

**A meeting of the Stukeley's Parish Council held at Great Stukeley village hall on Monday 5<sup>th</sup> July 2010 at 7.30pm.**

ATTENDANCE	M/s R. Hulstrom, P. Ryan, P. Vincent, T. Pinner, M. Monk, P. Hobson, Mrs. S. Parkin, Mrs. N. Sly, District Councillor K. Baker, County Councillors Sir. Peter Brown and Laine Kadic, M/s Tim Leathes and Robin Butler from Urban & Civic together with thirty two members of the public.
APOLOGIES	Were received from Mr. H. Raby who was away on holiday
40.OPEN MEETING	<p>The chairman introduced the two representative from Urban &amp; Civic and invited them to address the meeting on their plans and intentions for the Alconbury site. Mr. Butler explained that he was managing director of the company which was privately owned but they may consider going public at some stage, he explained that they were an 'Investor/Developer' company that in most cases wished to retain control of the development even after its conclusion. He said that they bought the site in November 2009 for just under 30 million pounds, he said there was some three quarters of a million square feet of warehousing space and that produced some 800 jobs. He said that they were in the process of discussing with the District and County Councils, the way forward, they were investigating transport links including rail, road, guided bus and public transport access to the site. There were investigations into providing more up to date services so as to attract a wider range of more high tech type of business, this required on site building refurbishments and that was one of the reasons for the required extensions of the temporary permissions was applied for, he said better facilities would encourage this as it would more long term secure leases and that this alone would require further major investment. Mr. Hulstrom enquired why some changes had been made to the renewals, this was explained as tidying up loose ends and no major changes were envisaged at this juncture. It was also stated that some form of social housing was on the agenda and that all local authorities would be briefed and fully consulted continuously throughout the period and that it was hoped that specific plans could be forwarded within twenty four months. As to the rail connection it was said that the freight terminal plans were not in their opinion feasible, therefore an extension was required whilst negotiations with network rail progressed into the provision of a passenger station for the site, this would be a significantly cheaper option as a rail 'flyover' would not be required. Mr. Monk enquired whether the provision of many extra jobs and also a passenger rail station and housing may have the potential to create more traffic issues on local roads, specifically Ermine Street through the villages especially as the District Policy had been that the area should be employment led, affordable housing was an issue, would it be a self contained community, the answer to this was no but that local infrastructure would have to be carefully scrutinised in association with any development proposals. In later stages it was advised that all the footpath links severed by the development would be re opened, this suggestion was warmly supported. This section was followed by a short question and answer session with one question being whether the developer would support a village access only legislation on Ermine Street, Mr. Monk observed that in the original applications dating back some ten years, a form of this was suggested by the Parish Council but strongly opposed by emergency services, the police and both County and District Authorities, so in a word 'don't hold your breath'. In finishing the representatives said that anyone wishing to visit the site to inspect the proposals, was welcome to do so by ringing Mr. Leathes for an appointment for someone to show them round. The chairman thanked them for attending and assured that the Council would strongly support the re development of the site</p>

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>and hoped to be kept well informed through regular consultation throughout the process.</p> <p>The next open item was the issue of the provision of a traveller site on the McDonalds site at Alconbury an issue which the chairman surmised was the reason for the high public attendance. At this stage Mr. Monk declared that he was severing his association with the District Council and as this was an open discussion and not a decision making process he was prepared to stay and assist the meeting with any questions that the residents may have, as when decisions were made at District level he would no longer be in their employ, that, was if there were no objections and there were none. Mr. Hoggett of Low road, led by saying that the parishioners were very disappointed with the Parish Councils response at the June meeting and that he felt they should be demonstrating that they are listening to the people who elected them and their views, to that end he said he had a petition signed by 500 villagers who were against the proposals, the chairman said that the Council were very active on the issue and that a final text for the Councils submission to the consultation was to be reviewed later on the agenda, he said he felt that the Council had taken into account many issues that were raised at that June meeting, Mr. Hoggett said that he and his committee felt that it was time these views were known, Mr. Pinner said it had to be appreciated that the Council were bound by many rules and regulations and that their response had to be carefully worded, although having the same issues at its centre thrust of the text. Mr. Hoggett was advised by Mr. Monk to send his petition to the head of planning services and to also contact the land owner with a