

Draft – work in progress!

The Stukeleys Parish – Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Response

(Contacts redacted for web publication)

1. Abbreviations

AW = Alconbury Weald (Urban & Civic development)

USAF = USAF Alconbury, presently occupied by US forces but expected to be sold for residential etc. use

NB = “Northbridge” land N. of A141, W of Ermine St. allocated for residential

EBP = Ermine St. business Park extension, NW of existing business park

NP = The Stukeleys Parish Neighbourhood Plan

NMU = non motorised user (of roads etc.) = pedestrians, cyclists, invalid scooters, horse/rider etc.

CIL = Construction Infrastructure levy

S106 = Section 106 planning provision for infrastructure costs consequent from a proposed development

PA = planning authority (Huntingdonshire District Council)

2. Generally

I strongly support the development of a NP for the locality and acknowledge the many challenging aspects that it must take into account:

- There will be developments in the locality that are much larger than the historic villages.
- The future for all will be very different from the past and we must make the best of it for the existing and future residents and other users (e.g. employment); We need a thoughtful NP will address the issues relevant to all.
- The NP needs to be defensible for it to have strength, unreasonable or small-minded policies will undermine its weight.
- It is impossible to forecast the developments, their eventual scale, style, and sequence. Therefore, the NP must be reviewed **and revised** frequently
- Because of the uncertainty, the NP cannot specify much detail but it is important that it defines principles to be applied over the longer term e.g. preserving the distinctive character of the historic villages, achieving high-value employment, avoiding “dormitory deserts” (see below).

3. We currently have no shops in our parish – is that OK or would it be better if we had some shops?

Obviously, as a resident, for convenience and to reduce car travel I would like some local retail for “top-up” supplies, however:

Draft – work in progress!

- a sustainable model would be needed and I don't see how this can be achieved with the resident population
- therefore, for sustainability, it would need to attract trade from outside the historic villages, which means there would have to be sufficient car traffic through the village. Through traffic is a problem, and we would like to reduce it, but I suppose if traffic is unavoidable then we might as well benefit in some way.
- Experience of the Tesco store on Stukeley Meadows shows it can be quite a nuisance to local residents etc. Therefore, appropriate siting is an issue. Perhaps the Three Horseshoes pub site might be a candidate

4. Would you recommend any changes for the hotel and pub in Great Stukeley?

We are lucky to have 2 pubs in Gt. Stukeley (but none in Lt. S). However, it seems both may be only marginally viable. Obviously any changes are for their owners, but I would encourage anything that improves quality and sustainability. The latter, however, will be dependent on users from outside the historic villages and that would mean more car traffic. Similar to local retail, maybe we will have traffic anyway and the pubs might as well benefit from it. The two establishments have very different characters and should capitalise on that. The Three Horseshoes has particular opportunities for innovative combination of retail, entertainment and catering. I would encourage development of appropriate scale. It would be a pity if the site was lost to residential use – we need to defend the villages from turning into “dormitory deserts”, nice houses but no community and nothing else.

5. What retail premises would you like to see at Alconbury Weald?

The outline planning application for AW was careful to avoid undermining the retail centre of Huntingdon Town. However, over the intervening years we have seen the town decline as a retail destination – why would anyone now go to the high street if there’s only “charity shops and nail bars”. Likewise, we see the larger retailers (supermarkets, clothing) declining, and are now seriously undermined by out-of-centre discount supermarkets. Of course, the large Tesco store at St. Peters hill has sucked much business out of the centre. In conclusion, Huntingdon town is not an attractive retail centre and shows no signs of ever being so.

AW needs to be successful – a desirable location to work and live. If it is not desirable then it will be devalued and this would be a serious loss to the **Parish**. I propose that AW needs a larger and better retail centre than is currently in their plan. Associated with this is the additional large residential development that is likely/possible on nearby sites (USAF Alconbury, and “Northbridge”). These also need to be successful and the lack of attractive retail in Huntingdon is a problem. Ideally, a single substantial retail centre should be associated with the three sites, not dispersed between them because this would significantly reduce its benefit.

6. Are there enough businesses in our parish?

Maybe, it is very hard to tell since most existing businesses would be micro-businesses from home or home-working, which is effectively the same. There could be opportunities for additional businesses of appropriate scale and impact and this would be desirable as it could support local employment opportunities and retail/catering outlets. There should be encouragement for additional businesses and that some degree of impact (visual, traffic) would have to be accepted (“no impact” is not acceptable – that would lead only to a residential desert).

