

A Special NORTHBRIDGE Planning meeting of the Stukeley's Parish Council held at Great Stukeley village hall on Wednesday 26th August 2009 at 7. 30pm.

ATTENDANCE	M/s R. Turpin, D. Middleton, P. Hobson, M. Reynolds, P. Ryan, C. Cowdery, P. Vincent, J. Butter, R. Hulstrom, T. Pinner, by invitation of the chairman, Mr. M. Monk and seven members of the public. The District Council Planning Department was represented by Ms Elizabeth Fitzgerald, Case Officer, Mr. Andy Moffat, Planning Services Manager and Stuart Bell, Transportation Team Leader.
APOLOGIES	Apologies were received from Mr. D. Bartlett, away on business, Mr. D. Adams, away on business, Mrs S. Parkin, on holiday, Mrs Gifford for personal reasons. Mr. H. Raby, a declared interest in the agenda.
AGENDA	The chairman introduced the members of the District Council who were present to address the members on the issues and legalities of M/s Persimmons final 106 agreement proposals in association with the Northbridge Development and also the Green Travel plan proposed for the same development.
NORTHBRIDGE DEVELOPMENT	Mr. Moffat led for the District and he explained the issues surrounding both proposals. He said that the District were to consult with all parties, including the County Council, the Town Council and the Stukeley's Parish Council, comment will be invited from all consultees. HDC will consult then with an advisory group consisting of all concerned departments before then consulting with the Development Management Panel. He explained that the section 106 agreement was principally to mitigate in every way possible the impact the development proposals may have on the local infrastructure, the developer was not responsible to 'right' existing wrongs and meet local wish lists. Therefore the main focus of these proposals was the provision of land and finance for a school including land reserved for any future extension requirements, also added substantial funding for St. Peters School for secondary education. The PCT were awarded a sum of £485 per dwelling for local health care initially thought to be for Huntingdon, Alconbury and possibly Brampton. There would be 40% affordable housing on site. An award to promote 'public art'. Several public open spaces on site including several 'toddler' play areas. A Multi use shelter and 'formal' open space. A wildlife area and perimeter woodland. Links to Hinchingsbrooke Park and also within the park. A community building and a changing facility, these two could be combined also ten year funding for a community worker on site. A bridge over the A.141 to give access from the site to Stukeley Meadows and Huntingdon. It was said that a section 106 agreement is legally binding on the developer and if there is any default the District Council will be certain to take action. During discussions it was revealed that the Parish Councils request to the developer to consider the introduction of a lights controlled pedestrian and cycle crossing adjacent to the emergency exit/access to the development had been acknowledged, but it was considered that this facility would be better placed on the north side of the junction rather than the south as was depicted. Many other issues were raised by both the members and the public in the following discussion. Mr. Monk said that of greatest concern to the members and the public was the amount of extra traffic that may be generated along the C.339 through the villages and that mitigating measures had been suggested in all areas apart from the villages, Stuart Bell said that it was acknowledged that an extra 200 cars per hour could be expected at peak times, he added that 'unfortunately for the residents, with whom he felt some sympathy, the Highways Agency and the County felt that the road was well capable of

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>handling those sorts of volumes, he also advised members to include their concerns in their submission to the District. A second issue Mr. Monk raised was that it was thought that village children should be included in the catchment area for the school 'as of right' and not if there is enough room, Mr. Moffat said he would raise this with County. Footpaths were of concern, as all the proposed measures were to improve the network towards Huntingdon and nothing northwards towards the villages. In conclusion he said that the most significantly affected areas by the development proposals were the two villages and that they had the most to lose and that very few mitigating measures were in place to redress that imbalance, not even the 'Green Travel Plan' buses were scheduled to serve the villages in any way. The above is a short resume of the main issues of the meeting after which the chairman thanked the officers for attending, being frank and informative and that he felt that members would now have a good basic insight into the proposals and be in a position to make a considered submission to the District within the stated timeframe ending on 8th September 2009.</p>	
NEXT MEETINGS	<p>On Monday 7th September 2009 at Great Stukeley village hall commencing at 7.30pm. On Monday 5th October 2009 at Little Stukeley village hall commencing at 7.30pm. On Monday 2nd November 2009 at Great Stukeley village hall commencing at 7.30pm. On Monday 7th December 2009 at Little Stukeley village hall commencing at 7.30pm.</p>	