

A meeting of the Stukeley's Parish Council held at Great Stukeley village hall on Monday 4th March 2013 at 7.30.pm.

ATTENDANCE	Mrs. S. Parkin, Mrs. S. Smith, P.Ryan, M.Monk, H. Raby, R. Hulstrom, Mrs. N. Sly, the County Councillors, the District Councillor and three members of the public.
OPEN MEETING	There were no questions from the members of the public present.
APOLOGIES	Were received from P. Hobson for personal reasons and Mr. P.Vincent who was away on business.
158.MINUTES	On a proposal by Mrs. Smith, seconded by Mr. Monk, the minutes of the meeting of the 4 th February 2013 were approved by members and signed by the chairman.
159. 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 both he and Mr. Hulstrom declared interest in a similar region because of their involvement in the 10k charity run to be held partly on that site. Mr. Hulstrom and Mrs Sly declared an interest in agenda item no 163Aa but as councillors for the area declared their intention to take part in the discussion on that matter, furthermore both Mrs Sly and Mr. Hulstrom declared an interest in agenda item 163B and Mrs Sly also declared she would not vote on that matter.
160. COUNTY ISSUES	Sir Peter informed that the County Rate increase had been set at 1.99% for the coming year. He also reported that the link road NW of Huntingdon was starting shortly and that a completion date was expected in 14 months namely 2014. Mr. Monk enquired whether Sir Peter had found out the County Councils policy on the A.14 viaduct, the reply was no, even though it was believed that the District Council policy was for its removal. It was also stated that the current strengthening work on the structure was costing an estimated 8-12 million pounds but should last 25 years, although this information was not welcomed Laine Kadic said the work was urgent and had to be done to keep it usable in the immediate future.
161.DISTRICT ISSUES	Mr. Baker informed that the District Council had increased their rate by what amounted to £5 per year per Band D. property.
162. ACCOUNTS	(a)The following monthly accounts were agreed for settlement on a proposal by Mrs. Smith, seconded by Mr. Raby and approved by the meeting EON Electric for February supply £60.29. Easiprint for March Magazine £165.00. M. J. Newman, clerks February Salary £159.57. net. Plus agreed office space allowances £28.00. M.J. Newman for clerks holiday entitlement for 2012/13 £197.40. T&S Gardening for maintenance £132.00. HMRC for income tax £168.97. Clerks Office Expenditure Jan/Mar plus varnish for village sign £56.38. RECEIPTS The Stukeleys Magazine Account £416.39. this was the amount of money donated by Mr. Cox from the original bank account for the initial parish magazine which was edited and produced by his late wife Pauline.
163. PLANNING	Aab. On this matter it was agreed that the questionnaire should be circulated to every member of the villages on the electoral roll and that this could require the production of some 1000 individual papers, it was therefore agreed that the planning group be charged with the responsibility of instructing Ms Easiprint to produce this quantity for circulation later this month or early next month. B. Planning Application 1300233FUL to re-organise porch, entrance and bathroom over; front conservatory to include first floor extension and rebuilt east wing to include single storey extension at 14. Green End. This matter was

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>discussed extensively and it was resolved on a proposal by Mr. Monk, seconded by Mr. Ryan to approve the application giving the following reasoning.</p> <p>The Council are led to believe the works will be completed in old stock Cambridge bricks and tiles and suggest that this should be a condition. The alterations are likely to improve the quality of this property both internally and externally, it will also improve the properties thermal footprint. Here is no adverse impact either on the street scene or adjacent open countryside. The development is also in keeping with the existing character of Green End. The Council has not received any letters of objection from neighbouring properties.</p>	
164.RIGHTS OF WAY.	<p>Mr. Ryan reported that progress on the diversion of footpath 11 had been slow due to the need to preserve adjacent archaeology. Presently we are awaiting confirmation from CCC rights of way that a consequent minor alteration to the route is acceptable. The clerk, supported by Ms Kadic reported that the councils request for grant aid to improve footpath 13 would be decided upon by the County Council next month. Mr. Ryan reported that through his involvement with the Market Town Strategy he was experiencing huge difficulties, especially in his efforts to establish improvements for cycling routes through those areas.</p>	
165.ALLOTMENTS.	<p>A. Mr. Ryan referred to the planning application drafted by Lock & Co on behalf of the Parish Council for the erection of the central building, allotment layout and associated services on the proposed new site in Owl End, which he had circulated to all members prior to the meeting, he asked for Council support for the submission of this document to the Huntingdonshire District Council Planning Authority at a cost of £385, Mr. Monk supported this motion. In a subsequent vote, five members were in favour with one against and one abstention, accordingly the motion was approved. Mr. Ryan, with the support of Mr. Monk and Mr. Raby, then intimated that he was extremely disappointed that the motion had not received total support, as it was a Parish Council Application he felt that it should have been supported by all members especially after the extensive discussions that had been held previously and the enormous support given by Urban & Civic, through their agents, at no cost at all to the Parish, he said that taking this all into account and including the huge commitment he had devoted to the project, that unless it was to receive universal support he felt, at that precise moment, that he could no longer continue with the project. There followed a protracted debate which revealed that the two members that failed to support the motion were principally concerned about the proposed clubhouse and/or opportunity for individual sheds. They appeared unlikely to change their position and support the plans as they were even though one member who had previously voted against said upon second thoughts they could change their opinion to abstention. This still did not satisfy Mr. Ryan's concerns, but it was accepted that a decision had been made and that it would not be appropriate to make changes to that decision. It is also recorded at this point that all members supported the principle of developing allotments, but this was not voted upon. Mr. Hulstrom intimated that he felt it should be recorded that any application should not preclude the possibility of the positioning of individual plot 'sheds' providing they received the approval of both the Parish Council and the Allotment Committee, this proposal was not voted upon. Mr. Monk interjected that as Mr. Ryan, whom he had supported wholeheartedly, was not prepared to continue, that the members who could not</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>support the motion be asked to forward the matter with Urban & Civic, this again was not voted upon.</p> <p>After much more discussion it was agreed that the application as it presently stands should be progressed by Lock & Co and then forwarded after the clerk had signed on behalf of the Council, to the District Authority, Mr. Hulstrom agreed to take these matters forward, hopefully with the valued assistance of Mr. Ryan.</p> <p>Whilst members unanimously praised and thanked Mr. Ryan for all his work they urged him to re-visit his decision in due course and hopefully change his position on the issue.</p> <p>B. The matter of the lease agreement was still under review and Urban & Civic were in the process of amending the document to take into account some of the observations made by Mr. Ryan & Mr. Hulstrom.</p>	
166.TRAFFIC ISSUES	<p>Mr. Monk said that he felt that traffic issues had been adequately covered in the item on the proposed village questionnaire. He added that the next issue that the group intended to address was a new signage strategy for the area in an effort to control traffic flows in the immediate area of the new Alconbury Weald development. Mr. Raby, supported by the chairman, observed that the new base entrance to the north of Little Stukeley had in their opinion served to reduce traffic flows through the villages.</p>	
167.PLAYING FIELD	<p>As Mr. Vincent was not in attendance there was no update to report on this matter.</p>	
168.COUNCIL WEBSITE	<p>Mr. Ryan with the help of Mrs. Sly had reviewed the options that were available for the introduction of a new Parish website and had agreed the most compatible and theme suitable for the purpose was a theme called ‘Incredible’ at an agreed price of £500 from Guava Design, they had also agreed that a test site be set up with the Councils existing host so that all members would be able to view the outcome prior to any final decision being made. They were asked to continue this program of work in the effort to secure a satisfactory conclusion. Members again recorded their thanks for the efforts of the two members on this project. Furthermore it was agreed that as this project was a natural extension to the information provided through the parish magazine that the monies recently received from the original parish magazine should be designated to fund the process.</p>	
170.ITEMS TO REPORT		
171. NEXT MEETINGS	<p>On Monday 8th April 2013 at the village hall, Low Road, Little Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 13th 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 3rd June 2013 at the village hall Low Road, Little Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 1st July 2013 at the village hall, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p>	