7. What sort of business is suitable for locations inside our existing villages?

Obviously, of appropriate scale and impact. E.g. micro-business, home-working, small workshop/craft. Appropriate location would depend on the likely impact (noise, traffic etc.). There should be encouragement for micro/home-working in residential areas (e.g. planning consent for additional built space within curtilage). For activities with more impact, they could be sited on otherwise unused, or underused sites (typically presently allocated for agricultural).

8. Are there types of business we should be attracting to Alconbury Weald?

The vision of Urban & Civic for intermediate scale technology, green tech etc; is ideal. I worry that this is not being achieved as intended and that much space will be used for warehousing – lots of traffic but few jobs of value.

The site needs to compete internationally and needs to make an appropriately attractive offer. Issues at present include: lack of rail link to Stansted (could be fixed by a scheduled service running on existing tracks, just needs routing appropriately), lack of scale of existing development (i.e. not got to critical mass for the target types of business), present lack of attractive site (much construction works, no retail, little landscaping), lack of nearby attractive retail – it is still a “windswept airfield in east Anglia”, and the nearest airport is miles away on congested roads.

9. What do you like about our environment in the Stukeleys?

- The semi-rural setting: within/near countryside but also near the town of Huntingdon and transport connections.
- Moderate levels of traffic at most times of the day (it really only gets busy at rush hours or if there’s disruption on the main routes).
- Mix of and types of housing.
- Access to countryside for recreation

10. What do you not like about our environment in the Stukeleys?

- Huntingdon town is not an attractive centre for retail or recreation
- Dominance of the villages (particularly the historic centre of Lt. S.) by the C339 road through-route

Draft – work in progress!

- Lack of attractive public space within the villages – need more than just areas of grass: why would I want to sit looking at a patch of grass? Local countryside is not particularly attractive (“agricultural desert”)
- Almost total reliance on private car transport to go anywhere out of the villages
- Access to countryside is poor for cycling and walking (e.g. towards Abbots Ripton)
- Access to, and around, Huntingdon town is poor for walking and cycling
- Air quality, though not really bad, is not good – but this is mainly because we live in the east of the country – downwind of many urban areas

11. What would you change about our environment in the Stukeleys?

- Combine small areas of grass, other attractive planting and landscaping, child play **and** adjacent to commercial catering and/or re-opened watercourses as a feature. Note that several watercourses have been culverted over the years and could be restored to pools/flowing water (seasons allowing!)
- Plant more trees, add multiple small-scale landscaping to improve the “public realm”
- Restore (without delay!!) historic routes across AW for walking, cycling and horse.
- Adapt off-road foot/cycle/horse routes onto the AW site to make them practically useful for accessing recreation, retail, education and employment on AW from the historic villages (Why would anyone like to walk along the C339 during busy rush-hours?)
- Restore (without delay!!) the originally-proposed cycle path into the Ermine St. works associated with AW
- Modify the Ermine St. works to achieve the original vision: restore it to a village lane, not a through route. This will require changes to road alignment and addition of small-scale landscaping.
- Lobby for improve facilities from the villages to Huntingdon town centre for NMUs
- Improve access to other areas of countryside for walking cycling and horse. Upgrade routes from foot-only to allow other uses

12. What is your view of major developments planned and proposed for our parish?

The Stukeleys parish is exceptional – having such a small local population surrounded by such a degree of ongoing and proposed development. Of course we must accept the likelihood that all four sites (AW, USAF, NB, ErmineBP) will be developed – mostly for residential. Given that, we should hope for development that is sympathetic to the landscape of the area, the existing population and existing uses. Of course, there will be impacts, and most concerning is road traffic and visual impact. It is essential that the developments make best use of the opportunity and that negative impacts are both minimised **and** mitigated. AW is a good model; Hopefully it will achieve high quality and employment – providing valuable jobs and a good mix of housing. What we must

Draft – work in progress!

avoid are “dormitory deserts” – simply places that people sleep and work/recreate elsewhere, travelling by car. This is often the norm for housing estates. Likewise, we must avoid large proportions of warehousing and similar – providing only relatively few and low-paid jobs while attracting substantial heavy goods movement. It is yet to be seen if AW can avoid both of these outcomes.

