

A meeting of the Stukeley's Parish Council held at Little Stukeley village hall on Monday 3rd June 2013 at 7.30.pm.

ATTENDANCE	Mrs. S. Parkin, Mrs. S. Smith, Mrs. N. Sly, P.Ryan, M.Monk, R. Hulstrom, P. Vincent, P. Hobson, County Councillor P. Ashcroft, District Councillor K. Baker and three members of the public.
OPEN MEETING	<p>Mrs. Bird from Little Stukeley explained that she had examined the plans for the proposed gypsies and travellers pitches on the old Megatron site and could see no appreciable differences to the plans supplied some eighteen months ago and that she hoped that the Parish Council may once again recommend refusal. Mr. Ryan explained that some subtle changes had been made, specifically concerning noise mitigation measures, this was to be achieved by the erection of a five foot high fence, although in his opinion this would have limited effect. He explained that he had been in consultation with a environmental noise officer at the District Council who had explained that although he agreed with Mr. Ryan, experience of an application in the south of the area which had been refused on noise pollution grounds by the Council, but that was subsequently overturned at an appeal tribunal, revealed that objections on noise pollution grounds may not stand up to scrutiny in this application. He, along with Mr. Monk advised that the Council were studying their previous response and that a robust planning based case would have to be forwarded if it had any chance of succeeding, that is providing the Council decided to again refuse the application when they addressed the issue in a later agenda item.</p> <p>Mr. Butter, from Great Stukeley, through the chair told Mr. Baker that there was a great deal of strong feeling opposing the introduction of a 'second bin' charge of £40 by HDC, he asked why and how it had been introduced. Mr. Baker explained that he was at the time Vice-Chairman of the District Council and as such did not vote, but stated that he was robustly opposed to the introduction of the charge, so much so that he had instructed District officials to collect his second bin as he was not prepared to pay the charge. He said that although the Overview and Scrutiny Panel were also opposed to the introduction, by virtue of the fact that the District was controlled by cabinet decisions that because of it's composition and the 'whip' system, it was not required to vote on the issue and it was passed as a matter of procedure. Mr. Baker was made very clearly aware that Parish members and community alike were completely disgusted by this method of decision making.</p> <p>Mr. Butter posed a second issue, 'Is there an active Planning Department' within the District Council, as in his opinion, in the local vicinity it looked to the layman, as if development seemed to take place in a hap-hazard manner to say the least, with any odd parcel of land being built on with no regard whatsoever to the need to provide infrastructure. He sited Peterborough and Bedford as examples of where the roads and services had been put in place prior to any development taking place. Mr. Baker observed that there was a Planning Department but unlike the two areas mentioned Huntingdon had no central government funding for such provisions.</p> <p>Mr. Ryan intimated that he was inclined to agree with Mr. Butter as he felt that the development of housing stock was continually based on financial income rather than the effective plan for future development and growth, he added that unfortunately there was no effective transport policy for the area, which in his and the Parish Councils view was an absolute must, considering the development proposals that were already 'on the table' ie; Northbridge, Washingley and Alconbury Weald. He said the worrying thing was that there</p>

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>appeared to be no ‘appetite’ to address these issues by any of the major authorities, from government level down to District and that the disturbing thought was that the local rural communities, those with the smallest voice, were those likely to be most seriously affected.</p>	
APOLOGIES	<p>Were received from H. Raby, away on business.</p>	
32. MINUTES	<p>On a proposal by Mrs. Smith, seconded by Mr. Ryan, the minutes of the meeting of the 13th May 2013 were approved by members and signed by the chairman.</p>	
33. MEMBERS DECLARATION OF INTERESTS	<p>Mr. Ryan and Mr. Hulstrom declared interest in the Alconbury Weald region because of their involvement in the 10k charity run to be held partly on that site. They also declared an interest in agenda item 37c for similar reasoning.</p>	
34. COUNTY ISSUES	<p>Mr. Ashcroft reported that he was still being ‘inducted’ into his role, as were up to 50% of councillors who were recently elected, he did explain however that as there had been no overall control in had been agreed at a recent meeting that those parties, other than the previously in control conservative group, had amalgamated to elect a new leader of a different persuasion, he said that for the next twelve months the council would still be run on a ‘cabinet’ basis as before, but then it would revert to the old ‘committee’ system run by individual chairmen. Mr. Monk said that the county were to be congratulated for their return to this, in his opinion, more democratic way of running a public authority. Mr. Ryan asked Mr. Ashcroft to supply as soon as practicable, the major port folio holders on the newly formed authority, this he agreed to do.</p>	
