

**A meeting of the Stukeley's Parish Council held at Little Stukeley village hall on Monday 7<sup>th</sup> January 2013 at 7.30.pm.**

ATTENDANCE	Mrs. S. Parkin, Mrs. S. Smith, H.Raby, P.Ryan, M.Monk, P. Vincent, R. Hulstrom, Mrs. N. Sly, Rebecca Britton and fifteen members of the public, together with three members of the planning team from Savills who are working on behalf of St. Johns College in promoting the development of a further business park on Washingley Farm land at Great Stukeley.
OPEN MEETING	<p>The chairman invited members of the Savills team to address the meeting on any issues they had re-visited in their previously advised proposals for the Washingley Farm site, in the wake of the two open public exhibitions they had staged in the villages. They stated that the two exhibitions had been well attended with 65 visits from interested parishioners. It was added that some changes had been made to the proposals.</p> <p>Discussions had been held on transport related issues with the District Council, County Council and the Highways Agency and were still ongoing, the main issues being impact assessments in three established critical areas, namely the Spittals Junction and A. 14, the A. 141 and Ermine Street through the villages, in these ongoing discussions the added possible impact of the proposals for the Northbridge site and Alconbury Weald also had to be factored. Other issues were the options of 'only right turn in' and 'only left turn out' other measures for site of a robust travel plan and dedicated 'car sharing', other specific issues including 'junction impacts' at Green End and 'one way travel system' on site were also being considered, it was said to have been agreed with agencies that the final site completion would remain reliant on the A.14 upgrade and its projected implementation in 2018 and that only 60% of the proposed build phase would be achievable prior to any upgrade. Mr. Hulstrom advised that he would be personally satisfied if they could demonstrably prove that the measures that had suggested could achieve a 40% reduction in the traffic impact originally envisaged, he also added that they should still be considering one entrance and one exit to Ermine Street and the A.141, to which the reply was, they did not wish to encourage 'rat running' through the new proposals. Mr. Monk interjected, why was it then considered that whilst, apparently, 'rat running' through the estate was not considered acceptable, why was it then considered acceptable through our villages, he also asked if there were any figures as to the number of journeys through our villages that were generated by the existing business park and if these were not available, efforts should be made to seek that information as in their own words their new proposals would generate an extra journey every two minutes along Ermine Street. Mr. Monk stated that St. Johns College had a responsibility to assess the impact of the existing business park, having profited from the sale of the land.</p> <p>In a reply to Mr. Ryan it was stated that they would expect to make an employment based application before the end of February.</p> <p>A question asked by a member of the public was, are there sufficient car parking spaces allowed within the development, because with the existing that was patently not the case with much on road parking this could then lead to unauthorised parking in Green End if insufficient space was provided, the reply was that spaces would be provided as per the District Council building specifications.</p> <p>Mr. Vincent observed that the existing site had empty buildings as did similar sites in St. Neots and St. Ives, although better times were forecast, was the development need demonstrably shown especially now with the Alconbury</p>

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

	<p>Weald proposals getting ‘Enterprise Zone’ status, the reply as before was the HDC core strategy proposals suggests that there is a requirement for this type of development to the north of Huntingdon. Mr. Monk observed that in line with the Parish Councils views, the District were now suggesting a policy rethink which would involve a change to housing development on this site.</p> <p>The team also advised that although no change was envisaged to the northern boundary buffer zone of 50m they were to implement some changes on the Ermine Street boundary side, this was to increase the green space in that area to 80m at the northern extremity, lessening to 50m towards the site entry point and the boundary with the existing park, this was to be achieved by ‘tightening’ up the proposals within the development. To make the green space more attractive there would be selective tree planting within this belt as well as on site in the green corridors.</p> <p>Mr. Ryan observed that the on site ‘green corridors’ were then under stress and in his opinion did not meet the ‘spirit’ of a green corridor space. Mr. Monk suggested they should work with adjoining landowners to secure better landscaping.</p> <p>A member of the public observed that in their opinion, even though the future for this area looked to be economically vibrant, they felt that the only way for an A.14 upgrade would be via an injection of private finance, which could in turn be difficult to source. Ms Magnus said she thought a condition of the proposals should be entrance to the site for workforce should be by ‘guided bus’ only with special concessions for disabled.</p> <p>In answer to another question it was stated that it was envisaged that some 2250 jobs could be created when the site became fully operational but that this would be achieved by stage development which could stretch to ten years.</p> <p>At this stage the chairman closed discussion, thanked Savills for their attendance and they left the meeting.</p> <p>Mr Day raised the issue of the proposed development of the Team Plant site, he explained he was not opposed to housing being developed on the site but only to the size and type of houses proposed which would in his opinion completely dominate and overshadow his Swan &amp; Salmon property next door and would have a detrimental impact on its listed building setting. There would also be an unacceptable loss of privacy on his garden area, similar reservations were expressed by his neighbour Mr. Dean. Mrs Gee said that although she supported housing on the site she was concerned about the design and size of the properties. Now that traffic calming was in place, the services such as refuse collection, could not access site and because of the close proximity of the traffic island to the proposed entrance would find it near impossible to stop on Ermine Street. As the area had previously been a manufacturing site, then a lorry transport garage it was suggested that a site survey should be insisted upon.</p> <p>Mr. Vincent suggested that any perceived drainage issues could be addressed by the installation of an on site storm water collection tank system. They were all assured that members would take their comments into consideration when making their recommendations to the Local Planning Authority. Mr. &amp; Mrs Wilson from Church Way wanted to know about who had been making enquiries of the Council as to what they were doing on the land beside Ermine Street in Little Stukeley, the clerk answered that an enquiry had been made and that it was the duty of the Council to investigate all requests, he added that he had visited the couple on the matter and that their explanations had been accepted by the Council and that no further action was envisaged.</p> <p>Mrs Gee remarked that the new bus service for the villages was a great success</p>	
--	---	--