To do so, any development needs to be much “richer” than providing the simple essentials:

Residential

Housing needs associated retail and particular recreation / entertainment facilities. By this I mean it should include features of notable distinction, not just the regulatory “neighbourhood play area”. For example:

- multipurpose performance & cinema venue with integrated high-quality catering
- certified running/cycling track
- off-road terrain for cycling and horse riding
- Water feature for canoe, open water swimming etc.

These need not, and should not, be provided as dedicated areas, they can be integrated with the fabric of the whole development: the Cinema venue as part of a retail hub, the track and routes running through the whole area, the water as part of the overall site water management scheme.

Employment

For employment, organisations ask “why set up here, rather than here”, factors include locations of key workers (existing or to be recruited) short-term establishment costs, long term costs associated with a site, travel convenience, communications etc. For our location, we cannot influence the labour issues but anything to help with travel and communications is helpful. Gigabit internet infrastructure (see “gigabit cities”) would have been exceptional, it is now the expectation (and I sincerely hope AW has put this in place!!). The move now is to 10Gb cities, perhaps there still is an opportunity to distinguish a site like AW/USAF by providing exceptional internet infrastructure. An opportunity that has not been taken by AW is to retain the runway for use by small (“executive”) jets. Though this would have faced severe local opposition, it could have made the site nationally, and internationally, exceptional – how many other sites can the senior managers fly directly to? For employment, the site needs to be much more distinctive, otherwise it is at serious risk of becoming a warehousing desert. I would rather have the occasional small jet and many high value jobs than lots of trucks and a few low value jobs!

Critical mass of existing business is important in several ways: a large, flagship, organisation or a collection of smaller ones endorses the site as a good choice and it attracts labour which then enhances the local pool that is potentially available to other companies. So far, AW does not seem to have achieved this, which is disappointing. Though the NP cannot directly influence this, any special support for appropriate “early adopters” should be strongly encouraged. Otherwise, the absence of critical mass indicates to organisations that the site may not be a good choice. Things that can be done to encourage early adopters:

Draft – work in progress!

- Presumption in favour of planning consent for appropriate employment use
- Avoid spurious planning objections (e.g. against storage of moderate amounts of flammable gas!!)
- Welcome diverse employment development / uses, and not just in the EZ, e.g. also in the historic villages – we need to encourage critical mass in the area, not specific to a site.

Other distinguishing benefits must also be sought. The EZ designation is helpful, but hardly transformational – the benefit is relatively small to organisations establishing there. More useful would be improve national and international transport & travel connections. The A14 redevelopment should help in this regard, but surely there is an opportunity with rail: “direct” connections to a significant airport are valued. Though a new rail track is obviously out of the question, perhaps a scheduled rail service to Stansted could be arranged, travelling via Hitchin?

Specific to USAF

This site already has considerable existing residential and other uses, with corresponding effect on the locality in terms of traffic and patronage/demands on local facilities. The uncertainty about its future is very unhelpful and the NP needs to allow for this. However, it is likely to be decommissioned, and this outcome must be planned for. Of the possible large scale developments, this one has the most potential for negative impact on the locality. The worst outcomes could be:

- A dormitory desert, providing housing, no jobs or other significant facilities. Principle road access continues to be via Ermine st. No Integration with the AW site
- A significant warehousing / distribution element using existing road access

It is imperative that both are avoided. Much preferable would be integration into the larger AW development:

- Continuation of the mixed employment / residential strategy
- Road access integrated with AW, principally to use the existing main Northern and proposed south access points. Measures to significantly restrict traffic along Ermine St.
- Integrated (with AW) planning for retail, school, health etc.
- Given the then scale of the site (AW + USAF) this further strengthens the case for substantial retail and recreation facilities (given also Huntingdon town’s failure to provide such). However, it is important that this is provided in a hub of critical mass rather than spread over the site; Only by providing mass in a significant hub will it be sufficiently attractive to be successful and sustainable.

Specific to NB

The site has not been developed so far, mainly because of issues of road access and routes for NMUs. Access opportunities are limited by the major routes (A14, A141) on two boundaries and Ermine St. on another; each has restrictions, Ermine St. being the on option at present. A14 and A141 cannot be used for

Draft – work in progress!

access until that section of A14 is de-trunked as part of the overall A14 improvement. When this happens, connection could be made to either road. Potentially, an A141 connection could also integrate a solution to the NMU access problem. In conclusion, the likely location of the main access would be different for a near-term and longer term site development.

