

**A meeting of the Stukeley's Parish Council held at Great Stukeley village hall on Monday 5<sup>th</sup> November 2012 at 7.30.pm.**

ATTENDANCE	Mrs. S. Parkin, Mrs. N Sly, Mrs. S. Smith, R. Hulstrom, H.Raby, P.Ryan, M.Monk, County Councillors Sir Peter Brown and Laine Kadic, Rebecca Britton, Tim Leathes & Nigel Hugill from Urban & Civic, M/s Hanlon, Haines, Billingsley, Rennie & Lusty representing M/s Savills, Phil Cox & Jo Haddock representing SMYFC and six members of the public.
APOLOGIES	Were received from P. Vincent, family commitment, P. Hobson, illness and District Councillor K. Baker, another meeting.
OPEN MEETING	<p>Ms Haddock representing the football club reported that training and matches were now taking place on the playing field. New goalposts had been purchased and erected. She added that although ferreting and organised shooting was still in force, rabbit control was proving a real challenge. She said that the formation of the mini pitch was progressing well and that the area was likely to be turfed next week. The poles for the lighting had been erected and that the portable changing rooms and toilets were also due to arrive next week and that these were the significant provisions required to conform to FA regulations. She also said that two Great Stukeley residents, Mr. Murkett and Mr. Rose had through their own companies sponsored two of the clubs teams. Ms Haddock said that it was their intention to complete the formalities with Mr. Hulstrom, of a rental agreement between the club and the council for the use of the facility. Mr. Monk said that his only concern was as to whether planning permission was required for the buildings, Mr. Cox said that they had been assured that it was not needed as the buildings had no permanent foundations, Mr. Monk advised that it would be pertinent to get the assurance written officially. Before they left they left a copy of their report with the clerk.</p> <p>Julie Magnus from Lodge Farm expressed to the members of Urban &amp; Civic and the Parish Council here annoyance about the forging of a new track across farmland at Grange Farm recently. She said there had been no notice given, no planning application made, no warning signs of excavation work, no protection barriers and no banksman employed on the site, an accusation she said that was backed by photo evidence. She accused U&amp;C of working a site in an unsafe manner. She added that the works had the capacity to disturb a pair of breeding Otters on the nearby reservoir and that a small number of Red Deer in the vicinity had not been seen since the works started. She asked, what was so important that the work had to be rushed through over a weekend period.</p> <p>Mr. Monk on behalf of the Council intimated that they had received notification on Thursday of last week and although they appreciated the reasoning behind the rush, they notified U&amp;C that they thought that the nature of the engineering works could require planning consent and that as such they could not condone the companies actions. Tim Leathes from U&amp;C said that he was extremely sorry for any distress that may have been caused and added that this is not the normal way his company behaved, he did however add that the services of a banksman had been paid for within the contract and that there had been one in attendance when he visited the site. He explained that they had been offered the opportunity of a visit by The Secretary of State for Communities &amp; Local Government and this was treated as a wonderful opportunity to display progress and potential in another effort to 'unlock' more funding from central government to progress the scheme which included the southern link to the A.141 and Huntingdon, the route allowed access within lands owned by U&amp;C from the old airbase to Grange Farm without using</p>

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

	<p>public roads through the villages and that the facility would allow travel from the different areas even if this was only in the region of one/two journeys per week. He said that unfortunately the need for planning permission had proved to be a 'grey area' and that because of the short notice of the proposed visit they had made the decision to go ahead. He said that before work had started surveying had taken place over several months by the various relevant bodies, so when the decision was made to forge this route it was placed in the least sensitive areas. He assured the meeting that it was their intention to make a 'retrospective' planning application as soon as practicable and that it should be available to the council in time for their December meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Hugill the company chairman explained that the 'buck stopped with him' and that this was not the way the company normally operated and that he hoped that all present would accept that the company had found itself in exceptional circumstances, although this did not excuse their actions at all, he endorsed that the necessary planning would be applied for and finished by offering his unreserved apology to all those who had been offended by the companies actions. Mr. Ryan reinforced that the Council would give it's full backing to the provision of the southern access at the earliest possible opportunity.