

A meeting of the Stukeley's Parish Council held in the village hall at Little Stukeley on Monday 2nd July 2007 at 7.30pm.

ATTENDANCE	M/s. M.Monk, D.Middleton, P.Ryan, H. Raby, S. Lloyd, R. Turpin, D. Adams, Mrs. S. Parkin, Mrs. S. Gifford, M/s T. Pinner, D. Hossack, C. Cowdery, J. Butter, R. Hulstrom, County Councillors Sir P. Brown, L.Kadic District Councillor K. Baker and seven members of the public.	
APOLOGIES	Received from Mr. M. Reynolds & Dist; Cncllr. Sanderson	
OPEN MEETING	The Council were advised from the floor that the base 4 th July celebrations involving firework display at 10.30pm were on Wednesday, the chairman requested that older neighbours were informed where possible.	
MINUTES	On a proposal by Mrs Parkin seconded by Mr. Butter the minutes of the June meeting were approved and signed by the chairman.	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
------	--------	--------

PLANNING

The chairman declared this part of the meeting open to allow members of the public to give views on current applications. Mr. Campbell representing Mr Sly on application 0701933FUL for a dwelling north east of 11 Owl End said that the original application had been refused by the District but that the new application addressed the salient points in that the new dwelling had been moved to the left of the site to allow views of College Farm, also that the derelict barn which has been granted planning permission for conversion and extension in front of the farmhouse would have a greater impact, not least because it was larger than original, he then distributed photo's to show this fact, Mr Wright said that this was not the case and that in actual fact the new proposals were smaller. Mr Hulstrom said that the development would contravene PPG 15 sections 216/217 in that the new development would have an adverse effect on the listed building status of College Farm on the street scene. Mr Monk stated that in his judgement the new development would be a better transitional link between new and existing. Many points were raised both for and against the development before the chairman closed the discussion and the Council returned into committee. At this point Mr. Lloyd declared an interest and took no further part in discussions. Although it was agreed that the new development was smaller it was still agreed by some that it contravened listed building regulations appertaining to College Farm. It was agreed that the perceived impact of the would be restored building was not the issue at discussion, after lengthy deliberations Mr Hulstrom proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that it contravened PPG 15 sections 216/217 with regard to impact on listed buildings, this motion was supported by Mr Butter, in the following ballot, opinions were equal with six votes for the proposition and six against, the chairman then used his casting vote in support of the motion, therefore the application was refused. Application 0701913FUL by Mr Pond of Church Way for alteration and extension to a barn to form a dwelling to the rear of 38 Church Way. Mr. Pinner and Mrs. Gifford declared an interest and took no part in discussions. It was agreed that some modifications had been made to the application but the drawings showed still that the access to be in a similar place, it was agreed that although works were in progress on a new access, the only evidence available to the Council was that of the application plans, therefore Mr

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
PARISH PLAN	The clerk reported that Mr.Dewar from CALC Would attend the September meeting of the Council.	The Clerk.
STANDING ORDERS	<p>Mr. Ryan had sent by Email to all councillors a draft copy of their work. A long discussion then took place on the subject of voting section 4.1, with not all in favour of the proposal for a signed ballot, after half an hour the chairman said he felt the matter had been fully discussed. Mr. Monk then proposed that this section be removed in favour of a record vote only, this was supported by Mr. Turpin. The ensuing vote was eight votes in favour with six against. Mr Hulstrom then said that he required this vote to be recorded, so following a short delay the votes was recorded as follows.</p> <p>In Favour of the motion, M/s T. Pinner, M. Monk, R. Turpin, D. Hossack, H. Raby, D.Adams, Mrs. S. Gifford and Mrs. S. Parkin. Against the motion M/s R. Hulstrom, J. Butter, C. Cowdery, D. Middleton, P. Ryan and S. Lloyd. It was noted that absentees Mr. M.Reynolds and Mr P. Hobson did not register an opinion.</p> <p>As Mr Ryan was called away on urgent business, the rest of this matter was deferred to the September meeting .</p>	M/s Hulstrom, Ryan and Cowdery report to September meeting.

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
<p>MINOR IMPROVEMENT GRANT</p>	<p>Mr. Monk put a draft proposal before the Council for consideration as follows.</p> <p>The Stukeley’s Parish Council 2008/9 Bid.</p> <p>The villages of Great and Little Stukeley continue to suffer problems of large volumes of traffic, some of which travels at speeds well above the designated limits. This causes problems of severance, with villagers reluctant to cross Ermine Street and potential problems of road safety.</p> <p>Whilst the Parish Council is grateful for the traffic calming measures which have so far been implemented along Ermine Street through the two villages, it has to be recognised that this is limited and therefore its effectiveness is also limited. The main problem appears to be the ineffectiveness of the ‘gateway’ features at the entrances to the villages. The scheme as so far agreed consists in each case of ‘Gateway’, with the village sign, speed limit sign, red surface and 30 roundel and kerbing’. It is not clear what is meant by ‘kerbing’ but the scheme as it stands does not slow traffic sufficiently as it enters the villages. This is particularly evident in approaching Little Stukeley from the north where the limit falls from 50mph to 30mph on a downward slope. What is needed is a far more rigorous ‘gateway’ with some form of narrowing and/or chicane, and maybe with priority for traffic exiting the villages.</p> <p>The Parish Council therefore wishes to propose this improvement at both entrances to each village, and would be pleased to support the bid with a contribution of £1.00 per elector.</p> <p>Mr. Turpin questioned whether the measures went far enough, Mr Monk said that the bid had been made with the confines of the grant in mind, namely a ceiling of £35.000. It was pointed out that the bid had been made with those constraints in mind and was considered incremental and part of the Councils long term aim to reduce traffic speeds through our villages. Mr. Monks proposals together with the addition were approved by a vote of ten in favour and three against.</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
MOTOR BIKES GATHERING	<p>The clerk reported that he had acknowledged the letter from both Mr. Redmore and Mr. Cox. He also reported receiving a letter from the District Council which advised that through government legislation this type of event was not breaking any law and as such could not be refused. Mr. Redmore had also received this letter and was not satisfied and intimated that he would take the matter further, he however registered his opinion that the Parish Council had done all they could in the matter.</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
------	--------	--------