In relation to the historic village, development of the site seriously erodes the separation of the village from the town of Huntingdon. It also is bad for the rural setting of the village. Accepting that it is unlikely that development could be prevented, we should demand design and mitigation measures to minimise these negative impacts. Further, the benefits to the historic village and the larger locality should be maximised. Regarding the latter, particular attention should be paid to:

- Set back of built development and planting of significant wooded buffer along Ermine St., in particular on approach to Gt. Stukeley
- Location of education facilities and access to them for children of The Stukeleys
- Provision of strategic retail and indoor recreation to maximise concentrated mass in the locality, not spread in a dilute fashion across the AW, USAF and NB sites. For example, a major provision on the AW/USAF site could be supported by a S106 contribution from NB.
- Provision of intensive and extensive off-road routes for recreation and travel to work, retail, and indoor recreation. Such route development should extend over other adjoining land under present co-ownership.
- Strong measures to limit traffic through the historic villages
- Setback of development and wooded buffer along the A1 and A141 boundaries to preserve some sense of rural setting for the elevated aspects of the historic villages and to avoid the site being seen as an extension of Huntingdon from Stukeley Meadows.

Locating the access on Ermine St., compared to access on A14/A141, has both benefits and drawbacks; It could encourage better integration into the local community and facilities but it makes traffic management much more difficult on that section of Ermine St. and A141. Likewise, it could cause unwanted traffic through the historic villages. Locating it on the A141 would tend to make the development be seen as an extension from Stukeley Meadows and Huntingdon, which may be inevitable. It could, however, facilitate valuable off-road access for NMUs from the site, and from the historic villages, to Huntingdon town

Note also that de-trunking of the adjacent section of A14 would allow road access to further (presently) agricultural land north of the NB site / west of Gt. Stukeley. Development may be proposed for this site, and this would seriously detract from the setting of the historic village. Further, it would close the separation of the village from the town of Huntingdon, likely leading to loss of character etc. This must be vigorously opposed.

Impact, Design, Infrastructure, and Mitigation

Each major development in the locality could cause significant negative impact for the historic villages, particularly as road traffic on Ermine St. The original

Draft – work in progress!

proposal for converting the route from a through-route back to a village lane was good. However, the plan now seems seriously deficient – apparently because of shortage of funds (incredibly!) – and the NMU provision has been removed. This is wrong, both in the case of the particular scheme and in the sentiment. It appears that the needs of the historic villages are seen as a low priority. We can correct this via the NP, capturing a larger portion of CIL and using an appropriate portion of this for mitigation missing from the planned development. Further development besides AW Phase 1 must trigger additional mitigation measures; the Ermine St. works must not be seen as “job done” in this regard.

More broadly, we should expect forthcoming developments to progress much as AW has: the developer proposes a core scheme and minimum mitigation measures to get the traffic model to work, the PA makes demands for S106 money, the developer and PA haggle over S106 total and % affordable housing, developer argues non-viable, PA concedes on elements – mitigation measures and affordable content are reduced.

We end up with not quite enough affordable housing and not quite enough mitigation. Further, the transport plan is a collection of band-aids that are just sufficient to make the particular development work (with a collection of somewhat unreasonable assumptions).

What we don't get is any longer-term planning and strategic solutions for the local area – particularly for roads and education. The A141 northern bypass is a case in point. The rush-hour congestion on Ermine St. largely results from inadequate capacity at the “Shell garage roundabout” and the “Tesco roundabout”. It is hoped that the A14 upgrade will relieve some of the traffic flow, but modelling shows this could be optimistic. Phase 1 of AW was the maximum development that could be supported from the northern accesses. Further development requires the southern access (near Tesco roundabout). However, it is not clear how the A141 can support this flow. Neither, probably, Ph 2 of AW afford to fund any adequate upgrade of the A141. Neither, could NB, or USAF, or EBP. However, taken all together, there could well be sufficient funds and strong enough case for major works to make all of them viable. Though such a scheme is well outside the scope of the NP, we can ask for a strategic solution to the A141 problem.

Likewise, we should demand strategic planning for Ermine St., provision of education, and retail/recreation in our locality. Of course, no one can know the sequence of developments (AW Ph 2, NB, USAF, EBP), but this is not an excuse for having no plan. A sophisticated plan is needed, with many “if this, then that” defined consequences. Otherwise we'll end up with a collection of inadequate “band aids”.

13. What sort of development is suitable for inside our existing villages?

Development can take many forms:

Draft – work in progress!

