

**A meeting of the Stukeley's Parish Council held in the village hall at Great Stukeley on
Monday 1st September 2008 at 7.30pm**

ATTENDANCE	M/s J. Butter, R. Turpin, P. Ryan, D. Middleton, R. Hulstrom, H. Raby, P. Hobson, M. Reynolds, P. Vincent, D. Bartlett, D. Adams, Mrs. S. Parkin, District Councillor K. Baker and one member of the public.	
APOLOGIES	Apologies were received from C. Cowdery away on holiday, Mrs Gifford, work commitment, T. Pinner, another commitment, County Councillors Laine Kadic and Sir Peter Brown, prior engagements. The clerk reported no contact with Mr. Hossack.	
CHAIRMAN	In the absence of Mr. Pinner, Mrs Parkin took the chair for the meeting.	
55. MINUTES	It was approved that the vice chairwoman signed the minutes of the meeting dated 7 th July 2008 as a true and correct record.	
58. MEMBERS DECLARATION OF INTEREST	There were no members declarations of Interest in agenda items.	
59. ACCOUNTS	On a proposal by Mr. Turpin seconded by Mr. Butter it was resolved that the following accounts were approved for payment. EON Energy for July supply £59.16.EON Energy for August supply £59.16. Printing matters for July magazine £92.00.Printing Matters for August Magazine £92.00. Clerks August Salary £192.09.Clerks September Salary £192.09. Clerks Expenses including painting materials £174.69. Moore Stephens for Annual Audit £173.32.	
60. PROJECTS	Mr. Ryan reported very little progress as new quotations were still being obtained for the necessary works, this time within the confines of the new budget which was decided by the reduced grant availability. He said he was meeting new contractors this week. It was hoped the works could commence early in the new year and certainly before the Easter break, on questioning he said grant availability was for a period of one year from its acceptance. He explained that ideally in the case of the invalid toilets a building extension would be best and that it was proving difficult to locate the facility satisfactorily within the structure of the existing building, but this had to be the case.	
61.FOOTPATHS	The footpath committee through Mr. Hulstrom provided members with a dossier on the state and accessibility of all the paths and bridleways in the Parish. There were many problems with access and some paths simply did not exist and others seemed to have no useful purpose, unfortunately District and County maps displayed from several eras did not help greatly. The clerk reported that he had spoken with the District department and that the	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>officer concerned was prepared to discuss these matters. It was generally agreed after much discussion that a meeting of the footpath committee with Mike Barber(footpaths and bridleways) of the District Council, on site may significantly clarify many issues, it was agreed that possibly Steve Oudett of the County should also be invited to attend. Mr. Hulstrom, whom the clerk provided with contact detail, agreed to implement this plan as soon as practicable and then report to members.</p> <p>Mr. Turpin then raised the issues surrounding the footpath (16) which crosses West View and the fact that the sign indicating the route has been moved to the metalled road in front of the West View houses, apparently on the County Councils instructions. Available maps from the District and County show different routes. The Owner of a property on who's access road the original line existed, insists the access is private property and has asked people to refrain from using it. It was the Councils opinion that the land over which the access travelled was actually in the ownership of the District Council and as such had public access. After much discussion the clerk was instructed to write to the legal department of the District Council to establish the exact stature of the piece of land in question and whether in fact the owner has the right to erect a sign intimating a 'private' access.</p> <p>Mr. Turpin also asked if the clerk could write to the County Council to ask them to have the hedge adjacent to the north side of the footpath from Moorfield Way to Ermine Street, trimmed back as it was a hazard to pedestrians, this was approved by members.</p>	
62. WAR MEMORIALS.	<p>Mr. Reynolds reported that Mr. Pinner had had a meeting with Mr. Espin of M/s Bowmans to appraise the recent works carried out by that company, how the Council were very unhappy with the standard of this work. It was agreed that the contractor should return and complete the work to the members satisfaction and until such time the payment of £4089.00. should be withheld. The clerk was instructed to inform M/s Bowmans by letter that the rendered account would not be paid until satisfaction was achieved. The War Memorials Trust were also to be informed of the situation and also that they may be asked to appoint an inspector to visit the sites if agreement can not be reached. Mr. Turpin said that he had a series of pictures before and after the works to give supporting evidence, Mr. Reynolds also had pictures from the 1980's showing the memorials after restorative works by Dennis Easton of St. Ives.</p>	
62. PLANNING	<p>On a proposal by Mr. Turpin supported by Mr. Raby members supported the retrospective actions of the Chairman and the Planning Group in making the</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>following planning recommendations.</p> <p>Application 0801867FUL for temporary use of existing buildings for employment(B1,B2 and B8) at RAF Alconbury, Refusal.</p> <p>Application 0802168FUL for two additional windows at 18.Blackstone Road. Approval.</p> <p>Application 0802202FUL for the erection of brick/railing wall at the Finches, 27. Ermine St, Lt. Stukeley. Approval</p> <p>Application 0802246FUL for a café extension at the visitors centre Hinchingbrooke Park. Approval.</p> <p>A new revised application under a similar number 0801867FUL for the Temporary change of use to permit the continuation of B1, B2, B8 and sui generis uses of existing buildings and hardstanding at RAF Alconbury was received and discussed at great length and on a proposal by Mr. Hulstrom, seconded by Mr. Ryan and approved by members the following decision was to be submitted to the District Council.