text added	1
			52	6.5 change Market Town Strategy to Market Town Transport Strategy'	Text amended	1
			53	6.6– clarify that 'a multi-modal transport assessment to CCC guidelines and scoped with CCC officers' will be required	Text added as stated	1
			54	6.6 – green travel plan requirement should be combined with the MMTA bullet point.	Text relocated	1
Emma Thornton	5	Huntingdon Town Centre Manager	55	Support for design framework	noted	3
			56	Important that this project improves visual and physical links between this area and the town and to ensure new build is in sympathy with the town park.	noted	3
Mr. P. Benstead	6	9 Priory Gardens, Huntingdon	57	Mature trees must be retained to enhance local area	agreed	3

			58	Ensure that replacement buildings complement the historic nature and character of the town	agreed	3
County Archaeologist	7	Box ELH1108 Shirehall	59	Site is located within an area of high archaeological potential	noted	3
			60	Planning applications should be accompanied by the results of an archaeological fields assessment	Text added	1