

## ANNEX 1

## BROOKSIDE, 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
Environment Agency	1	Bromholme Lane, Brampton, PE28 4NE	1	P 23 plan is based on the SFRA but it should be taken from the EA flood map.	Appropriate flood map extract will be included in revised document	1
			2	p. 23 A flood risk assessment will be required to accompany any future application	Text added accordingly	1
			3	Figure 11 incorrectly captioned	Caption corrected	1
Cambridgeshire Archaeology	2	BOX ELH1108, Castle Court, Shire Hall, Cambridge	4	Alternative wording for section 4.6 suggested: 'An archaeological evaluation was undertaken on the study site in relation to previous development proposals. The results are reported in Archaeological Field Unit Report Number 152 (Historic Environment Record Number ECB 186). The evaluation identified a zone of medieval buildings outside of the medieval town ditch. This is indicative of suburban development, focussed on a crossing point over the town ditch. In the northern part of the site medieval quarrying and possible prehistoric features were identified. The site has potential to contribute to an understanding of the medieval development of the town and of prehistoric land use in the vicinity. As a result of the above any future permission for development of the site would	Text amended as shown	1

				be subject to a negative condition to secure a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with PPG16 paragraph 30.		
D. Parker-Seale	3		5	Design should be limited to 2 storeys	Limiting the development to 2 storey height will not create buildings of sufficient presence on this prominent site.	3
			6	Design should be sympathetic to the town as a whole	The document makes reference to the importance of design and character.	3
			7	No hi-tech flat roof designs	The document is not intended to make specific restrictions on design. The acceptability of design proposals will be considered at a detailed stage.	3
			8	Open areas should be no/low-maintenance	This is a detailed matter and will be subject to detailed consideration at the appropriate stage.	3
West Highways Division	4	Box ET 1031 Stanton House Stanton Way Huntingdon	9	Reference should be made to Huntingdon and Godmanchester Transport Strategy	Reference is already made within the document	3
			10	Extent of cycle lane along Cowper Road is questioned	Noted. The document shows a cycle route rather than a cycle 'lane' but it is agreed that the extension beyond Avenue Road does not correspond with the route shown in the Market Town Strategy. This will be altered to match.	1
			11	The key to the site is good pedestrian connections and crossings to the town centre and other key destinations	Agreed	3
Huntington Town Council	5	1 Trinity Place, Huntingdon	12	Members welcomed the proposals and supported the indicative layout on page 33.	Noted	3
			13	Important to complete the scheme quickly and comprehensively due to prominent location	The LPA would also wish to see a comprehensive development of the site.	3
			14	Page 22 para 3.4 delete question marks and	Text amendments made accordingly	1

				add figure reference		
Luminus Group	6	Brook House Ouse Walk Huntingdon	15	Luminus now owns all parcels of land in the UDF	Noted. Land ownership diagram altered accordingly	1
			16	Luminus supports development for housing on this site	Noted	3
			17	Do not agree that the retention of the barrack block is appropriate due to difficulties in meeting requirements of sheltered accommodation and modern building regulations	The document favours retention of this building as a potential benefit to the scheme as a whole. Its shortcomings are noted but are not necessarily insurmountable. Its future must be considered in the context of comprehensive proposals for redevelopment of the sites.	3
			18	Suggest that Brookside/Ambury Road corner block could be 4 storeys, with a view through this block. 4 storeys are typical around the ring-road eg HDC office and new County Council office	It is unlikely that 4 storey height will be considered acceptable in view of the immediate context.	3
			19	Density is considered too low, particularly at the rear of the site.	The layouts and densities shown are indicative but they are based on approaches to the development of the site/s that take into account the context and opportunities. Proposed schemes of an increased density would be subject to the same design/layout/context considerations promoted in the document.	3
			20	Increased densities will be critical to the delivery of particular housing types on this site	Noted. See 19 above.	3
			21	Do not agree with the retention of the existing railings	Noted. These railings form a very significant boundary treatment and may well benefit the re-development of the site. Proposals to remove them would	3

					need to offer an alternative boundary treatment of equivalent quality.	
			22	In view of central location, parking at a one-to-one standard may not be required.	Noted. This would be subject to detailed consideration as part of any future submission.	3
			23	Additional contributions for play equipment etc should not be necessary due to proximity of park.		
Urban Design Officer	7	HDC	24	Amend land ownerships following sale of land	Noted	1
			25	Omit para 4.5 as archaeology now included in following paragraph.	Omitted	1
			26	Reference to 29% affordable housing	Reference altered to reflect current position.	1
Development Control Panel	8	HDC	27	Endorsed document		3