Residential

The Stukeleys are categorised as “smaller settlements” with allowed in-fill development of 2~3 houses. However, this limit is not sufficiently sensitive to the particular site. Some sites are too small for this number, others could reasonably provide more. There has to be a presumption of allowing development because of growth and the need to maintain a balance of types of housing. Without appropriate new and/or subdivided housing, The Stukeleys will see progressive gentrification – prices rising faster than the budgets of lower-income households and rising proportion of high-price properties.

We should study and be sensitive to the changing age/income profile of existing residents – I expect we will see an ageing population and out-migration of younger members of families. Both types generally want smaller properties, and a review of existing housing stock will probably show under-provision. I think we should try to achieve an overall profile of types of housing stock that helps to support a balanced age profile of residents and down-sizing opportunities for older members so that larger houses are not under-used.

Presuming there is a need for more smaller dwellings (but in a range of price/specifications to suit the younger vs older) then the “2~3” dwellings guideline is too restrictive. Further, it may be necessary to allow building of some larger/more expensive houses in order to fund an appropriate portion of affordable. Viable sites then could be a combination of one/a few larger houses and a larger number of smaller units. Additionally, it may be appropriate to allow subdivision of large existing sites/houses to provide more smaller units.

Retail

See sections 3 & 4. Also: additional provision in the historic villages would be welcome, but perhaps unrealistic. More realistically, we need to support the sustainability of the existing pubs by allowing creative development which has good forward prospect for success and for the benefit of the locality.

Business/employment

See sections 6,7 & 8

Road

This is challenging – we have conflicting aspirations for reducing through-traffic to improve local amenity while making facilities on AW, USAF, and NB accessible to the local population. The solution is to return Ermine St. to a lower-capacity village lane and change junction priorities to favour travel in and out of residential areas at the expense of through-flow.

We also need to take the opportunity to improve the immediate areas around the road so that they can be reclaimed for local enjoyment rather than being dominated by motor traffic. Some particular cases:

- Lt. Stukeley, around the historic crossing of Church Way, Low Road and Ermine St. In the 1960s (?), when Ermine St. was the main route north from Huntingdon, the Ermine St. carriageway was raised to ease traffic flow. However, this was to the serious detriment of the immediate area and the setting of the Swan and Salmon (listed building). The opportunity

Draft – work in progress!

should be taken to restore levels and make the area an attractive centre, to include the land associated with the village hall. Perhaps the culverted stream could even be opened to make some feature of the water.

- Setting of the village hall in Gt. Stukeley. Much of the immediate area is given over to the road – both Ermine St. and the parallel access lane. This could be converted to a narrower “shared surface” which would reduce the division of the village and make space for a larger area in front of the hall. A larger area, perhaps with a mix of planting and paving could enhance the hall with some outdoor public space for events.
- With development of the USAF site there is surely an opportunity for enhanced public space and NMU connection at the (present) ends of Pringle Way in Lt. Stukeley

14. What other development would you like to see in the Stukeleys?

See above

15. Do we have enough green space in the Stukeleys?

- If we need more green space where should it be?

- If we have too much green space which areas could be developed for other uses? What would those uses be?

We have plenty of green space in the Parish, but surprisingly little “publicly useful” green space:

The vast majority is under intensive agriculture. While this is valuable, it is not publicly useful. However, it could be made so with enhanced routes for NMUs (see also section 11)

Most public green space is not particularly useful/used: playing fields are used only for team sports and are not interesting for much else, verges simply soften the impact of traffic, churchyards are important but not appropriate for recreation.

What is needed is publicly-accessible space, which need not be exclusively **public** space, that is useful for what people want to do these days. No longer is the focus of recreation on team/collective activities, it is on individual/personal. In particular:

- Walking and enjoying the local environment
- Dog walking
- Running
- Cycling
- Just being in a pleasant outdoor space to sit, reflect and meet occasional others

Note:

Draft – work in progress!

- How many of these are currently restricted to the pavements along our roads, particularly Ermine St. and adjoining farm tracks. This is not the environment that residents deserve.
- That publicly-useful space need not be green grass – other planting & landscaping and hard features could be more valuable and lower maintenance.
- Play areas need not be corralled only into a few official areas, the local environment can be richer with individual, small scale features spread throughout the locality, particularly in odd corners of residential areas and on off-road recreation routes. It is better to have play provision in places where adults also want to go so they can be enjoyed together!