</p> <p>Mr. Monk then introduced the team from M/s Savills who were representing the interests of St John's College, the owners of the land that was subject to a possible planning application, he pointed out that he and Mr. Hanlon were personal friends but this would have no bearing on the ensuing discussions, thus there would be no conflict of interest.</p> <p>Mr. Hanlon explained that they were sorry to hear of the councils disappointment at not being included in pre-development discussions but said that the primary reasons for these were to establish the parameters of any possible development and that they intended to involve the council in the period leading up to the planning process, even to the point that once they had formulated a development plan to promote they would hold an open exhibition in Great Stukeley village hall, hopefully towards the end of November. He also said it was quite clear within the Core Strategy development plan that this area was designated for 'employment' development. He then handed over to his colleagues to elaborate on their thoughts thus far.</p> <p>They said the area in question was to the north of the existing Ermine Street Business Park and alongside Ermine Street with the entrance thereto on Ermine Street. The nature of the development proposals was to reduce travel in the area with their estimates of 8% of in travel along Ermine Street, which equated to an extra vehicle every 2/3 minutes, 38/40 movements in peak times, 100/115 movements via the A.141 and 43/97 along the A.14. At a later stage in the process a detailed investigation would be conducted into traffic generation impacts on the main road junctions in the vicinity. All figures produced would be shared with Highway Agencies for verification purposes.</p> <p>In the case of Landscaping there would be a strong and robust buffer to guard the environmental outlook from Green End with a proposed tree belt some 20 to 30 meters wide on the northern edge of the site. There was also proposed green corridor alongside Ermine Street similar to that that had been suggested to front the housing proposals on the site the opposite side of Ermine Street, this together with much green space within the development that included plantings to 'soften' the impact of the buildings on this elevated site.</p> <p>As to design, their original thoughts were for the site to be fronted by B1 office development to be backed by B2 in the centre with the higher B8 developments to the rear, eastern edge of the development, but subsequent discussions with</p>	
--	---	--

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>District Officers had led to B1 at the top of the site on higher ground, B2 at the front and the B8 element on the southern edge boundary to the existing ESBP. This presentation was followed by questioning from members, Mrs Smith asked whether any mitigating measures were under consideration to ensure no extra impact on traffic flows through the villages, namely no right turn on leaving site and no left turn entering the site, the answer was not at this stage, was there any thought given now the two sites were proposed to be linked internally, to using a ‘one way’ system so as to only require one entrance and exit facility, again the answer was not at this stage. The address was backed up by descriptive diagrams which depicted what the applicants thoughts were as to the design and layout of the proposed development.</p> <p>Mr. Monk enquired whether any consideration had been given, in the light of traffic generation, to a contribution to any possible traffic calming along Ermine Street, again not at this stage but would consider it if it were to become a possible condition of development. He also remarked of the poor design quality of existing buildings at ESBP and would there be assurances of better design quality should the development proceed, the answer was quite definitely. He said that a great deal of thought should be given to the type and quantity of impact reducing measures needed to mitigate the effect of the rising buildings on the local landscape and environment.</p> <p>Mr. Ryan questioned whether consideration had been given to the ‘need’ factor in the light of the Alconbury Weald development, the answer was that they were looking to develop a site ‘earmarked’ in the local plan for employment development. The Savills people agreed to furnish members with detail of the evenings presentation and assured that the comments heard would be considered prior to making a formal outline application, they were thanked by the chairman for attending.