

A Special Meeting of the Stukeley's Parish Council held in the village hall at Little Stukeley on Monday 17th September 2007 at 7.30pm.

ATTENDANCE	M/s. R. Hulstrom, H. Raby, M. Reynolds, C. Cowdery, D. Middleton, M. Monk, R. Turpin, T. Pinner, S. Lloyd, Mrs. S. Parkin, Mrs. S. Gifford and nine members of the public.	
APOLOGIES	Were received from M/s. J. Butter, P. Hobson, P. Ryan and D. Adams	
PLANNING	<p>Mr. Monk was introduced by the chairman and he said the purpose of the meeting was to make a decision on planning application 0702859FUL for a dwelling on land north east of 11 Owl End Great Stukeley, an application which had been before the Council on a previous occasion. He said that the majority of the Council's planning group were in favour of refusal and gave a list of reasons why, he said personally, he would favour approval as he felt that the proposals did not adversely affect the view of College Farm.</p> <p>The Chairman then opened the meeting to the public and invited comments.</p> <p>Mr. Wright of College Farm said that he was opposed to the development on the grounds that it had a detrimental affect on College Farm and an adverse affect on the open rural area of Owl End. He said that all buildings on the College farm site were covered by listed building regulations and the rebuilding of the fallen barn was a statutory need, apart from the church, College Farm was the oldest listed building within the village. He said he was given to believe, that when permission was given to develop No 11 Owl End it was on the understanding that this should be the boundary of development in the area. He furnished all present with photo's and letters to suggest that his new barn development was no larger than previous and that the developer was exaggerating the affect that this would have on College Farm. He suggested that the layout plan does not accurately show the relationship of the Farm to the new development and that a site visit would prove this point. Mr. Wright made several other points and concluded by saying , This development should not be allowed for numerous reasons, it would totally alter the setting of the Listed Building and thereby changing it's context within the historic environment, it extends the development and therefore changes the protected frontage and significantly impacts on the character and appearance of Owl End.</p> <p>Mr. Campbell then addressed the Council on behalf of the applicants, he stated that at the previous hearing he considered that Mr. Hulstrom had misled the Council on points of District regulations and perhaps he would have been better advised to have contacted the case officer rather than another District Council official. He implied he considered the rebuilt barn would be significantly higher than the original and as such restrict views of College Farm more than the new development which had purposely sited to the West of the site to avoid such restriction. He said that</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>the curtilage of the Listed Building and the space around had not been infringed and that the proposals were not in breach of District Council Planning policy regulations, he said that the positioning of the development was crucial in this debate and that the visual impact could only be ascertained by viewing from the road at Owl End, he concluded by saying that, on this point, viewing established that the new proposals in no way visually impacted on College Farm. Mr. Hulstrom replied that he specifically did not contact the case officer as he did not wish it to be thought that he was in any way trying to influence the outcome, he said he still believed that the proposals contravened District Council planning regulations PPG 15 sections 216 and 217. and that the development had an adverse affect on College Farm and the surrounding area.</p> <p>Mr. Lloyd asked Mr. Wright whether it was a measured pole that he had used to signify the height of the new barn, Mr. Wright said it was and that it reflected accurately the impact of the barn on College Farm. He then asked Mr. Campbell whether the boarded materials were still to be used, as it was indicated that they were in keeping with other dwellings in the area, he said he doubted this, as he had seen no other dwellings with this type of cladding. Mr. Campbell replied that the issue was, that they were in keeping with the new barn conversion proposal.</p> <p>Mr. Monk said that he believed that the planning process and regulations were open to interpretation and could be looked at in different ways by different individuals. It has to be decided how the regulations apply to this application and a judgement has to be made as to how this development will impact on the local area. He said he considered that the development did not adversely obscure the views of College Farm and that it made a good transition from the new to the West and the old to the north east. Mr. Raby enquired whether in his opinion any regulations were likely to be breached, Mr. Monk replied, No. Mr. Turpin added that he considered that views of College Farm were not completely impeded and that in his opinion, there was no good planning reason to refuse. At this point Mr. Monk requested a recorded vote. Mr. Monk then proposed that the application be approved on the grounds he had given, this was seconded by Mr. Raby. Voting was as follows, Members in favour, M/s M. Monk, H. Raby, R. Turpin, C. Cowdery, Mrs. S. Gifford and Mrs. S. Parkin. Members against, M/s R. Hulstrom, D. Middleton and M. Reynolds. Therefore the motion was agreed for approval. Mr. Lloyd declared an interest and took no part in the ballot.</p>	