The challenge is to find and exploit opportunities to increase useful provision, and this has to be opportunistic. A useful principle could be for all developments, large and small, should have a requirement to E.g.

- Use the large local developments to provide larger-area solutions:
 - Provide or enhance **off-road**, attractive routes for NMUs. They should be planned both for useful connection to the wider locality (Abbotts Ripton in particular!), and for local recreation: to achieve circular routes of a range of lengths, interlinking residential areas.
 - Enhance the value of off-road locations on recreation routes with seating at viewpoints, signage, landscaping & planting, wildlife info/viewing features etc.
 - Add small-scale play features on routes to encourage children to accompany older residents and learn enjoyment of the environment
- Wherever there is a public space (of any scale), enhance it to make a richer local environment and provide more opportunities for residents to use it. E.g.
 - Where there is a small area between built features, don't necessarily turn it to flat grassed area (green, but useless, and a cost for maintenance). Instead, use shrub small tree planting & landscaping for a low-maintenance feature. If space and location is appropriate, add a bench and/or a little play equipment to encourage use.
 - Small scale residential and other developments should be allowed only where they also enhance the immediate locality e.g. with planting & landscaping, sculpture/architecture, play, off-road public access for NMUs.

16. Should we be identifying permanent green space between the villages and existing and proposed developments?

Yes, but it should not simply be provided as only a buffer to keep "them" away from "us". We ultimately need interchange between the historic and new developments – both physically in terms of motor and NMu routes, but also psychologically: we will all be poorer if each community turns its back on the other. We can achieve this by provision of **useful** publicly-accessible green space for individual and small-group recreation, with features like those discussed in section 15. In larger areas we should take the opportunity to

Draft – work in progress!

restore linked woodland (with NMU routes throughout) for recreation and as noise & visual barrier. All green areas need to be maintained and we need creative solutions to pay for this:

- Trust funds for sustainability in perpetuity
- Planting of specialist hardwoods as a commercial crop – and why not under commercial ownership with appropriate obligations for public access?
- Woodland industries based on fast-growing willow etc.
- Commercial use of areas within (e.g. “high ropes” and physical-challenge activities, innovative holiday accommodation e.g. tree houses and log cabins)

17. Are the facilities in the Stukeleys sufficient for our community?

No, there are important elements missing and others that could be improved significantly. However, in any improvements, we must be careful to change / add / provide in ways that will be actually used. The focus, then should be on prevailing behaviours and worthwhile initiatives. I suggest:

- Changes to “green space” as outlined in sections 15 & 16. It needs to be publicly-useful.
- Setting of the village halls: significant improvement in the outside space of the two halls would make them more attractive for special events (e.g. weddings). GSVH needs some high quality outside space and access to it from the main hall. LSVH does have the space, but the access from the hall is not particularly attractive. A renewed structure could provide a very attractive combination, perhaps veranda-style. An objective could be to make it a specially-attractive location for wedding receptions.
- Fabric and facilities for the halls, to maximise rental opportunities for sustainability – and for the benefit of local users.

18. What should we be doing to help integrate new developments into the existing villages?

We should think of this in two ways: Physical and Attitudes.

Physical:

- Ensure that new developments are designed to support community – locations and catchment of primary schools, integrated routes for NMUs (both for recreation and daily travel), retail and indoor recreation facilities associated with the **locality, not just the development**, of sufficient scale to support strong community and ensure sustainability (see above).
- Provide facilities and routes for recreation & NMUs to re-join the historic villages into the new developments.

Attitude:

- Ensure that both new residents and historic residents are included in community-wide communications and events
- The Parish Magazine must be seen to be relevant to both historic and new

Draft – work in progress!

- Encourage use of new facilities by historic residents, and new residents to use facilities in the historic villages e.g. using sites for events

19. What should we be doing to encourage healthier communities the Stukeleys?

This is important; health issues of younger people and the quality of life for the older have been much discussed. Key for both is physical activity – as recreation but it should also be part of one's normal daily activities. The degree of development in the locality gives use the opportunity to create much richer outdoor opportunities. I have described some above in section 15 and others; we need opportunities that are attractive to the wide range of residents:

- Off-road routes to work, shops, schools etc. as well as for recreation
- Priority shifted from motor to NMU in the public realm; walking & cycling should be encouraged, rather than discouraged.
- Facilities for physical exercise – but integrated with the environment e.g.:
 - make/adapt circular routes with distance markers and surface suitable for walking, running & cycling.
 - Small-scale exercise & play features along walking routes
- Information (maps, routes etc.) and encouragement to get "out and about" on routes in the locality. With the large amount of development, routes and access will change. New opportunities can be used to encourage people to explore. This should be a SPC priority.

