

A meeting of the Stukeley's Parish Council held at Great Stukeley village hall on Monday 7th September 2009 at 7. 30pm.

ATTENDANCE	M/s H. Raby, R. Turpin, D. Middleton, P. Hobson, M. Reynolds, P. Ryan, Mrs. S. Parkin, Mrs. S. Gifford, D. Adams, C. Cowdery, P. Vincent, J. Butter, R. Hulstrom and T. Pinner, County Councillors Sir. Peter Brown and Laine Kadic, District Councillor K. Baker, together with PCSO Gemma Clarke.
OPEN FORUM	The chairman introduced PCSO Gemma Clarke who then detailed her work in the community. She said she was in regular contact with the clerk to enquire of any issues. She said that there were still some speeding issues through the villages, in a recent survey carried out in July the following results were notified. In Little Stukeley, Easterly 22% were travelling over 35mph and Westerly(with the benefit of the 'gateway' 6% were over 35mph. In Great Stukeley, Easterly 24% were over 35mph and Westerly 18% were over 35mph. Mr. Cowdery asked how many were over 40mph and Gemma said she did not have that information but would try to access it in the future. She said that some 20000 vehicles were monitored over a seven day period. She said she was 'leafleting' local businesses to warn about speeding through villages and also of the HGV ban on Ermine Street. She said 'Speed Watch' was becoming more popular especially now there were fewer restrictions on who could operate them, people exceeding the limit were sent a letter and if any individual received three they risked the likelihood of prosecution. If ever the Council wanted to join the scheme they should contact Gemma who could now arrange training and set up.
62. MINUTES	The minutes of the meeting held on 6 th July 2009 were approved on a proposal by Mr. Reynolds and seconded by Mr. Turpin and then signed by the chairman.
64. MEMBERS DECLARATION OF INTEREST	Mr. Raby declared an interest in agenda item 69, Planning, specifically discussion on the Northbridge development, it was agreed on a proposal by the chairman to defer that item to be the last on the agenda.
65. ACCOUNTS	On a proposal by Mrs. Parkin, seconded by Mr. Ryan it was resolved that the following accounts were approved for payment. August Accounts. EON Electric £59.16. Printing Matters for magazine £84.00. M. J. Newman, clerks August salary £196.79. September Accounts EON Electric September account £59.16. Printing Matters for October magazine £100.80. M. J. Newman, clerks September salary £196.79., expenses May/Aug £76.44.
66. FOOTPATHS	Mr. Cowdery reported that there were still problems regarding signage on footpath 1 which ran across land in the ownership of the chairman, the problem was not the path but Mr. Pinner's objection to the modern metal signs and their influence on the street scene, he said he would be more than happy with one of the old wooden directional signs. In regard to footpath 17 which ran diagonally across land adjacent to Waterloo roadway and Ermine street and owned by Mrs Gifford. The access was poor and the cost of gates was in the region of £600 each but the main problem was that to divert the path, which was a possibility, the old route would have to be brought up to standard, the legitimacy of taking such action and the costs involved, Mrs Gifford was not happy with. It was agreed however that Mr. Cowdery should pursue the matter to seek a satisfactory outcome in both cases. The poor state of the bridleway between Little Stukeley and Alconbury, littered with rabbit holes that posed serious danger to pedestrians and horses alike was to be reported by Mr. Cowdery to the authorities. Mrs Parkin asked that a damaged indicative sign at West View also be reported for repairs.
67.TRAFFIC CALMING	The clerk reported that the vegetation had now been trimmed beside the gateway feature to allow better visibility of signage, the County had been asked to remove surplus 'spoil' from the verge in the same area. Jo Challis of