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>and asked, now that more people were using the service, whether the council might consider the provision of a bus shelter on the west side of Ermine Street in Little Stukeley, she was told her suggestion would be noted.</p> <p>Ms Magnus from Lodge Farm proceeded to read at length a list of her concerns about the lack of the retrospective planning application for the newly formed track across Grange Farm and the reasons for her concerns about the track, after this lengthy dialogue she was informed that the council required a copy of this document for their records and that the application was on it's way to the Council and was expected in the next few days, Ms Britton on behalf of U&amp;C said that she would also want to be copied the document to give her the opportunity to make comment.</p>	
APOLOGIES	Were received from P. Hobson for personal reasons, apologies were also received from both County Councillors and the District Councillor.	
133.MINUTES	On a proposal by Mr. Raby, seconded by Mr. Ryan, the minutes of the meeting of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> December 2012 were approved by members and signed by the chairman.	
134. MEMBERS DECLARATION OF INTEREST	Mr. Ryan declared his interest with Alconbury Weald issues as he was part of a group who received preferential building rental arrangements on the site, also a non prejudicial interest in agenda item 138C, after a lengthy discussion Ms Monk, R. Hulstrom and Mrs Parkin also disclosed a similar reaction to the same agenda item.	
135.COUNTY ISSUES	No Councillors present	
136.DISTRICT ISSUES	Mr. Baker was not at the meeting.	
137. ACCOUNTS	<p>(a)The following monthly accounts were agreed for settlement on a proposal by Mrs. Smith, seconded by Mr. Ryan and approved by the meeting EON Electric for December supply £60.29. Easiprint for December Magazine £145.00. M. J. Newman, clerks December Salary £159.57. net. Plus agreed office space allowances £28.00. and Office Expenditure Sept/Dec £77.10 One-Com for magazine website £20.16 Alan Summerfield for verge cutting £300.00</p> <p>(b) Income Magazine Advertising £89.50.</p> <p>(c) The clerk then produced for members bank reconcilliation figures and budget update figures for the three month period ending 31<sup>st</sup> December 2012, both sets of figures were accepted in their entirety by members.</p>	
138.PLANNING	<p>A. Mr. Monk reported that the planning committee, because of the Christmas break had had insufficient time to compile the questionnaire discussed last month. It was agreed a new format should be used for a questionnaire in which parishioners were asked, if and what development they would like to see in the villages, was there a perceived need for some social housing in the parish and finally what, in view of all the new development proposals locally, would parishioners like to see in the form of re-enforced traffic calming through the two villages, he said they would hope to have a draft available for the next meeting.</p> <p>B. It was generally agreed that as the document only arrived just after Christmas, not everyone had had time to study the implications, so the issue was to be placed on the February agenda. Mr. Monk did however venture to the meeting and Ms Britton in particular that possibly Urban &amp; Civic should consider withdrawing one of the main stumbling blocks to their application, namely the proposed new access onto Ermine Street, in an effort to placate the feelings of the local residents. Mr. Monk also informed members that there was a Joint Parish Councils Liaison Group meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup> February where the document would be discussed and said that he and Mr. Ryan would report that meetings judgements to the Parish Council at their meeting later that day.</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>C. Application No 1201935FUL to develop two new houses on the Team Plant site at Little Stukeley. After much discussion it was decided on a proposal by Mr. Monk, seconded by Mr. Ryan that the application be refused on the following grounds. The excessive scale of the two houses would have an unacceptable impact on the listed building setting of the Swan &amp; Salmon. It would seriously impact into the privacy of both the Swan &amp; Salmon and 1A Low Road. Due to the close proximity of the traffic calming island on Ermine Street to the proposed entrance and the necessity for service vehicles to park off site, traffic flows could be seriously impeded.</p> <p>It was considered that the development in it's present form would pose a detrimental impact on the adjacent village conservation area.</p> <p>The Council are at length to advise that they are certainly not against the re-development of this site for housing but just the magnitude of the present proposals.</p>	