Other health issues arise from noise & air pollution. Both would benefit from:

- Much more tree planting around the locality, in particular to screen from the A14, the East Coast main line and main road routes proposed for AW etc.
- Reduce through-traffic

20. What's good about public services in the Stukeleys?

- Relatively frequent bus service
- Relatively nearby access to education, health & waste disposal facilities

21. What do you not like about public services in the Stukeleys? How would you change public services in the Stukeleys?

- Protect bus service to destinations critical for those without access to car transport, and to provide a realistic alternative to travel by car for others e.g. to Schools, GP surgery, Huntingdon Town, Railway station
- In the new developments, provide critical services in locations convenient for both the historic and the new population

Draft – work in progress!

22. What is your view of employment opportunities in our parish?

What sort of employment opportunities are suitable for locations inside our existing villages?

What other employment opportunities would you like to see in our parish?

See sections 6, 7 & 8.

23. What modes of transport do you currently use?

Cycling (principally)

Walking

Car

Train

Scheduled flights

24. What modes of transport would you like to be able to use in the Stukeleys?

What would you change about transport in the Stukeleys?

- Cycling (principally)
- Walking
- Car

See Sections 11 & 12.

Within the historic villages I would like to see:

- Restore Ermine St. to a village lane, instead of a through-route
- Change the presumption of priority for motor traffic to priority for NMUs in the “public realm”
- Enhance local routes for NMUs to encourage their use for daily activities as well as for recreation. (see also sections 10, 11 & 19)

Within the new developments, the same principles should apply:

- Much stronger encouragement and facilities for NMUs to limit motor traffic congestion & pollution and to increase personal activity for health
- Provision for NMUs of attractive, direct, off-road routes to key destinations e.g. education, employment, health, public transport, retail recreation
- Presumption of priority for NMUs, not motor traffic, in neighbourhoods
- Separation of motor traffic away from neighbourhoods
- Schemes and initiatives to increase patronage of public transport – if there is not strong modal shift from private car to public transport, the locality will suffer from poor health due to inactivity, congestion, pollution and unsustainable public transport
- Tough limits on motor traffic from new developments: development locks if forecasts are exceeded

Draft – work in progress!

25. What is your view of current traffic conditions in the Stukeleys?

Traffic is very light except on Ermine St. through the historic villages. That flow is moderate, in terms of the road capacity, except at rush hour when it is so heavy as to act as a barrier between the two “sides” of each of the villages.

It appears that the traffic flow on Ermine St comprises:

Substantial through-traffic avoiding the Spittals interchange

Significant traffic to/from the existing USAF

Relatively small amounts of traffic to/from the historic villages

A small, but annoying amount of unauthorised heavy vehicle movement

Only at rush hour is the traffic a significant detriment to the villages. However, the Ermine st. carriageway itself is a significant detriment to the local amenity:

- it divides and dominates the villages
- it excludes residents from enjoying the centres of their villages

Such a carriageway provision is not necessary to support the traffic to/from the villages (as opposed to the through-traffic); a village lane would be entirely adequate and could be arranged to restore the hearts to the villages.

26. What concerns do you have about how traffic might change in the Stukeleys in the future?

What changes would you make in the Stukeleys to improve traffic conditions?

Clearly, a lot of traffic would be generated by the proposed (and otherwise likely) new developments. Phase 1 of AW had to be limited because of difficulty of solving the traffic problem. Phase 2 is dependent on the southern access & a solution for the A141 (see section 12). NB has been hobbled by the traffic issues associated with the A14 and A141.

We should expect these developments to go ahead within the next 20 years and it is essential that a **good** solution for traffic is put in place. Previously I have warned against a piecemeal approach to this; a strategic plan for the locality & N. Huntingdon is needed.

We should require:

- An integrated, strategic solution and planning to cover possible eventualities for the scale and sequence of development
- Strong development caps in the event of traffic being above forecast
- Avoid using Ermine St. through the historic villages other than for traffic to/from the immediate locality; return the route to a village lane and include measures to discourage through-traffic

Draft – work in progress!

A very low limit on traffic allowed from a new USAF development onto Ermine St.; the bulk of the traffic must be routed through AW Phase 2.