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>the County had said that traffic surveys would be carried out in October in an endeavour to assess the success of the measures.</p>	
68. VILLAGE MAINTENANCE	<p>The chairman reported that the villages were now in a good tidy state and that the flowers planted had given a good show this summer and had been a worthwhile project. Little Stukeley bus shelter had been given a coat of paint. Mrs Parkin reported that the County Authorities were very much against the planting of trees on the verges as had been suggested, but they would have no objection to the planting of tree belts on adjacent farmland if the farmers would agree. Although this was perceived as unlikely, Mrs Parkin said she would continue her investigations.</p>	
70. DISTRICT ISSUES	<p>Mr. Baker said the only item to report was that the EERA meeting scheduled for the 30th September was now at the Commemoration Hall in Huntingdon.</p>	
71. COUNTY ISSUES	<p>Sir Peter Brown said that the new library was ‘up and running’ and first results show that there were 1100 new members with children’s membership up 60%. Laine Kadic said that the County had ordered new interactive signs for Great Stukeley and would advise when they arrived. A letter from the Highways agency advised that they were happy with the Spittals interchange and that the number of accidents had reduced significantly since the traffic lights were introduced. The County said that signage for HGV’s was to be reviewed, in particular at the junction with the A.141 in an effort to try to reduce numbers travelling through the villages.</p>	
73. ITEMS TO REPORT	<p>A letter was received from the Stukins family thanking the Council for the flowers sent on the occasion of Mrs Stukins 100th birthday. A letter was received from M/s Bowman’s in which they stipulated that the remedial work they had undertaken on the War Memorials was guaranteed and that inspections would be carried out this winter to ensure no further damage had taken place. Mr. Vincent asked whether the Council would consider reinstating some play equipment in the playing field at Great Stukeley especially if he could get voluntary labour to prepare the site prior to erection, he was asked to sound out support including a questionnaire in the magazine and report back to the Council as soon as he had some firm prices, he was told by Mr. Baker that grants were available from the District Council for such projects. It was reported that the Parish Notice board glass in Great Stukeley was becoming very poor with visibility through them difficult. Mr. Adams said he would supply free the Poly Carbonate and Mr. Pinner said he would ask Mr Parren for a price to remove the old and fit new. Mr. Hulstrom said he was still experiencing difficulties in arranging a meeting with Ms Tozer of the District Council with reference to planning issues at Grange Farm Green End, but he was still trying. Mr. Butter asked again for details of service periods for all Council members, the clerk admitted that he had forgotten last month.</p>	
69. PLANNING	<p>Application No 0900846FUL for a single storey extension including a conservatory at 1.Owl End Great Stukeley was approved on a recommendation by the planning group.</p> <p>Application No 0900958FUL for the siting of a free standing generator and housing at 3-5 Tower Close was similarly approved.</p> <p>Application No 0900980FUL for the erection of 38 Bungalows on footprint of existing at RAF Alconbury, Ermine Street, Lt. Stukeley was approved.</p> <p>Application No 0901049FUL for the refurbishment of existing industrial unit including rear extension and extraction flues associated with production works at 1 Hurricane Close, was approved on suggestion of planning group.</p> <p>Application 0901100FUL for the erection of a dwelling on land at 12 Church Road and 24 Ermine Street, was also approved.</p>	

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

	<p>EERA Consultation event at the Commemoration hall Huntingdon on Wednesday 30th September 2009, a consultation on the East of England Plan>2031 and the possibility of the development of 50.000 houses in and around RAF Alconbury site, the meeting agreed that as many Councillors as possible should attend the event, the clerk was to 'book' places.</p> <p>Application No 0500526 OUT/DOC the Green Travel Plan and the developers 'Final Offer' Section 106 proposals. A long and varied discussion took place on these issues which had previously been explained by District Officials at the 'Special' planning meeting recently. It was decided unanimously that the following submission be sent to the District Planning Authority.</p> <p>The impression gained from the meeting with the District gave the impression that the District were 'comfortable' with the proposals, this was not the case with the Parish Council. They believe that it is extremely optimistic to believe that a development of over 1000 houses will have 'nil' traffic impact on the local network. It is believed that the huge investment by the 106 agreement proposals into the Green Travel Plan is very out of proportion as it relies on the dubious belief that the majority of the residents will use the bus or cycle and if statistics are to be believed there could be some 2000+ cars on the estate when it is completed and some of those will surely want to journey further than the immediate locality and are sure to use their cars for that purpose. No mitigating provisions appears to have been made to the road network around the town and more importantly to us no measures are proposed to mitigate the extra traffic(200 extra cars per hour at peak times estimated according to Stuart Bell) that is certain to travel through the villages, we think this estimate could be dramatically underestimated. With these comments in mind the members cannot support the proposals as they stand and would respectfully make the following suggestions.</p> <p>(i) The proposed pedestrian activated signals at the northern access to the development from Ermine Street would be better placed to the south of it. This would accord more with the primary desire line of pedestrians, the vast majority of whom will be coming from the Stukeley villages. Whilst such a change would necessitate, then crossing the access road, given that it is only intended for use by public transport and emergency vehicles it should not present a danger to pedestrians.</p> <p>(ii) The proposed new bus service connects well with Huntingdon but ignores the opportunity to connect with the Stukeley villages. The Council is of the opinion that this new service should commence in the villages, this would attract additional patronage thus making the service more viable in the long term.</p> <p>(iii) The development will generate noticeable increases in traffic through the villages along Ermine Street, despite the 'best efforts' of the Travel Plan. The Council understands that there is sufficient capacity in Ermine Street to carry this additional traffic, but that is not the point. It is the environmental consequences of this additional traffic which are of concern, particularly the impact of noise and vibration on homes close to the road(and this includes a number of Listed Buildings), together with the social severance caused with both villages straddling Ermine Street. With the increase in traffic flow there is the potential to impact on road safety, particularly increased danger to pedestrians wishing to cross Ermine Street. The Council considers that a modest addition to the existing traffic calming measures would help mitigate this impact. The completion of the 'Gateway Features' into the two villages</p>	
--	--	--

