

Annex 1  
Old Fire Station, St Neots  
 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:	Respondent no.	Nature of Comment	Response	Action
St Neots Town Council	1	i) Broadly welcomed the draft plan for this site but expressed concern that the various masterplans for the town are being considered and adopted piecemeal by the District Council.	Noted	2
		ii) The Town Council would ask the District to allocate time and resources to the production of a comprehensive Town plan for St Neots.	Noted	2
		iii) The removal of the household waste depot from this location is welcome.	Noted	3
		iv) The expansion of facilities for the surgery and additional retail premises are agreed.	Noted	3

Comment by:	Respondent no.	Nature of Comment	Response	Action
		<p>v) The Town Council would object to the loss of the whole of the amenity area known as Ropers Field or Shady Walk; however they would consider the extension of the car park over part of that site provided funds can be generated by a Section 106 agreement or other means to improve and enhance the playground and open space;</p> <p>vi) The Town Council would invite the LPA to consider extending the scope of this plan to land fronting onto Cambridge Street. Ideally the Town Council would wish to see the gap in the built form along this important approach to the town infilled and the car parking removed to the rear.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Agree. Awaiting response from Lidl, who own the land. It is agreed that built form in this location would improve the streetscene here.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>1</p>
Cedar House Surgery	2	Very interested in proposals to re-develop and enlarge the current Cedar House surgery premises. They are concerned over the timescales involved in relocating the current users as they are increasingly working out of unsuitable premises.	Agree. Important that pressure is put on the County Council to move out of this depot as soon as possible.	1
HDC	3	i) With car park extensions and pedestrian	Agree. Make changes to plans to highlight this.	1

Comment by:	Respondent no.	Nature of Comment	Response	Action
Transport team		<p>desire lines as highlighted, we also need to amend the existing car park to provide and east-west route from the improved recreation area to Huntingdon Street (indeed, between Shady Walk and Huntingdon Street. There appears to be sufficient width to the car park to achieve the same number of spaces/ appropriately dimensioned access aisles, and also provide a 2m central footpath link across the site - with only modest alteration to the existing car parking layout. Links from the existing paths within the site should be made to the new east/ west link.</p> <p>ii) It needs to be made clear that no vehicular access to the extended car park will be available from Huntingdon Street. The access from Huntingdon Street is poor in terms of width/ geometry – only limited parking/ servicing should be provided from here. The separate pedestrian access south of 12 Huntingdon Street is essential in view of the northern access being inadequate to cater for vehicles and pedestrians.</p> <p>Careful design need to be applied to the re-development around 12 Huntingdon Street to ensure that the parking and servicing thereto does not compromise the new pedestrian link from the extended car park/ recreation ground.</p>	<p>Agree. Highlight this on plan.</p> <p>Agree. Highlight this on plan.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>

Comment by:	Respondent no.	Nature of Comment	Response	Action
		<p>Consideration should be given to onward linkage to the town centre and the crossing of Huntingdon Street.</p> <p>I assume car park extension will be 'secured by design', with CCTV etc. mentioning this may allay any local fears of crime and disorder.</p>	Noted. Detailed matter for car park construction specification.	3
Dixon Sharman Associates (owners of 12 Huntingdon Street)	4	Welcomes proposals to develop and improve the area.	Noted	3
Environment Agency	5	The proposed development is shown to be located within an area designated as being at low to medium risk of flooding. Concerned that this is not mentioned within the development brief as it will have an impact on the redevelopment of the site.	Noted. Add comments on flooding.	1
County Archaeology	6	Records indicate that the site is located in an area of high archaeological potential. It is likely that important archaeological remains survive in the area and that these would be severely damaged or destroyed.	Noted. Add to annex.	1

Comment by:	Respondent no.	Nature of Comment	Response	Action
9 Prospect Row	7	<p>A few observations:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The recreation ground is well used, mainly used by dog walkers and adolescents.</li> <li>Would question that statement that the recreation ground could be reduced in size but improved in quality by asking in what context and from whose perspective?</li> <li>Additional car parking spaces in town will inevitably encourage more vehicles into the town. As a resident of Prospect Row it can be difficult to park in this area at weekends and I would not wish to see this situation decline still further. Has any consideration been given to a 'park'n'ride' scheme for heavier weekend traffic?</li> <li>The household waste site in the town centre provides an excellent resource for people to be able to take recyclable waste to a local depot with ease, and without recourse to the use of motor vehicles. In finding a new location for the site, which admittedly suffers from</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Improved play equipment.</p> <p>The County Council are currently considering 'Park'n'ride' as part of longer term transport strategies.</p> <p>The District Council now undertakes doorstep recycling. The waste depot is primarily used for access by those using cars, and is not in the best location for such a use.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p>

Comment by:	Respondent no.	Nature of Comment	Response	Action
		access an egress issues, has consideration been given to user groups without access to vehicles.		
12 East Street	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that East Street will have more traffic.</li> <li>Concerned over loss of surgery. Moved to East Street to be near to the surgery.</li> <li>Concerned over height of any new buildings to be built onsite of Waste depot.</li> <li>Concern over anti-social behaviour of those using new car park late at night.</li> </ul>	<p>This development brief does not envisage generating more traffic onto East Road. The Surgery needs to expand.</p> <p>Brief explicitly states storey heights of new buildings. Single and 1 ½ storey close to existing dwellings.</p> <p>Details of CCTV etc to be dealt with at detailed design stage.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p>
48 East Street	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over use of car park as a late night meeting place.</li> <li>Light pollution.</li> </ul>	Details of CCTV and lighting columns etc to be dealt with at detailed design stage.	2
4 Woodlands	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan makes sense, but the issue of where the Waste Disposal Depot goes has not been clarified.</li> </ul>	The County Council is currently consulting on a suggested new location for the Waste Disposal depot.	2
			Also minor typos.	