35.DISTRICT ISSUE	<p>(a) Mr. Baker observed that there was not a great deal to report. (b) On the issue of the ‘second bin charge’ Mr. Monk felt that the imposition of the charge was purely to achieve more income and as such he proposed a letter be sent to the District to say that the Parish Council deplores the decision to introduce the charge as it was felt that this counter productive and would increase ‘fly tipping’ and that there would be less re-cycling, it was to be added that there was considerable anger within the community and as such the Parish Council should actively encourage residents to return these second bins in an effort to get HDC to reconsider their decision. Both Mr. Ryan and Mrs Smith felt that this was a little strong and that residents should be advised that if they did not agree with the charge, they had the opportunity to return the second bin, as they felt that those who wished to continue with the bins should feel free to do so. Mr. Ryan also added that he felt that the charge of £40 may be excessive for a facility that may only be used three or four times in the summer and that HDC should be questioned as to how the figure of £40 was arrived at. Much debate followed but on Mr. Monks proposal, with an added phrase to enquire of the District as to what the basis for the charge was, supported by Mrs. Sly members voted four in favour, two against with one abstention, so the clerk was asked to communicate Mr. Monks proposed text to HDC.</p>	
36. ACCOUNTS	<p>(a)The following monthly accounts were agreed for settlement on a proposal by Mrs. Smith, seconded by Mr. Hulstrom and approved by the meeting EON Electric for May supply £60.29. Easiprint for June Magazine £195.00. M. J. Newman, clerks March Salary £159.46. net. Plus agreed office space allowances £28.00. 34SP.COM domain charges £47.00. AMN Painting, varnishing two village signs £56.00. T&S Gardening for grass maintenance £851.51. HMRC income tax £119.60. RECEIPTS Nil</p>	
36a.COUNCIL COMPUTER	<p>Mr. Hulstrom reported that he had been researching a suitable replacement computer for the council and with the agreement of the clerk he had identified a</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>lap-top as a possible alternative, at an approximate cost of £380 either from Amazon or John Lewis, he then proceeded to discuss the technicalities of such a machine and it's capabilities and the clerks lack of knowledge in this type of technology, which caused some amusement in certain circles, he agreed that if any tutorage was required he would along with Mr. Ryan, help the clerk in anyway possible. He furthermore suggested that he liaise with the clerk as to the type of equipment purchased, he was then given authority, on a proposal by Mrs. Sly, supported by Mr. Monk, to proceed with the purchase of a replacement unit up to a cost of £380.</p>	
<p>37. PLANNING</p>	<p>A. The questionnaire it was agreed could not be finalised until such time as Paul Foice of HDC had come to a Parish meeting to address members on HDC ideas for affordable housing in the Stukeleys.</p> <p>B. Application No 1300666FUL for change of use at the Megatron site for six pitches for gypsies and travellers.</p> <p>A lot of the dialogue for this application had been heard in the open meeting, but many more issues were raised, as was the Parish Councils original submission, after another lengthy debate, Mr. Monk proposed, seconded by Mr. Hulstrom and supported by all members that: The Stukeleys Parish Council recommends Refusal on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is not acceptable for any form of residential development as it is a relatively small site in open countryside, set away from settlements, surrounded by busy main roads. The traffic on these roads will only increase considerably as the development of Alconbury Weald gets under way. 2. There is no safe route from the site to local services including health centre, shop or school. 3. The site is prominent and such development would be visually intrusive and is especially inappropriate at the approach to the main access point for the Alconbury Weald Enterprise Campus, which is being rebuilt to a high design standard. 4. There is insufficient space on the site for the Gypsy/Traveller occupants to conduct their business which is an integral part of their lifestyle and culture. <p>The clerk was asked to communicate this submission to the case officer and Development control at HDC as soon as practicable.</p> <p>C. Mr. Ryan explained to members that the planning group had had an informal meeting with U&C to discuss their reaction to the PC responses to their initial planning application, he said a lot of the councils suggestions had been acknowledged but that a good few more had not, these included traffic issues and the lack of a link between housing development and business development, this implicated that housing development was not to be linked to job opportunities and in this particular area there seemed to be no will to address this issue. The phasing of development was not linked to the implementation of infrastructure measures but in part the council appreciated that such measures as A.14 and A.141 upgrades were not in the companies control. The nature of differing types of development in different site areas was generally supported. The PC were still pressing U&C to liaise with the County Council Education Department on a strategy for the provision of educational opportunities in the area north of Huntingdon as duplication would not be desirable. The PC were still robustly opposing the introduction of a second access onto Ermine Street as it was seen to not be necessary, unfortunately not an opinion held by the developers who seemed to place great stall on this entrance being brought forward. Another issue was the continued discussions about the proximity of the development proposals to the village boundaries of Little Stukeley and the</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>need for a green space corridor to protect it's identity. It had been identified that U/C were in the process of lodging a revised application sometime later this month. The meeting felt these informal meetings between the planning group and U&C served a real useful purpose and should be continued especially if as mooted these meetings could be specifically directed solely at the Stukeleys and their uniqueness by being the closest neighbouring community to the proposed development.</p>	
