

**A meeting of the Stukeley's Parish Council held at Great Stukeley village hall on Monday 5<sup>th</sup> September 2011 at 7.30pm.**

ATTENDANCE	M/s M. Monk, H. Raby, P. Hobson, R. Hulstrom, P.Vincent Mrs. S. Parkin, Mrs. N. Sly, Rebecca Britton of Urban & Civic
APOLOGIES	Were received from Mr. Pinner & Mr. Ryan who were both on holiday, District Councillor Keith Baker who had a prior engagement and County Councillors Laine Kadic & Sir Peter Brown who had County meetings to attend.
CHAIRMAN	In the absence of Mr. Pinner the vice chairman Mrs. Parkin took the chair for the meeting.
OPEN FORUM	There was no member of the public present but the clerk read a letter from Mr. Redmore of Great Stukeley complaining about horse droppings on the footpaths beside Ermine Street, it was agreed that it was difficult to monitor but that the clerk should put a note in the magazine to ask livery school operators to ask their clients to return to sites to clear any mess, it was also agreed that the clerk should also refer to dog owners in Great Stukeley and their obligation to 'clear up' after their pets as this, at present, was not the case.
77.MINUTES	On a proposal by Mr. Raby, seconded by Mr. Monk the minutes of the meeting of 8 <sup>th</sup> August 2011 were approved and were then signed by the Chairman.
79. MEMBERS DECLARATION OF INTEREST	Mr. Monk declared a non pecuniary interest in item 82a of the evenings agenda in that he would take no active part in any discussions on that item.
80. COUNTY ISSUES	Although no councillors were present Ms Kadic, through Mr. Monk, reported that issues in Moorfield Way surrounding a raised drain cover, had now been resolved.
81.DISTRICT ISSUES	With Councillor Baker away there was no report.
82. PLANNING	<p>(a) issues surrounding the St. Ives West Consultation were raised by Mr. Hulstrom, he said the proposals there greatly mirrored those for the Northbridge and Ermine Street Business Park proposals in that the developments would severely restrict the green belt areas between separate conurbations, namely, St. Ives and Houghton and in our instance, Great Stukeley and Huntingdon. He advised that the planning group recommended that it was commented that the development at St. Ives should, as had been suggested beside Ermine Street, should be 'tapered' so the development progressed further back from the road as it leaves St. Ives and approaches Houghton so as to give the impression of leaving a totally urban area and approaching a more rural scene, he said although St. Ives was not in our immediate vicinity it would be an effort to affirm this councils strong opinion on keeping the rural nature of country villages where ever possible, the members then agreed that this was a response to the consultation that they could all support, in the efforts to prevent a precedent being established.</p> <p>(b)Application No 1101259FUL for alterations and extensions to a property in Pringle Court were considered to be acceptable and to have no adverse impact on the area or neighbouring properties, thus on a proposal by Mr. Hulstrom, seconded by Mrs Sly the application was approved.</p> <p>(c) Mr. Monk raised the issue of what the District Authority termed 'preliminary enquiries' in relation to new planning applications and how it impacted on any decisions made by the Parish Council. It had appeared that in some cases these discussions took place between the developer and the District prior to an application, this, without the knowledge or input of the local council, and in some cases facilitating the 'approval' of such plans by the authority. Mr. Monk</p>