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

An informal meeting of the Stukeleys Parish Council Planning Group held at Little Stukeley village hall on Monday 25th March 2013 at 7.00pm

ATTENDANCE	M/s M. Monk and P. Ryan, Mrs. S. Smith, District Councillor K. Baker and Representing Huntingdonshire District Council Planning Department M/s Andy Moffat and Andy Brand.
PLANNING	<p>The essence of the staging of this meeting was for the District Officials to informally update members on the latest position with the two ‘live’ planning applications referring to the land known as ‘Northbridge’ beside Ermine Street in Great Stukeley, namely applications No’s 1001712OUT for 1021 dwellings and 0500526OUT for 1050 dwellings and both for access, primary school, local centre, community building, footway/cycle bridge, public open space, landscaping and associate works. Mr. Moffat stated that the site was allocated in the District Councils statutory plans and that the Local Plan Review as emerging was showing that the full site of over 1000 homes would be needed to meet demand even with the Alconbury Weald proposals. He explained that both parties had now submitted a revised transport assessment which had been accepted by both the County Council and the Highways agency as being acceptable, indicating that they would not object on traffic grounds. The Highways Agency had moved from a position of “Nil detriment to the A.14” to one of “Limited Impact”. He added that within both sets of 106 proposals, also submitted, there was no provision for any contribution from that fund to support further traffic calming measures along Ermine Street through the two villages as it was considered that that route had sufficient capacity to accept any extra traffic that may be generated. He explained that because of government changes to the Section 106 requirements and the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy ‘secondary education’ would now be dealt with through CIL rather than a 106 agreement. The provision of a community liaison leader or the provision of external footpath links, the offer of ‘warden support’ at Hinchingsbrooke Park had been withdrawn, However, both applications proposed direct footpath links to Hinchingsbrooke Park, although, the District Councils SPD on developer contributions did not require improvements to the footpath network beyond the development site. It was further explained that the new CIL funding of a “meaningful” proportion(15%) would now be allocated to Huntingdon Town Council as the site was now in that Councils area.</p> <p>Mr. Moffat explained that the new section 106 proposals were now out to consultation and that period closed on 4th April although this had been extended to allow for the Parish Councils meeting on 8th April after which the District could compile their recommendations to place before the Development Control Panel, hopefully sometime in May.</p> <p>Mr. Moffat indicated that the main agencies (HDC, CCC, HA) generally can see no major objections to either scheme. SPC members asked, therefore, in what way they might be able to affect the planning outcome. In reply, comments are particularly invited on the content and ‘triggers’ for S.106 items, for example in requiring the proposed bus service to be funded until it is at break-even, rather than until the point at which it was expected it would be at break-even. After further discussion it also transpired that the masterplans are indicative and it may be possible to influence, within reserved matters, layout of the site. However, the provision of primary school places for Stukeleys children in the proposed 2FE school cannot be guaranteed and HDC have no means to require the developers to provide improved footpath/cycleway links between the site and the neighbouring areas.</p>

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>The Stukeleys members registered their frustration and disappointment of the fact as they saw it ‘that village residents were likely to get all the negatives from this development so close to our communities and as things stand non of the benefits’.</p> <p>Mr. Moffat said he totally understood the local feeling but explained that the latest regulations would make it extremely difficult for any local authority to turn down any such application especially as they were now, technically speaking, supported by both major highway authorities.</p>	