

**ST IVES CHARACTER ASSESSMENT & BOUNDARY REVIEW: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES**

**APPENDIX ONE**

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

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Action
1	Planning Policy Manager HDC	(i) Minor text and graphic improvements	<i>Amendments made</i>	1
2	Urban Design Officer, HDC	(i) Minor text and graphic improvements	<i>Amendments made</i>	1
3	Conservation Team Leader	(i) Minor text and graphic improvements	<i>Amendments Made</i>	1
4	Cllr John W Davies St Ives South Ward Councillor	(i) Supporting proposal to include The Wilderness	<i>The suggested redrawing of the boundary to include The Wilderness was considered. It was not thought to be appropriate to do so.</i>	3

5	Two Comments Sheets from public exhibition	(i) Supporting proposal to include The Wilderness	<i>As Above</i>	3
6	Comments Sheet from public exhibition - please see the attached questionnaire for the questions to which these comments are the response	<p>(i) Existing conservation area is not maintained to a level which warrants extending it, other than the built environment which could be protected by other means, there is very little worth conserving. The character has already been ruined by poor management and contradictory planning policies and objectives.</p> <p>(ii) The boundary is incorrect, but it is too late to do anything about it.</p> <p>(iii) The existing conservation area should be abandoned or managed rigorously rather than in the ad hoc uncoordinated way as present. i.e. all or nothing, but don't just go through the motions for political expediency.</p> <p>(iv) It is a sad reflection of the reality. There is very little of the 'historic character' which remains. Other than the quayside area, which is under threat, there is little of note to conserve. I do not recognise the town from this fictional document.</p> <p>(v) It is a wishful fantasy harking back to a time when conservation was taken seriously – the assessment bears no resemblance to the truth. Perhaps the author should listen to residents of the conservation area who despair at how it has gone to the dogs.</p> <p>(vi) Tell the truth – litter, filthy pavements, empty shops, too many loud clubs, restaurants. Poor control of development by 'do as I please' businesses etc. Nothing to do with historic need.</p> <p>(vii) If managed properly to regain the historic character of a riverside market town rather than a binge drinking</p>	<i>Noted</i>	3

		<p>(viii) dump with pretence of being something it is no longer. The existing conservation area has only suffered from so called progress because its objectives have been ignored. Nothing suggests that extending it will protect anything worthwhile. You should accept that recent policy objectives have destroyed any historic character. 'Character' is more than just bricks and mortar – the heart has gone.</p> <p>(ix) Concentrate on making existing conservation area something to be proud of rather than compromising any further.</p> <p>(x) What would be the point? It is a time wasting exercise designed to distract attention from the awful state of the existing conservation area. It should acknowledge that the objectives of the present conservation area were forgotten a long time ago. This should be an exercise in getting back to basics and addressing problems of existing conservation area.</p>		
7	6 Comments Sheets	<p>(i) The bigger the better!</p> <p>(ii) St Ives is a lovely town which I think is worth preserving.</p> <p>(iii) This is a very positive move to help to protect and enhance our area. A management plan is vital.</p> <p>(iv) Good to see the area extended. I would be interested to know why part of the St Ives school is included, but not all. Is this wise?</p> <p>(v) Need for new development that can be modern 'not pastiche' in context and high quality.</p> <p>(vi) The development of the St Ives Golf Club site should be addressed in the plan.</p>	<i>Noted</i>	3

8	St Ives Town Council Town Hall St Ives Huntingdon PE27 5AL	(i) Supported the contents of the document and congratulated District Council on the quality.	<i>Noted</i>	3
9	St Ives Civic Society	<p>(i) There are 55 arches on the New Bridges and not 51. Some of the lanes area has become cluttered with storage for beer barrels or been taken over for outdoor seating. Long standing problem with lack of cleanliness due to catering establishments sweeping rubbish into public areas.</p> <p>(ii) The field 'containing good ridge and furrow [Aa]' has actually been ploughed up.</p> <p>(iii) The map refers to How House and Grounds when it should be Howe as in the text on page 37.</p> <p>(iv) Support for comments in paragraph 4.2 regarding need for improved paving and street furniture.</p> <p>(v) Drawing attention to the very poor condition of the Royal Oak Inn (13 Crown Street).</p> <p>(vi) They are very concerned about the future of the Corn Exchange.</p>	<p>(i) <i>Amendments made</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>Noted</i></p> <p>(iii) <i>Amendments made</i></p> <p>(iv) <i>Noted</i></p> <p>(v) <i>Noted</i></p> <p>(vi) <i>Noted</i></p>	<p>1</p> <p>3</p> <p>1</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p>

10	D H Barford & Co on behalf of BBSRC (Biotechnology & Biological Sciences Research Council) who own Houghton Grange and associated land	(i) The land that is owned by the BBSRC does not have any special architectural or historic interest and is therefore not appropriate to be included in the conservation area.	(i) <i>Amendments made</i>	1
11	Andrew S Campbell Associates on behalf of St Ives Golf Club	(i) The proposed inclusion of the whole of the golf club is not justified as it bears no relationship to the historic character of the town. It does not reflect the special character of St Ives nor the general character of the conservation area.	(i) <i>Amendments made</i>	1
12	Hemingford Grey Parish Council	<p>(i) Wishes for other parts of Hemingford Grey to be considered for inclusion within a conservation area.</p> <p>(ii) Hemingford Village Street is Hemingford Road, and Filbert's Walk is Filbert's Passage.</p> <p>(iii) Hemingford Meadow should be in the singular. There is ridge and furrow in field between Filbert's Walk and London Road, but there are also remnants to west of this area and Meadow Bank.</p> <p>(iv) New Bridges has 55 flood arches</p>	<p>(i) <i>Noted</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>Amendment made</i></p> <p>(iii) <i>Amendment made</i></p> <p>(iv) <i>Amendment made</i></p>	<p>3</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>

13	<p>Quinton Carroll, Manager Historic Environment Team Cambridgeshire County Council Box ELH1108 Shire Hall Cambridge CB3 0AP</p>	<p>(i) Pleased to supply information and data from the County's Extensive Urban Survey that assessed the creation of the historic core of St Ives and that it was incorporated into the overall plan.</p> <p>(ii) Intention is to raise awareness of wider historic environment and its relationship to the settlement. Fully support the proposals.</p>	<p>(i) <i>Noted</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>Noted</i></p>	<p>3</p> <p>3</p>
14	<p>The Ramblers' Association 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 87-90 Albert Embankment London SE1 7TW</p>	<p>(i) No specific comment to make, but Ramblers believe footpaths and alleyways are an important element in the character of St Ives and existing ones should be preserved, maintained and clearly signed. Provisions should be made in new developments to link destinations and encourage people to walk.</p>	<p><i>Noted</i></p>	<p>3</p>