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>said he was seeking the permission of members to approach the District Planning Authority to see if the Parish Council could become part of this preliminary process, it was agreed that this should take place on a proposition by Mr. Hulstrom, seconded by Mrs. Sly.</p>	
83. ACCOUNTS	<p>The following monthly accounts were agreed for settlement on a proposal by Mr. Raby, seconded by Mr. Monk and approved by the meeting EON Electric for September supply £59.16. Easiprint for September magazine £95.00. M. J. Newman, clerks August Salary £159.57. net. Plus agreed allowances £28.00. Office expenditure for May/September £70.02. T&amp;S Gardening maintenance for August £985.06. Moore Stephens for Audit Charges £392.40.</p> <p>The following income for the month was notified. Magazine Advertising £23.</p>	
84. RIGHTS OF WAY	<p>Mr. Raby reported that the committee had inspected the designated route of footpath 2 from Low Road, Little Stukeley to Alconbury and had found it virtually non existent and severed at one point by the A.14, discussions with Mr. Alan Adams revealed that the ‘old’ route followed field boundaries all the way through to Alconbury but that farming methods had changed significantly since those days with many small grass fields being amalgamated into one large arable unit, Mr Raby said it was difficult to envisage any easy solution and that the issue should be referred back to the County. With regard to footpath 13 from Ermine Street to Beech Avenue it was agreed that there were disadvantages to the council accepting ownership and that it was really the County who had responsibility for it’s maintenance, Mr. Hobson added that the overhanging branches and overgrown hedge had been trimmed back by the adjacent developer, he also reported that no communication had been received back from the builder regarding the Councils proposals as per August minutes.</p> <p>Issues surrounding footpath 11 were ongoing, although Urban &amp; Civic were ready to progress once advised by the County. With footpath 9 there had been no report by Ms Kadic on her meeting with Mr. Baker.</p>	
85. PLAY EQUIPMENT	<p>Mr. Vincent reported to members that the Councils bid for funding to Woodford Waste Management Services had been successful to the tune of £13100. this in addition to the lottery award of £5006 would facilitate the provision of the new equipment at the Little Stukeley village hall site. He explained that the providers now required a ‘facilitation’ contribution amounting to £1491.00. to process the grant payment, this would eventually be followed by the Councils contribution towards the gross cost of the equipment, amounting to £1875.00. Members on a proposition by Mr. Vincent, seconded by Mrs. Sly authorised the clerk to sign the necessary documentation and issue a cheque for £1491.00. in favour of the Woodford Group. The members then recorded their sincere and grateful thanks to Mr. Vincent for all his hard work on the project.</p>	
86. ALCONBURY	<p>At this stage Mrs. Parkin declared this topic the subject of an open meeting so that Rebecca from Urban &amp; Civic could contribute to the discussion.</p> <p>Mr. Monk started by referring to Local Development Orders, he said it was noted that Urban &amp; Civic had been successful in being awarded Enterprise Zone status for a section of Alconbury Airfield, which meant significant tax incentives for the development and the occupiers. The development process would be simplified through a Local Development Order instead of requiring planning permission. The Parish Council should continue to work with the District Council and Urban &amp; Civic to ensure a high quality development, which could involve a Design Code being incorporated within the order. At this stage he ‘flagged up’ the meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> September at which Urban &amp; Civic were to give a presentation of their proposals for the development of the Alconbury site, he suggested that this meeting should be advertised as prominently as possible in an</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>effort to get the local community to attend to observe, members agreed with this entirely and the clerk was asked to place notices in the village notice boards ASAP, Mr. Hulstrom agreed to place notice on the Parish Website as well. Rebecca Britton then explained that the meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> &amp; 24<sup>th</sup> September was to take place in a converted hangar space, on the Friday there would take place what was termed as ‘Technical Workshops’ at which the strategic partners of Urban &amp; Civic could have intensive discussions on such issues as Bio-diversity, Homes &amp; Living, Transport, Green Infrastructure and business developments. On the 24<sup>th</sup> the site would be open to the public from 1.00pm to 5.00pm with displays to view, Chance to have a say on Urban &amp; Civics view for the site, find out more about emerging details, chance to have a guided tour of the site, together with this there would be a free bus service from Huntingdon, through the Stukeleys to the site also various entertainment attractions and refreshments. She said that advertising of the 23/24<sup>th</sup> September presentation would be extensive locally, in the press and on the Urban &amp; Civic website. She also reported that Urban &amp; Civic intended to hold a ‘feedback’ meeting on Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> September to analyse the comments and questions received at the presentation.</p>	
87.ALLOTMENTS	<p>At this point the Council returned to committee format. In the absence of Mr. Ryan , Mr. Monk reported on the open meeting held in Great Stukeley village hall on 11<sup>th</sup> August, minutes appended in the minute book, he said it was well attended with the majority in favour of the provision of these facilities, as it was in law, if there were a number of requests the Parish Council was obligated to seek land for such purpose. It was emphasised that other avenues had been explored but no other land was available for purchase, even if the Council had sufficient funds to devote to this venture, so it was entirely appropriate that when Urban &amp; Civic offered to lease the parcel of land in Owl End, that the Council considered taking up this offer. There were some concerns about parking, traffic issues and possible vandalism but the Council considered the benefits of provision far out weighed any detriments. The concerns of two residents of Owl End had been acknowledged by letter. Mrs Sly suggested that there were parishioners who had implied that the provision of the land by Urban &amp; Civic may render the Council some obligation to that company when planning issues were presented, but Mr. Monk said that it should be remembered that the Council were embarking on this project for the greater good of the members of the community and particularly those, numbering now nineteen, who had requested allotment space, this together with the fact that there was no alternative site. Mr. Monk proposed, supported by Mr. Hulstrom that the Council now officially adopt a policy of proceeding with the provision of allotments, this received unanimous support. Mr. Hulstrom also proposed that for the initial year the Council become, at a cost of £55 a member of NSALG as this would provide members with an invaluable source of information with regard to the setting up and running of allotment space.</p>	
88.TRAFFIC ISSUES	<p>Mr. Monk suggested to members that the paper which had been circulated to all, which detailed the make up of the proposed traffic group, be adopted as council policy, in this he was supported by Mr. Hobson and then all members present. He said the group could have a significant role to play especially with the re-development proposals at the airfield also the housing development proposed together with the proposed extension of the Ermine Street Business Park between Great Stukeley and Huntingdon and the traffic they may generate.</p>	
90.ITEMS TO REPORT	<p>It was agreed on a proposal by Mr. Hulstrom, seconded by Mr. Monk and agreed, that following Mr. Bakers correspondence with reference to the</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>proposed allotments as his statement that he has erected buildings at his farm to provide, in his words, ‘employment and recreation for the next generation’, the clerk be instructed to write to the enforcement officer at the District Council, to enquire whether these buildings, already erected, required planning consent, and if so were the Council missed out on the consultation process as they had received no plans, or in actual fact had there been a breach of planning regulations.</p> <p>Mr. Monk said that the Council were being consulted on the Community Infrastructure Levy and the Development Contribution and he was not sure whether a response was needed. He asked members if it was permissible for he and Mr. Hulstrom to meet with Claire Burton of the District Council to seek clarification and then if necessary, make a delegated response on behalf of the Parish Council, this permission was given on the proviso that that response is circulated to members, with twenty four hours to comment, prior to release to the District Authority.</p> <p>Mr. Vincent sought the approval of the members to proceed with another project for which he would seek more grant aid, this would be the refurbishment of the playing field, including new rabbit proof fencing, repairs to the field surface, dredge the pond to make a water feature, planting of shrubs and trees at the eastern end and the placement of picnic tables also the possible re-erection of the goal posts, members warmly welcomed this proposal and gave it their full support.</p>	
91. NEXT MEETINGS	<p>On Monday 12<sup>th</sup> September 2011 at the village hall, Low Road, Little Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm</p> <p>On Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2011 at the village hall, Low Road, Little Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 7<sup>th</sup> November 2011 at the village hall, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 5<sup>th</sup> December 2011 at the village hall, Low Road, Little Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p>	