view to sending them a copy also. Mr. Ryan questioned the reasoning for some of the objections, specifically in relation to the Gypsy Traveller site circular 01/2006, Mrs Bole on behalf of the petitioners explained at great length the reasoning but it was still not totally clear because of the wording of the circular that all the points were totally valid, although it was agreed that the vast majority of the petition had well thought and very pertinent points to make. It was reasoned that the non provision of authorised sites could lead to even more instances of illegal sites being established and that such sites cost the Country 18m pounds to clear up last year, this was the centre of the problem that the District faced, that together with government directives to provide such sites although this could change in the future with local authorities being charged with that responsibility. Mrs. Chalker asked why so many sites were designated for Huntingdonshire, Mr. Monk said it was because we were part of the 'Eastern Region' which had the highest concentration of travellers so was therefore perceived to create the greatest need, although the scale of need in Huntingdonshire was low compared with some neighbouring councils such as Fenland and South Cambs. Mrs. Gee wondered whether the fact that the development could cause a devaluation in local properties could be used as a factor, Mr. Monk advised that this could be 'a very dangerous road to tread' and cautioned against such a text. In the final analysis members agreed that the text of the Councils submission to the consultation should be published on the Parish Council website as soon as was practicable.</p>	
41.MINUTES	<p>Regarding the minutes of the 14<sup>th</sup> June 2010 Mr. Ryan asked for the following adjustments, Annual Parish meeting notes, delete phrase 'and this could mean up to 18 caravans at any one time'. Also replace the word 'sites' with 'pitches'. Agenda item 33, delete 'and grievance procedure'. With these alterations agreed he proposed approval of the minutes, this was seconded by Mr. Hulstrom, agreed by members so the chairman signed the minutes as a true and correct record of that meeting.</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
43. MEMBERS DECLARATION OF INTEREST	Mr. Monk declared an interest in Agenda item 48(b), with the same reasoning as from previous meeting, as this particular item was part of a decision making process. It was agreed that this item be delayed to the final agenda item so as Mr. Monk could leave prior to its discussion.	
43a CHAIRMANS REPORT	This had been circulated to members and was to be included in the Minute Book folder, the chairman intimated that the biggest single issue facing members was the management of the severely reduced budget and that between now and Precept time in November members should be giving consideration as to where the necessary cuts could be made as he was loathe to agree to an increase in the Parish Rate. In his report he also paid tribute to the significant service of over 100 year between them, to retired members Richard Turpin, Jim Butter, Mick Reynolds and Sarah Gifford.	
44. ACCOUNTS	The following monthly accounts were agreed for settlement on a proposal by Mr. Monk, seconded by Mrs. Parkin. EON Electric for July supply £59.16. Easiprint for July magazine £90.00. M. J. Newman, clerks July salary £199.46. M. J. Newman for maintenance work on Council property and flower planting this spring, including commodities purchased for the purpose. £395.16. The clerk reported no income for the period.	
45. RIGHTS OF WAY	The clerk reported that Mr. Smiths agent had requested a meeting with the rights of way committee in an endeavour to resolve the issues surrounding footpath 11 at the Grange at Great Stukeley, he said he had provisionally agreed to such a meeting and that this would be arranged when Mr. Raby returned from holiday. Mr. Ryan informed members that contact with the County in the matter of the PPP scheme had now been formalised with the clerk being named as contact.	
46. CONSTITUTION	Mr. Ryan reported that he was working on the substance of the Financial regulations and that he had recommendations to guide but that not all matters were pertinent to the Parish Council, he hoped to complete this work over the next two months. All other regulations including, freedom of information, grievance procedures, risk assessment, race relations etc; were to be studied by a committee of four members including M/s P. Ryan, R. Hulstrom, P. Hobson and Mrs Sly with a view of combining total requirements into a single document that could be reviewed annually.	
47. PLAY EQUIPMENT	Mr. Vincent reported that the Council had been awarded a grant by WREN for the proposed equipment at Great Stukeley, this amounted to £14,635 which as agreed left a balance of £3500 for the Council to fund. Mr. Monk proposed, seconded by Mr. Hulstrom a sincere vote of thanks to Mr. Vincent for all his hard work on this project, he was then to check all the conditions of the grant offer after which the clerk, as responsible financial officer was authorised to sign acceptance on the Councils behalf. Mr. Vincent then said he was very keen to assist with the project at Little Stukeley, this offer was gratefully accepted.	
49. TREE PLANTING	Mrs. Parkin reported that things were progressing nicely and that she was awaiting a call from Ms Halford to advise time of ordering and also planting instructions. There was some concern amongst members that no formal agreement was in place with Mr. Field, as this was considered to be beneficial to both parties, Mrs Parkin was asked to contact Ms Halford to seek advice as to how such an agreement should be worded. Mrs. Parkin said that she now had seven volunteers but required more if possible.	