CORE STRATEGY

Mr. Monk, as he promised produced several draft replies for the Councils consideration.

Core Strategy.

The Stukeley's Parish Council considers that Huntingdon has largely reached(or indeed breached) it's environmental capacity. If there has to be major growth, this should be directed to St. Neots, which is more in need of regeneration and where the barrier of the railway has already been breached by the development now taking place east of the railway/north of Cambridge Road without having any impact on any other settlement.

The Council is vehemently opposed to any additional housing which might be suggested as an extension to the Northbridge housing allocation on the grounds of traffic erosion-or elimination of the green space between Great Stukeley and Huntingdon leading to a loss of character and identity.

If Huntingdon has to take more housing land, the only suitable location for Greenfield development appears to be north of the A.141 opposite the retail park. Although this would break out into the Countryside, it would enable the construction of a pedestrian/cycle bridge over that route through developer contributions thus linking the town safely to the development and the Jubilee Park beyond it.

For employment development, the Council strongly opposes, on the same grounds, the option to extend the Ermine Street Business Park. The diagram shown in the document is erroneous as it does not show the existing extent of the Business Park and indicates a direction of growth into an area which is already developed. In reality, any extension of the Business Park would destroy the green gap between it and Great Stukeley and it would have a very adverse impact on the landscape as it lies on rising ground. It would damage the concept agreed through the emerging masterplan for Northbridge that the landscaping strip along Ermine Street should increasingly widen to maintain the perception of rural character and setting.

On a proposal by Mr Lloyd, the following was agreed for addition to these proposals. The Council broadly support, but encourage stronger emphasis on promoting new and improved means of cost-effective(for the traveller) and timely public transport throughout the District.

This motion was supported with all councillors in favour.

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
PLAYING FIELD	Mr. Raby reported that contact with the District Council advised rodent control officer had revealed that the only control that may work was rabbit fencing which would be extremely expensive and not guaranteed to work. It was reported that those playing football in the field had obtained topsoil and had filled all the holes recently.	The clerk.
CLOCK	Mr. Pinner reported that the clock was now functioning well. Mr. Soinne had spoken with him and given all details of costs involved in renovating the clock from the original problems in the early nineties, how money was raised for the cause, these had been recorded by the late Mark Hodges. For the recent successful works Mr Soinne had applied to the Historical Churches fund for a grant (to which the Council contributed £300) to ensure receipt of a grant. £3000 was received to cover new electrical rewiring of church and works on the clock but after donations were added there was a shortfall of £1700, a figure for which Mr. Soinne obtained an interest free loan from the fund. Mr. Pinner asked if the Council would be able to fund the repayment. Mr. Hulstrom enquired the conditions and length of the loan period, Mr. Pinner said he would Email that information to all councillors the next day, then a decision could be made by the Council on the way forward.	
VILLAGE SIGN	It was reported that the chairman had contacted, via the clerk, all councillors with reference to its repositioning, it was agreed on a proposition by Mr Lloyd seconded by Mr. Reynolds, that Mr. Parris be allowed to undertake the work, but also that this type of contact for decisions (email)be avoided in future, except in the case of emergency.	
FOOTPATH	The Clerk reported informing the County Council that the Parish were prepared to grant aid the project to a maximum of £2500, this offer had been acknowledged. Mr. Cowdery reported that Councillor Sanderson had acknowledged the Councils action in the columns of the Hunts Post.	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
ACCOUNTS	<p>On a proposal by Mr. Raby seconded by Mr. Butter the following accounts were agreed for settlement. Pioneer Landscapes for grass maintenance £601.50 Printing Matters for magazine £62.00. EON Energy for electricity £59.16. Homebase for paint £57. 95. Labour for painting £60.00. Clerks Salary £177.65..</p> <p>The clerk notified all councillors of the financial position of the Council as at 30th June 2007, and also produced a budget update for the same period. He once again emphasised the high nature of Council balances and the fact that the auditor was unlikely to condone the position, with the exception of councillor Adams everyone else was satisfied with the position.</p>	The Clerk
OTHER BUSINESS	<p>Mr. Turpin reported confusion about advert charges to local organisations, some of which are quite large and take space, it was agreed that a decision be deferred to the next meeting. It was reported that services at Hinchingsbrooke Hospital had been saved and closure had been averted.</p> <p>Overgrown grass verges outside the hospital car park were to be reported to Councillor Sanderson by Mr. Adams. Mr. Butter asked Mr. Adams if he would undertake the arrangements for Council meetings at the school in future, including promotion of the meetings to local residents. Mr. Adams said he would.</p>	
NEXT MEETING	Will be on Monday 3 rd September 2007 at Cromwell Park school in Parkway at 7.30pm.	All