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>would serve to reduce speeds more effectively and could deter some traffic originating from further afield from using this route, instead using the A.14 which was designed to accommodate such movements. A continuation of the existing street lighting system would enhance further the safety aspects as well. There could therefore be ‘nil detriment’ to the villages if this were to take place. The Council considers that the cost of the additional ‘Gateway’ features is very minor in comparison with most other measures set out in the Travel Plan and Draft 106.</p> <p>(iv) The Council seeks an assurance that the public open space on the development will be accessible to village residents.</p> <p>(v) The Council is disappointed that there is no provision for allotments within Northbridge. Given the relatively high density of the development with small gardens and increased demands for allotments nationally, there should be adequate provision made. It is understood that this is expressed locally by waiting lists for allotments in Huntingdon, Godmanchester and Brampton. Huntingdonshire’s Open Space, Sport and Recreation Audit prepared by PMP, points to need for 0.32ha/1000 population and this should be applied to Northbridge. Such provision could be made within the existing land budget for landscaping and open space so that there would be no additional burden on the development. Equally, management and maintenance could be undertaken in the same way as for other forms of public open space.</p> <p>(vi) It is understood that the structural landscaping along Ermine Street is included in phase 1 of the landscaping scheme. The Council seek reassurance that the timing of phase 1 is such that planting would take place before the development commences.</p> <p>(vii) The only improvement to footway/cycleway connections between the development and the wider countryside is proposed to Hinchingbrooke. The Council recognises the significance given to the footpath within the development which follows the line of the former Huntingdon to Alconbury drove road. This footpath connects to Low Road, Little Stukeley and beyond. It is, in it’s current condition, not easily travelled on foot and certainly not on a bicycle. The development offers the opportunity to upgrade this longer route for the benefit of users from Northbridge giving them a second countryside route and connections to the wider footpath network. It has also to be mentioned that there could be a lack of continuity for footpaths 18 and 19 through the development.</p> <p>(viii) Whilst it is accepted in terms of education provision, the development only needs to consider needs arising from the Northbridge development itself, you will be aware that the Council has consistently raised the point that it is nonsense for Primary school pupils in the Stukeley’s to have to travel to Huntingdon for schooling. In future this mean going by two primary schools (Stukeley Meadows & Northbridge). This Council consider that the County Council should acknowledge this fact by altering the school catchment areas so that children from the two villages can be educated at their nearest primary school in Northbridge.</p>	
74. NEXT MEETINGS	<p>On Monday 5th October 2009 at Lt. Stukeley village hall commencing at 7.30pm</p> <p>On Monday 2nd November 2009 at Great Stukeley village hall commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 7th December 2009 at Lt. Stukeley village hall starting at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday January 4th 2010 at Gt. Stukeley village hall starting at 7.30pm</p>	

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