139.RIGHTS OF WAY.	<p>On a proposal by Mr. Ryan, the chairman suspended standing orders so that Ms Britton could engage in this agenda item. Ms Britton informed members that the archaeological people and the County had agreed a proposed re-route of footpath 11 at Grange farm that avoided the ridge and furrow, they had agreed the line of both the route and the fencing, the contractors had been informed to be ready to erect the fencing and that an official planning application would be lodged later this week.</p> <p>As for as the barrier gate in Owl End she said that she envisaged that this would be placed at a similar time, hopefully in April, as the allotment became a reality.</p> <p>The clerk reported that he had submitted a grant application to the County Council for the required works on footpath 13 at Great Stukeley.</p>	
140.ALLOTMENTS	<p>Mr. Ryan reported that provisional plans had been supplied by agents at Oundle on a 'pro-bono' basis and that the design appears to have been well received by all parties, he added that it was now the time to get a quantity surveyor to price the project to ensure that the Council could both warrant the outlay and the seek finance, Ms Britton said she could hopefully get such a person, to again work on a 'pro-bono' basis.</p> <p>He also advised that he and Mr. Hulstrom were to meet a local firm of solicitors, also on a 'pro-bono' basis to go through the lease proposals, having said that he added that the solicitors still required two councillors to sign documentation regarding their terms, it was agreed that he and Mr. Hulstrom could do this on the Councils behalf.</p>	
141.TRAFFIC ISSUES	<p>Mr. Monk said that he nothing to report.</p>	
142.PLAYING FIELD	<p>Mr. Vincent reported that he had experienced a great deal of difficulty in securing firms to quote for the rabbit fencing scheme, however he had acquired one quotation for the work which was for a measured 430m of fencing at a cost of £4000 and that there were lottery grants available for this type of scheme, he added that contact with Sport England had revealed that they would only look at funding schemes of 10k or over. Mr. Raby said that he thought that the existing fence should be removed and the hedge cut back prior to the work taking place, Mr. Vincent agreed to seek a quote for this additional work. Mrs. Parkin reported that she had visited the parents of the children who had been seen on quad bikes in the field and that they had apologised and assured it would not be allowed to occur again.</p>	
144.ITEMS TO REPORT	<p>On the matter of the Parish Website and the complaints that it's content was sub standard and out of date, Mr. Ryan said unfortunately he had to agree but that to his work and other commitments to Parish Council business he had not</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>had any time to undertake the updating process, Mrs. Sly said that she would endeavour to update the site in the coming weeks if Mr. Ryan supplied her with all the detail on how to access the site for this purpose.</p> <p>Mrs. Sly said she had been contacted on several occasions on the matter of safe access to the new play equipment and the field, she added that she felt that the only possible answer was some form of signalled pedestrian crossing, Mr. Monk observed that this very issue could be covered by the aforementioned questionnaire on traffic calming as the problem could be where to site such a crossing as similar issues of safety could be associated with the village hall, there were no similar problems in Little Stukeley as there was only one site where the introduction could be feasible.</p> <p>As Mrs Smith and also Mrs Sly were not satisfied with the County agents judgement on the hedges overhanging footpaths in specified sites in both villages the clerk was instructed to ask them to return to site and explain why the County had taken no action.</p> <p>The matter of works in a field beside Ermine Street in Little Stukeley had been dealt with by the clerk in an earlier report to the meeting.</p>	
145. NEXT MEETINGS	<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 ANNUAL PARISH COUNCIL MEETING at the village hall, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley commencing at 7.00pm.</p> <p>On Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2013 at the village hall Low Road, Little Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 1<sup>st</sup> July 2013 at the village hall, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p>	