

Annex 1

St Mary's Urban Village, 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	The master plan is to be broadly welcomed although the town Council would urge the District to "join up" the various master plans to form part of a single cohesive Town plan for St Neots.	Noted.	3
		Notwithstanding the allocation of this area for housing in the Local Plan, the District be asked to look at building in a significant element of retail as well;	A large element of retail, with its significant servicing requirements, would blight this historic part of the town. However, an increased element of small scale retail could be looked at.	1
		The District should review the plan with a view to incorporating crime prevention measures in order to minimise hidden areas and routes of escape.	Noted. Add comment in annex regarding secure by design.	3
		An element of leisure provision needs to be included and the areas be investigated for the possibility of including a cinema on	The Church Hall has been suggested in the masterplan for an enlarged	3

Comment by:	Respondent no.	Nature of Comment	Response	Action
		<p>this site.</p> <p>The schedule of listed buildings in this area should be reviewed.</p>	<p>community / leisure resource in this location. The site is not the best location for a cinema. Such a use would require a large building that would not sit well in this historic area, and would seriously detract from the setting of the listed buildings and the conservation area.</p> <p>Disagree. Listed buildings provide an important historic backdrop to the town.</p>	3
St Neots Parish Church	2	<p>Welcomed proposals as an attempt to deal with an area that has some potential but which has been in a poor state for many years.</p> <p>Provision of pedestrian access was to be encouraged.</p> <p>Several points relating to the future use of the Church Hall, its potential for expansion, future ownership and management.</p> <p>Unsure as to why consideration was not given to properties further west than Windmill Row.</p> <p>Noted that proposed buildings adjacent to church yard wall to the north of the Church Room would alter the view from the churchyard, and this would need to take into account the presence of trees along the wall.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. This will be discussed at some future time.</p> <p>These properties are existing shops, offices and flats, and are not proposed for redevelopment.</p> <p>Agree. The scale of buildings will need to be discussed at more detailed stage.</p>	3 3 3 3 3

Comment by:	Respondent no.	Nature of Comment	Response	Action
HDC Transport team	3	<p>Figure 16 - label the streets on the map</p> <p>Para 6.2 – change to ‘<u>some of</u> these accesses’</p> <p>Para 8.3 - Church Walk and other off site accesses may need improvements.</p> <p>Para 8.5 – Access A – Ibbetts Row, will need improvements to construction and visibility.</p> <p>Para 9.4 add Access to the site will require close examination to achieve safe and practical all mode access to the site down these narrow corridors.</p> <p>Also make reference to the new Manual for Streets and forthcoming design advice from CCC.</p>	<p>Agree. Make changes.</p> <p>Agree. Make changes.</p> <p>Agree. Make changes.</p> <p>Agree. Make changes.</p> <p>Agree. Make changes.</p> <p>Agree. Make changes.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>
CCC Highways	4	Support the proposal for an urban village, but think there needs at application stage to be some work on enforcing parking arrangements to limit use etc, but that’s a minor item.	Noted	3
Environment Agency	5	<p>Fully support the production of design frameworks for specific sites.</p> <p>Noted in para 4.1 that although the site is mostly outside the 1 in 100 year flood plain, most of the site is within the 1 in 1000 year flood plain.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Add to document.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>1</p>

Comment by:	Respondent no.	Nature of Comment	Response	Action
		Support statement in para 9.7 that any application should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment.	Noted.	3
		Planning Policy Guidance Note 25 (PPG25) is not mentioned. Extremely important that reference is made to this document.	Noted. Add to document.	1
County Archaeology	6	Records indicate that the site is located in an area of high archaeological potential.	Noted. Add to annex.	1
		The site is located in the medieval core of the town, adjacent to the medieval parish church of St Mary (record number CB14932), and investigations in South Street have demonstrated that deposits associated with the medieval development of the town survive in the vicinity (record number ECB464).	Noted. Add to annex.	1
St Neots Town Centre Initiative – Redevelopment and Environment Group	7	Area between High St and Brook St has a lot of potential to improve access and through routes. There is a lot of wasted and underused space. It is appreciated that divided land ownership has hindered past attempts to improve the area.	Noted.	3
		It is hoped that this plan can proceed and if any one landowner is obstructive then the District Council should consider using its powers to overcome such a problem.	Noted.	3
		Favoured small scale redevelopment approach with the through	Noted.	3

