

ANNEX 1

**ST NEOTS CONSERVATION AREA BOUNDARY REVIEW, CHARACTER ASSESSMENT AND DESIGN CODE
CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

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

Resp no.	Respondent	Comm No.	Comment	Response	Action
1	CPRE	1	Welcome inclusion of river crossing, meadows, Island Common, Priory Park.	Noted	3
		2	Areas of gravel pit alongside A428 should be protected	Noted	3
		3	Street improvements need a higher profile	Agreed. Issue to be fed back to Management Plan	1
		4	Traffic calming in Eaton Socon is showing its age	Noted. Issue to be fed back to Management Plan	1
2	Cllr A. Gilbert	5	Welcomes proposal to extend boundary in Eynesbury to protect historic parts of the town from increasing development pressures.	Noted	3
3	W. R. Wilkinson	6	Objects to the inclusion of his property in the conservation area. Recommends relocation of the boundary in front of property, as is the case further north along Crosshall Road.	<p>The properties on the west side of this stretch of Crosshall Road are considered to form part of the wider setting of the meadow area, due to the nature of the topography and the openness of views. Development affecting these properties may affect the attractiveness of the meadows themselves. As such, it is considered appropriate to include the properties indicated on the proposed boundary.</p> <p>The exceptions in this frontage are the bungalows at 105-113 Crosshall Road. Due to their limited height, they do not contribute</p>	3

				<p>as strongly to the enclosure of the greenspace as the neighbouring properties. They also site back from the established building line, creating something of a 'gap' in the enclosure. Their exclusion from the proposed area is therefore justified.</p> <p>With regard to the point made about properties further to the north along Crosshall Road, there is a significant difference in the topography in this area and the road loses direct visual contact with the river. The spatial relationship is not the same and the boundary is dictated by different criteria. The boundary should therefore remain as originally drawn.</p>	
4	Questionnaire response	7	Concerned about flooding in the Eatons and the lack of maintenance of the water course	Noted. Concern passed to Environment Agency for action.	1
5	Questionnaire response	8	Recommends that river corridor becomes a wildlife conservation area as part of management plan.	Noted. Issue to be fed back to Management Plan	1
6	Questionnaire response	9	Recommends inclusion of fields opposite Brook Farm, Grt Paxton	The fields north of Priory Park were originally part of Priory Common field. However, they lie beyond the defined extent of the settlement, and the topography is not such that they require to be included as a setting to the Conservation Area.	3
7	Questionnaire response	10	St Mary's Urban Village should include a mix of uses to make best advantage of the town centre site	Noted. Issue to be fed back to Management Plan	1
8	Questionnaire response	11	Interested in preventing development in the western meadows	Noted. The designation of the Conservation Area assigns greater value to the open nature of this land.	3
9	Questionnaire response	12	Keen to see meadows become a community recreational area.	Noted. Issue to be fed back to Management Plan	1

10	Questionnaire response	13	Boundary along St Neots Road is inconsistent and includes many new buildings and blocks of flats	It is acknowledged that the quality of buildings along St Neots Road varies; however, the boundary seeks to include the historic route and, through the management plan and future control of development, will aim to enhance the area's existing character.	
11	Questionnaire response	14	Long term local ownership of the area is needed	Noted	2
12	Questionnaire response	15	Support overall plan and welcome future information	Noted	3
13	Questionnaire response	16	There should be no parking in the market square	Provision of adequate parking is important to the viability of the town centre which, in turn, helps to boost its vitality and economic well-being. Parking in a central location is part of a wider strategy to ensure that St Neots remains a popular and well-used shopping environment	3
			Stop putting road humps in	Noted. In some circumstances, physical impediments to vehicles are the only means to ensure reduced speeds.	3
14	Questionnaire response	17	The north side of market square is let down by modern buildings	Agreed	3
15	Questionnaire response	18	Priory Centre is a disappointment. Does not use lovely river setting and difficult to find the entrance	Noted. Issue to be fed back to Management Plan	1
16	Questionnaire response	19	A St Neots Residents Association would be useful to represent the views of local people	Noted	2
17	Questionnaire response	20	Recognises the need to protect the river corridor	Noted	3
		21	Objects to control over personal property	The additional controls resulting from Conservation Area designation are relatively limited and are intended to prevent the most dramatic of interventions which might reduce the environmental quality of a place.	3
18	Questionnaire	22	Notification of the exhibition by post to affected	Noted. Due to the large number of affected	3

	response		properties would have been better	properties, it was considered appropriate to make press releases, a statutory notice and direct mailing via the free press.	
19	Countryside Agency	23	Recommends maximum public benefit is made of river frontages including alternative route for the Ouse Valley Way	Noted. Issue to be fed back to Management Plan	1
20	Environment Agency	24	Suggest that reference to the need for Flood Risk Assessments is clarified in Character Assessment	Noted but the character assessment is not considered to be the appropriate location for conveying this information	3
21	Questionnaire response	25	Correct reference to Anarchy Castle to 'Castle Hills'	Amended	1
22		26	Correct reference to 'Illand Common' to 'Islands Common'	Amended	1
23	Cambridgeshire County Council – Development Strategy	27	Insufficient justification for inclusion of Priory Park Infant school. Subsequent information provided by e-mail should be included in the final version of the document.	Additional wording will be included as per Appendix 2	1
		28	Household Recycling Site/Old Fire Station UDF – this scheme depends on the selection of any alternative site for this facility. As yet, a suitable alternative has not been found.	Noted	3
24	Cambridgeshire County Council – West Highways	29	There will be a cost impact for highway schemes falling within the proposed area.	This is not necessarily the case. The impact of the Conservation Area is not to bring radically new approaches to highway design or materials – just that schemes are looked at with a particular care to visual quality. There may be areas where alternative materials or detailing will be explored, but these would normally be supported by additional grant funds eg HDC Small Scale Environment Improvement Grant.	3
		30	The new area is vast compared with the existing	Noted, but the size of the area reflects the historic importance of the settlement and its wider setting	3
		31	Guidance is needed on acceptable materials for	Noted. Ideas about highway design can be	3

			roads, footpaths, street furniture etc.	addressed through projects associated with the Management Plan	
		32	Highways schemes for Island Common, Priory Road, Hen Brook, Avenue Road etc are included within the Market Town Transport Strategy	noted	3
		33	Would not wish planning policies to increase demand for on-street parking.	Noted, but not within scope of this document	2
		34	Trees in the highway in a Conservation Area will restrict development of new schemes.	Noted. The designation of the Conservation Area is intended to ensure that potential options for retaining such trees, or providing adequate compensatory measures are considered, in the interests of maintaining visual quality	3

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Total questionnaire responses: 34

Responses tabulated below, where an opinion was expressed

	Strongly support	Support	No opinion	Oppose	Strongly oppose
Do you agree that the existing boundaries need to be reviewed?	24	9	-	-	1
Do you agree with the proposed extension to the conservation area boundary?	20	10	-	-	3
Do you think that the document properly represents the character of the conservation area?	13	15	3	-	2
Do you agree that the conservation area needs improvement?	18	12	1	-	1
Do you support the management plan?	16	10	2	1	2

Response statistics		
Male	19	59%
Female	13	41%
Under 20		
20-34	1	3%
35-49	3	9%
50-64	12	38%
65 and over	16	50%
Full-time work	5	16%
Part-time work	3	9%
Not working	1	3%
Retired	23	72%
Student	0	0
Other	0	0
St Neots resident YES	27	87%
St Neots resident NO	4	13%
Working in St Neots? YES	6	25%
Working in St Neots? YES	18	75%