</p> <p>Mr. Sly expressed his concern about the speeding traffic, the volume of traffic at all hours, emanating from the units at Grange Farm and the danger comprised in this narrow country lane. The clerk explained that contact with the enforcement dept; at the District had revealed existing planning permissions in the area and that it may be extremely difficult to prove that any regulations were being abused, it was strongly suggested that issue may be of an environmental health nature instead, this would require a log of all movements over a specified period, the clerk said he would supply to Mr. Sly the relevant contact details so the matter could be progressed. Ms Britton added that she was meeting with the tenant of Grange Farm later this week and that any relevant information on the notified nuisance would be of great help.</p>	
105.MINUTES	On a proposal by Mr. Monk, seconded by Mrs. Smith, the minutes of the meeting of the 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2012 were approved by members and signed by the chairman, as were the minutes of the Two Open Council meetings held on the 29 <sup>th</sup> and 31 <sup>st</sup> October 2012	
107. MEMBERS DECLARATION OF INTEREST	Mr. Hulstrom and Mrs Sly declared a possible interest in agenda item 112B, Preliminary enquiry by St. John’s College for land off Ermine Street as they lived in Green End but declared their intention to vote on the issue as councillors representing that area. Both also declared an interest in agenda item 112A(b), Mr. Juggins proposals for Green End, Mr. Hulstrom declared he would both take part in discussion and voting, whereas Mrs Sly stated that although she would enter the discussions she would not vote as the site in question bordered her property. Mrs Sly also declared her interest in agenda item 112F and said she would leave the meeting whilst that was discussed. Mr. Ryan declared his interest with Alconbury Weald issues as he was part of a	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
110. ACCOUNTS	<p>group who received preferential building rental arrangements on the site.</p> <p>(a)The following monthly accounts were agreed for settlement on a proposal by Mrs. Sly, seconded by Mr. Hulstrom and approved by the meeting EON Electric for October supply £60.29. Easiprint for November Magazine £145.00. M. J. Newman, clerks October Salary £159.57. net. Plus agreed office space allowances £28.00. T&amp;S Gardening for Grass maintenance work £688.22. Royal British Legion for wreaths £40.00.</p> <p>(b) Income The clerk reported the Receipt of the second instalment of the Precept amounting to £8000.00.</p>	
111.MAINTENANCE	<p>The clerk informed members that two litter bins were required, one in each village, adjacent to the play equipment. The cost of these being £269.98 inc; VAT. On a proposition by Mr. Hulstrom, supported by Mr. Monk the members authorised the clerk to purchase these.</p> <p>The Clerk was also authorised on a proposition by Mr. Monk, seconded by Mrs. Sly to purchase polyanthus plants to set around the two village signs. The clerk reported that he had in fact managed to complete a satisfactory repair on the seat beside the equipment in Little Stukeley play area.</p>	
112.PLANNING	<p>A. To consider alternative proposals for affordable development as an exception to agreed planning principles. This item was deferred to next months agenda because of time constrictions.</p> <p>B. St. Johns Land at Great Stukeley. This matter was the subject of the Open session and it was agreed by members that the planning group formulate a response, circulate among members and if assent is given the clerk would send the response to M/s Savills.</p> <p>C. Initial responses to the Alconbury Weald outline planning application. Mr. Raby thanked Mr. Monk for his comprehensive draft suggestions forwarded to members prior to the meeting, these thanks were endorsed by the entire council. Mr. Raby proposed, seconded by Mr. Hulstrom and supported by the meeting that these responses be used as the basis of an initial response to the District Council to be formulated by the planning group, the final document would be circulated prior to release by the clerk to the authority.</p> <p>D. Responses to the Huntingdon Local Plan Review. Once again Mr. Monk had provided a draft, Mr. Ryan said that he thought that the sustainability assessment should be commented on as well and require information on how some of the ‘assumptions’ were arrived at ,also state that it was considered that a close look be taken at the draft strategic option and also the draft development management policy as well, this response was again to be produced by the planning group, circulated prior to dispatch to the authority.</p> <p>E. Green End, Great Stukeley, this matter was discussed in the open session.