Comment by:	Respondent no.	Nature of Comment	Response	Action
		<p>routes made more attractive.</p> <p>Felt that small retail units would only succeed if close to the High Street. Rest of site should be mixture of small housing units, offices, and workshops. Latter would provide activity during the day and add to the High St footfall. The workshops could fit into the Creative Enterprise Centre's cluster strategy. The Initiative has a strong interest in Brook House and agrees with the Planning view of its contribution to the area.</p>	Noted.	3
St Neots Town Centre Initiative – Management Group	8	<p>Approved the concept of better access through opening up certain passageways.</p> <p>Small retail was already oversupplied as it was difficult for them to survive as small units with high rents / rates.</p> <p>One member thought that this was a lost opportunity for a 10,000 sq ft retail unit that the retail sector badly needed.</p> <p>Social provision using the Church centre was not thought ambitious enough.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Proposal follows ideas proposed in the Civic Trust report to create an 'urban village' of small scale buildings with a mix of units.</p> <p>Disagree. This would not reflect the Civic Trust's recommendations. Site is in the historic core of the town and any large scale redevelopment would blight this area.</p> <p>This would be discussed at a later stage.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p>

Comment by:	Respondent no.	Nature of Comment	Response	Action
		Importance of Brook House was recognised, as was the need to tackle the unsightly garage problem.	Noted.	3
		It was agreed that the proposal was within the spirit of the Civic Trust report.	Noted.	3
11 completed questionnaires	9		8 'strongly support' redeveloping the site, and 3 'support'  5 'strongly support' the overall concept, 4 'support', and 2 'oppose' the concept	3
Correction 1		'Red line boundary' to site inconsistent on all maps.	Red line boundary to be as figure 26, but without the buildings highlighted with an arrow as 'retail with residential above'. These buildings should not be included.	
Correction 2		Re-order photos to correctly relate to figure 17		
Correction 3		Para 8.8 unfinished. Clarify what PPG22 means.		
			Also minor typos.	

Written comments from members of the public who attended the exhibition:-

1. 'We would like the area to become one that can be browsed through, so that shops can be part of a pleasant experience. It is also necessary to have all the infrastructure in place before work starts rather than after work has been completed'.
2. 'This area is long overdue to be brought back into use. I approve of the fact that the old cottages and the forge will remain and be brought back into use – the sooner the better. The fact that Brook Street does occasionally flood should be taken into account. Too many pedestrian routes may result in late night antisocial behaviour - one though route would be preferable.'
3. 'Excellent idea, long overdue. Please try to keep as much of the original buildings and style as possible.'
4. 'Strongly agree with the plans. It would turn an eyesore into a desirable place to be.'
5. 'It would be nice to see 'boutique' type shops in the alleys in the way that has happened in Hitchin, and if the market were judged to be sufficient, perhaps more (with residential above) could be added. This area of the town is incredibly important and should be opened up and current barriers removed. Access through the site should be ensured in any plan. Whatever happens, the site should not be redeveloped solely for residential purposes.'
6. 'Was hoping it was going to include more shops. Needs a seating area and possibly flower beds or baskets.'
7. 'The concept of mixed use is good but my concern is too many residential units into small a space causing parking and congestion problems. The area at present is shabby but has a certain charm.'
8. 'No more residential units, more green areas for people to sit and relax and eat. An area for young children to be able to get out of their pushchairs and walk safely.'
9. 'The original trigger for this plan was the Civic Trust report. But the major part was that St Neots needed bigger retail areas. This is not addressed. Instead of residential areas how about a cinema! Developers are willing to come here if given the right area. This is an ideal area.'