</p> <p>The Parish Council recommends Refusal of this application by the following response.</p> <p>Renewal of Temporary Permissions at Alconbury Airfield.</p> <p>A plan for the extensive use of the site, principally for warehousing, was approved by the Secretary of State some years ago. Various conditions were imposed, principally for transport infrastructure and specifically a rail connection. This plan has not been implemented but the site has been used for open storage(mainly containers and vehicles), warehousing and some office space under a series of temporary permissions. Transport infrastructure and mitigating measures required by the original approval(reserved matters & TWA) have not been implemented even though use of the site already corresponds to , perhaps, one third of the scale of the original approval. The present application is to consolidate and renew these temporary permissions.</p> <p>There are several aspects that raise concerns;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aspects of the existing use of the site are already outside the temporary permissions, as evidenced by the planning application and documents on file, of particular note are; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A new two storey structure. ○ Stacking height of containers. ○ Use of unauthorised areas. • Continuation of the temporary permissions constitutes developments of the site without the infrastructure and mitigation measures required by the original approval, particularly regarding; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rail connection. 	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Local roads. o Public Transport. o Environmental. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We see no evidence of inspection or enforcement by the Planning Authority (Huntingdonshire District Council) of the temporary permissions prior to the latest application. <p>In relation to specific matters in the renewal application;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We object to the removal of the restriction of night time activities because of the noise nuisance to residential properties in the locality. Over recent years we have received several complaints about this issue, with noise causing disturbance of sleep. We request that condition 3a proposed by the developer in section 11.4 of their planning statement is modified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To cover all noise on the site, i.e. remove the restriction limiting it to only container movements. • So the metric is changed to Laeq (1 minute) from Laeq (5 minutes), given that sleep is disturbed by short events. • To specify an appropriate metric for condition 4. 2. The application asks for a relaxation of location of containers stored on the site, to allow them to be placed close to the boundary fence and to be stacked two high within 200 meters of the fence and four high elsewhere. The existing stacking of containers is visible for some distance from the site; the elevation of the site meaning that the skyline is of containers. We object to the visual impact this causes and request that a condition is imposed to lower the maximum stacking height to Two and no containers to be located within 200 meters of the boundary fence. <p>In addition we propose that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The renewal period is for a period of only two years, rather than the requested three and that there should be no further renewals of temporary permission(s). • We would wish to see at some stage the implementation of the original consents or the production of a complete new application. 	
64. PARISH MATTERS	<p>The issue of dog control was still under review and the District Council have agreed to meet with the Council this Autumn to discuss the positioning of some new waste bins.</p> <p>Mr. Middleton registered his gratitude and that of his mother for the flowers sent by members to commemorate her 100th birthday last week.</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
65. ITEMS TO REPORT	<p>Mr. Ryan reported that due to a misunderstanding of issues he had failed to get the Councils submission on this subject, to the Inspector on time, he had assumed that he could make this by letter but had been informed that the closing date was 15th August, with no meeting in August a reminder was not evident. He gave members his sincere apologies, which were accepted.</p> <p>The clerk reported a Neighbourhood Panel meeting at the hall in Alconbury on Tuesday 9th September 2008 when 'Speed Watch' was a subject on the agenda, Inspector Taylor had invited a representation from the Council. M/s D. Bartlett, D. Middleton and P. Hobson agreed to represent the Council. Mr. Turpin who is the Councils Police Liaison Committee representative said he had not received any notification but was unable to attend because of a previous engagement. The members attending agreed to report at the next meeting so Traffic Calming was to be included on the October agenda when it was hoped that there may be some communication from the County Council on the progress of the scheme for Ermine Street5 through the villages, which had, by email, been promised for September.</p> <p>The clerk reported further correspondence with the Post Office in which they still implied that even if the Post Office in Gt. Stukeley closed there would be no provision of the 'outreach service'. Together with the chairman a reply had been sent to question why a service that had to pass through the village to get to other outlying villages could not actually stop off to serve the residents, if in the initial stages on a trial basis, a reply is still awaited.</p>	
66. NEXT MEETINGS	<p>On Monday 6th October 2008 at 7.30pm at Cromwell Park School, Hinchingsbrooke.</p> <p>On Monday 3rd November 2008 at 7.30pm at the village hall Little Stukeley.</p> <p>On Monday 1st December 2008 at the village hall Great Stukeley, commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 5th January 2009 at the village hall Little Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p>	