</p> <p>F. Application No 1201557FUL for a replacement dwelling in Green End. Mrs. Sly left the meeting. Mr. Monk said that he saw no reason to refuse this second set of plans, as Mr. Sly requested to speak, Standing Orders were suspended to allow this. He said consultation with the District had revealed that the present design was more in line with their requirements for the area.</p> <p>It was agreed on a suggestion by Mr. Monk, seconded by Mr. Ryan to recommend approval of the application on the following grounds.</p> <p>The Development has no adverse impact on the rural countryside, the size and type of the proposal is commensurate with the size of the nominated plot, design and materials to be used are in keeping with surrounding properties. This farmhouse type of development is ideal in this rural environment.</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
113.RIGHTS OF WAY	<p>Mr. Ryan reported that he had received a complaint about an electric fence across footpath 1 at Little Stukeley, he said he was to go and visit the landowner in an effort to resolve the problem.</p> <p>Ms. Britton reported that the issues surrounding footpath 11 at the Grange Farm were still ongoing.</p> <p>On the matter of the newly forged track at Grange Farm it was agreed that new signage may now be required to direct the route of the bridleway.</p> <p>Mr. Monk reported that the surface of footpath 13 as it travels from Ermine Street to Beech Avenue has become very slippery and is ‘pooling’ in places after recent heavy rain. It was also reported that on the same path as it leaves Green End towards Great Stukeley park there is a footbridge with some broken deck timbers, as both issues were considered potentially dangerous the clerk was to email Simeon Carroll of the county to ask for prompt action.</p>	
114.ALLOTMENTS	<p>Mr. Ryan reported that the allotment lease details were to be made available shortly by Urban &amp; Civic and there were no other issues to report at present.</p> <p>Mrs. Parkin reported that the trees for the Community Wood were to be delivered to the Godmanchester nursery this week and that planting would commence as soon as it was considered pertinent, Urban &amp; Civic's advisors were to agree a planting regime that ensured that trees were planted in the most beneficial manner so as to achieve maximum growth potential.</p>	
115.TRAFFIC	<p>Mr. Monk reported that the group's next meeting was on 13<sup>th</sup> November and one of the main agenda issues would be a discussion on traffic issues associated with the Alconbury Weald development proposals.</p> <p>A report was received that foliage from an adjacent hedge was obscuring motorists' view of the interactive speed sign entering Little Stukeley from the north, the clerk was to report the matter to the County Council, in the same report concerns were registered about noise and also mud on Low Road &amp; Mill Road as a result of potato harvesting operations, the complainant was to be assured that the farmer has intimated that the operation is now ended and also it is noted that the road has been recently cleaned up with a power brush, an operation for which the clerk has thanked them.</p>	
116.PLAYING FIELD	<p>It was reported that the children of Mr. Rose were using quad bikes in the field, Mrs. Parkin agreed to visit the gentleman to ask him to stop his children doing this. Now that there were organised football teams operating in the field it was agreed that the matter of rabbit control should be further investigated to see if it was feasible to ‘rabbit fence’ the field, the clerk was to ask Mr. Vincent if he could find out whether there was any possibility of this being grant funded.</p> <p>As there was concern about the football club having temporary buildings behind the pub it was thought it may be pertinent to enquire whether planning consent was in fact required, Mr. Monk agreed to make the enquiries.</p>	
117. ITEMS TO REPORT	<p>All matters covered in other agenda items.</p>	
118. NEXT MEETINGS	<p>On Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2012 at the village hall, Low Road, Little Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm</p> <p>On Monday 7<sup>th</sup> January 2013 at the village hall, Low Road, Little Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 4<sup>th</sup> February 2013 at the village hall, Low Road, Little Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 4<sup>th</sup> March 2013 at the village hall, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 at the village hall, Low Road, Little Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 13<sup>th</sup> May 2013 the ANNUAL PARISH MEETING followed by the</p>	

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DETAIL</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	ANNUAL PARISH COUNCIL MEETING at the village hall, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley commencing at 7.00pm.	