CORE STRATEGY	<p>Mr. Monk had prepared a statement on the Councils behalf and he proposed this be accepted, Mr. Turpin asked for an amendment to be included, the proposal and amendment were agreed by the Council with one abstention. The statement was as follows;</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>Option B; Huntingdon Area Focus.</p> <p>The Council opposes this option as it considers that: Huntingdon has reached, or arguably has already breached, the limits of it's environmental capacity. There should be no further Greenfield releases. Development should therefore be limited to that on Brownfield sites, such as the area between George Street and Ermine Street in Huntingdon(as identified in the Huntingdon West Area Action Plan Issues and Options report) and at RAF Brampton.</p> <p>The Town is not well related to the proposed guided busway as it is at the furthest point of the on-road section.</p> <p>Any proposed extension to the Ermine Street Business Park is strongly opposed as it would;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Destroy the green gap between Huntingdon and the beginning of Great Stukeley at Green End. 2. Have an unacceptable impact on the wider landscape by virtue of it being on rising land visible over a very wide distance. 3. Draw very large amounts of commuter traffic through Great and Little Stukeley(traffic accessing the existing Business Park is already causing considerable concern in the villages) 4. Huntingdon is the only town in Huntingdonshire to have net in-commuting; other towns need additional employment to a much greater extent. <p>The Concerns about any extension to the Ermine Street Business Park apply also to other options.</p> <p>Option C. St. Neots Area Focus.</p> <p>The Council supports this option as the best of those presented as ;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.St. Neots needs additional employment more than Huntingdon. It is not accepted, however, that within this option as presented, there still needs to be additional employment on a Greenfield site at Huntingdon. To focus properly on St. Neots, there should be a greater emphasis on providing additional employment there with employment development at Huntingdon limited to brownfield sites (reasons set out in response to option B) 2.The expansion of St. Neots east of the railway offers the best opportunity to create a sustainable new neighbourhood with a good level of local services and employment and Development east of the railway would not impact on any other community. 3.St. Neots can be connected to Cambridge (and Bedford) by a high quality transport route along the A428/A421, which is likely to be as good as (or in the case of Huntingdon better than) the Guided Bus. 	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>Options For Additional Growth.</p> <p>The Parish Council considers that government guidance is flawed in insisting that the requirement of the regional strategy are a minimum. This is an open invitation for developers to press for a scale of development greater than is needed exceeding the environmental capacity of the area and it's infrastructure. The District Council should press for the requirement to be in terms of a maximum capacity(up to) which will give greater certainty to both developers and local communities.</p> <p>Of the options for additional growth, the Parish Council considers that Option 1(enhanced growth in the St. Neots Area) is the only acceptable one in that it offers the best opportunity to create a critical mass of new development in one location allowing development of a sustainable new urban extension. However, to bring it forward in one plan period would undermine the opportunity that this location offers for providing land for the longer term.</p> <p>The Parish Council has grave reservations about the suggestion of a new eco-town at Alconbury Airfield. It is not clear how this would relate to the existing town of Huntingdon nor how the relationship with Great and Little Stukeley would be dealt with, particularly the traffic implications. However, there is little evidence upon which to form a judgement, and the current policy of developing the Airfield as a major employment area also greatly concerns the Parish Council as it sees no safeguards for it's communities.</p>	