

## ANNEX 1

## WEST OF STUKELEY ROAD, 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
Development Control Panel	1	HDC	1	Question value of plan in section 4	All diagrams are considered appropriate to explain some of the principles within the text	3
			2	3.6 – Barracks Brook, not Alconbury Brook	Text amended	1
			3	Agreed the need for the Urban Design Framework	Noted	3
Environment Agency	2	Bromholme Lane, Brampton, PE28 4NE	4	Internal Drainage Board should be consulted regarding the floodplain area	IDB contacted for comment.	1
			5	Watercourse is called Barracks Brook, not Alconbury Brook	Text amended	1
			6	UDF does not mention SUDS (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems). These should be promoted to contain and control run-off	Text added to promote SUDS	1
			7	EA not aware of flood compensation proposals.	More information supplied to EA for further comment	1
English Nature	3	Ham Lane House, Ham Lane, Nene Park, Peterborough	8	No references to the potential nature conservation interest on the site, as well as biodiversity enhancement that might result from development, contributing to the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Biodiversity Action Plan.)	References added.	1
			9	1.1 should include bullet point referring to the protection and enhancement of the nature conservation interest of the area	Reference added	1
			10	2.3 should include 'Biodiversity By Design: a	Reference added	1

				guide for sustainable communities’.		
			11	Site appraisal should include an assessment of the current and potential nature conservation interest of the site and surroundings.	This detailed information will be sought as part of future planning submissions	3
			12	4.2 should explicitly set out objectives for biodiversity enhancement	Reference added	1
			13	Planning considerations: this should include the requirement for an Ecological/Protected Species survey with any planning application.	Reference added	1
			14	Planning considerations: should also include the requirement for specific biodiversity enhancement plans as part of future submissions.	Reference added.	1
Mr. M. Page	4	DH Barford & Co	15	Question need to prepare a Design Framework when the site is not allocated and there is no certainty that all of the area will come forward	This is a potential ‘windfall’ area of brownfield land and the preparation of a design framework represents good practice	3
			16	Land is in 5 different ownerships	Noted	3
			17	Insistence on comprehensive development would be prejudicial to a scheme which would itself bring benefits (eg removal of bus depot from proximity to Thomas King Drive)	The District Council favours a comprehensive development of this area. However, the text will be amended to reflect the opportunity for ‘phased development which does not prejudice the successful implementation of the Framework guidance, if necessary supported by legal agreement.’	1
			18	Design framework should omit references to ‘comprehensive’ development and instead refer to facilitating development in a ‘planned’ way.	Text will be amended to reflect the opportunity for ‘phased development which does not prejudice the successful implementation of the Framework guidance, if necessary supported by legal agreement.’	1

			19	Ownership areas in Figure 1 are incorrect	Noted and amended accordingly	1
			20	90m access into the bus depot site would require re-positioning of pedestrian crossing.	Noted. The exact positioning of accesses and potential impact on the position of the pedestrian crossing will be subject to further detailed consideration.	3
			21	A combined access to serve a comprehensive development could not necessarily be secured.	Noted. By way of a phased development, linked by legal agreement, it may be possible to secure a comprehensive outcome with a shared access.	3
			22	Rationalisation of the existing accesses into the bus depot site to provide a single access point would itself bring benefit.	This is agreed. The issue is whether the implementation of a single site will prejudice the good planning of a wider area	3
			23	The position of proposed footway/cycle links will need to be revised to take account of exact vehicle access points and relocated pedestrian crossing.	Noted. The positions shown in the UDF are indicative and would require agreement of exact positioning following detailed highway design	3
			24	Landscaping has already been established in the land to the rear of the bus depot site so there is no reason for additional landscaping within the depot site itself.	Noted	3
Andy Thomas	5	Archaeological office Cambs CC	25	Confirms requirement for results of archaeological field assessment to accompany planning applications	Noted	3
			26	3.7 The site also has potential medieval remains	Reference added	1
Huntingdon Town Council	6	1 Trinity Place Hartford Road Huntingdon PE29 3QA	27	Reduction of commercial traffic would be welcomed	Noted	3
			28	Recommended that footpath links be constructed between Thomas King Drive and	It would be difficult to implement this specific link due to land ownership and	3

				Stukeley Meadows.	the position of existing built form. The UDF therefore proposes a new link which is closer to the 'desire' line from Stukeley Road to Stukeley Meadows.	
			29	Recommends that the Council considers the improvement of pedestrian crossing points on St Peters Road and Ermine Street.	Comment passed to CCC	1
			30	The Railway Authority should be contacted regarded the poor state of the fencing at the bridge	Comment passed to relevant authority	1