50. DISTRICT ISSUES	Mr. Baker said that he had no significant issues to report.	
51. COUNTY ISSUES	Ms Kadic informed members via the clerk that the bridge crossing the brook in the centre of Alconbury would be closed for necessary remedial work between 8am & 5pm on the following Sundays, 18 <sup>th</sup> & 25 <sup>th</sup> July and 1 <sup>st</sup> August 2010	
53. ITEMS TO REPORT	Mrs Sly reported that she had received enquiries about the recent installation of a	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>swimming pool and ancillary building at a property in Ermine Street Great Stukeley as to whether a planning application had been received or whether the development actually required permissions, the clerk was asked to contact planning office to clarify the issue.</p> <p>Another issue raised was the amount of temporary signage advertising events that was now prevalent and also the fact that a lot was not removed after the event, this was to be referred to in the magazine.</p> <p>A complaint from residents about the amount of horse manure on pavements was raised again and it was agreed that with the large numbers of horses and ponies in the area, not all emanating from the villages, it was a difficult issue to address, the chairman said he would contact the BHS and the Pony Club to see if the problem could be mentioned in their literature to members, it was also to be mentioned in the magazine again.</p> <p>Mr. Monk raised an issue of water from a hydrant being regularly released from a site just inside the redundant base entrance at Great Stukeley, this flooding both footway and part of the highway, although inconvenient at present it could become dangerous in the winter, Mr. Pinner agreed to contact base authorities to seek the reasoning.</p> <p>Mrs. Parkin reported that on a recent visit there was instance of foul odours at the Brampton Service area , this she considered was emanating from the nearby recycling centre, the clerk was to contact Environmental Health at the District to report the matter.</p>	
48.PLANNING	<p>(a) Application 1000739S73 was for additional consultation on condition 1 of application 0801867FUL for extension to time limit to allow temporary uses to continue for a further five years, Mr. Hulstrom reported contact with the District had revealed that this was only consultation and that the Parish had already refused the application. It was advised that the application was to be the subject of a Development Control meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> July, it was agreed that M/s P. Ryan and R. Hulstrom should represent and speak on the Councils behalf at that meeting.</p> <p>(c) Application No 1000970LBC for the replacement of cracked cement render on the western gable at Waterloo Farm was approved on a proposal by Mr. Hulstrom, seconded by Mr. Monk.</p> <p>(b) Local Development Framework: Strategic Housing Land Availability (SHLAA) Update: Part C: Sites Assessments for Gypsy &amp; Travellers. As initially reported Mr. Monk for similar reasoning as per last months minutes, declared an interest and left the meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Ryan read from his original observations and members discussed the issues raised by the public earlier in the evening, it was agreed by the meeting that the planning group should formulate and finalise the Councils response then circulate it among planning group before submission to the District. It was also agreed that the text of the Council's submission should be placed on the Parish Council website as soon as practical, this submission was also be filed in the Parish Minute book, relevant to the July 2010 minutes. The list of items to form the basis of the consultation reply was:</p> <p><b>Foul Drainage</b>  <b>Traffic movements</b> re. Road speed limit  <b>Pedestrian/Cyclist safety</b> re. Speed limit and pedestrian crossing  <b>Basis of assessment of need</b> re. HDC should re-assess transit site requirement. If decoupled from RSS then HDC should re-assess need for transit sites HDC have assessed need for permanent sites, and are preferred, so provide these before investing in transit sites</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p><b>Enforcement of transit usage</b>, otherwise becomes a site for permanent residence</p> <p><b>Unsuitable</b> re. Noise and pollution from traffic, even for transit use</p> <p><b>Facilities in Alconbury are impractical to access sustainably</b> (foot/cycle)</p> <p><b>Disjointed site makes it difficult to screen</b> re. Visual impact</p> <p><b>Effect on co-sited business</b>, re. Visual impact</p> <p><b>Safety of children</b> re. Adjacent dual carriageway</p> <p><b>Insufficient/unsuitable space for residents to carry on their occupations</b></p> <p><b>Reasons it is unsuitable as a permanent site also apply if it is a transit site</b></p> <p>Also refer to strong local opinion against the site, evidenced by 500+ petition and referring to points in petition text &amp; mentioned in the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no space for horses &amp; dogs</li> <li>- not suited to preferred arrangement of caravans around a central space</li> </ul>	
54. NEXT MEETINGS	<p>On Monday 6<sup>th</sup> September 2010 at Little Stukeley village hall commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 4<sup>th</sup> October 2010 at Great Stukeley village hall commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 1<sup>st</sup> November 2010 at Little Stukeley village hall commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 6<sup>th</sup> December 2010 at Great Stukeley village hall commencing at 7.30pm.</p>	