<p>38. INTERNAL AUDITORS REPORT</p>	<p>Following the receipt and reading of the internal auditors report and recommendations, on a proposal by Mr. Hulstrom, seconded by Mr. Monk and approved by members, the following changes were made to the Parish Council constitution.</p> <p>Cheque Stubs, it was now practice for the signatories to initial stubs also.</p> <p>Staff Appraisal , this was noted as not relevant in our case.</p> <p>Annual Parish Council Meeting, comment noted and this years meeting held in May.</p> <p>Minute Book, Section 137 payments will in future be recorded as paid under the powers of the 1972 act.</p> <p>The clerk already has delegated powers to spend up to £200 as per financial regulations, but this information will also be appended to standing orders as requested.</p> <p>Secret Ballot, point noted and procedure will be as directed, if requested correctly by a member, a secret ballot will be conducted.</p> <p>Chairman, it is noted that the chairman is required to sign a declaration of acceptance of offence, even if they are being re-elected to the position, also in each year each councillor will be asked to confirm that the register of interests form does not require amendment.</p> <p>Risk Management, noted, Council clerk does carry out periodic inspections of council assets.</p> <p>Insurances. Noted and the council is in the habit of conducting annual insurance cover matters.</p> <p>Allotments. Noted, when up and running the society will be asked to supply annual report and financial statement in time for the annual meeting.</p> <p>Financial Risk, noted and the clerk agrees to add cheque number and date to any financial total paid to cover petty cash expenditure in order to create an audit trail.</p> <p>Magazine, it was noted that it had to be insured that the advertising revenue did not exceed the cost of production of the magazine.</p> <p>Clerks Gratuity, it was noted, and the clerk has checked with democratic services at HDC and the gratuity at present would appear in order.</p> <p>Contractors. Noted and still observed that Council is required to obtain best value and ensure that selected contractor has all the public liability insurance required and is fit for purpose.</p>	
<p>39. RIGHTS OF WAY</p>	<p>Mr. Ryan said there was nothing to report, the clerk advised that bridleway four between the villages had recently been refurbished by a contractor working for the County Council. Still no news of grant aid request for footpath 13 though.</p>	
<p>40. ALLOTMENTS</p>	<p>A. Mr. Hulstrom reported that the hedge at the site had now been removed in readiness for the construction of the new access. He also said that in his view, now that planning permission had been secured there was no reason why the lease documents could not be signed, he said that he would seek to find out if the lease from Mills & Reeve was in the hands of Hunt Combe, the solicitors in Huntingdon. It was then agreed that the chairman be given delegated powers to sign on behalf of the council as soon as they were available.</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>B. Mr. Ryan said that U&C were in favour of an open meeting with the residents of Owl End to discuss the work schedule involved in setting the allotments up, including project starting date and daily working hours. Consideration was necessary as to where spoil from the site was to be transported, also incoming hardcore as well, the possible favoured route could be 'Pickles Way' thus avoiding large lorries using Owl End in this construction stage, although U&C may believe that it could be the better option in some cases to actually use Owl End during this construction phase which could last some two to three weeks in late June this year, however both Mr. Ryan and Mr. Hulstrom both favoured the personal approach to each and every resident because it could not be guaranteed that all could attend an open meeting, they agreed to progress this issue once a start date had been notified by U&C. An approximate handover dated was now needed as it was felt that this would galvanise the allotment society after what would appear to have been such a long period of inactivity. Mr. Vincent said he had contact details of all those who had initially registered an interest in an allotment and that as soon as a date had been given he would arrange a meeting in an effort to further progress the project, on a suggestion by Mr. Hulstrom and supported by all members it was suggested that once this meeting has been staged and interests renewed a bond of commitment of £20 should be levied from each prospective tenant.</p>	
41. TRAFFIC ISSUES	<p>(a) Mr. Monk reported that the group had not convened recently so nothing to report.</p> <p>(b) The recent introduction of very large roadside signs, specifically for the Stukeleys, on Ermine Street outside the business park warning of a bridge height restrictions over the railway and under the A.14 at Brampton Road, Huntingdon were the subject of a great deal of discussion, Mr. Ryan said he had contacted the contractor responsible for the erection of the signs who had explained via email(circulated) the reason for the size requirement, it was also intimated within that email that consultation had taken place prior to their erection, the clerk advised that this council most certainly had not been consulted and according to their representative, neither had the District Council. This explanation was not accepted and Mr. Monk added that these signs, of which there were several round Huntingdon, were a clutter and blight on the roadside and that an explanation should be sought from Cambridgeshire County Council as to why they authorised such large signage. Mr. Ashcroft was also asked to investigate the issue and he was given Emma Murden as a CCC contact dealing with this issue.</p> <p>Mr. Monk suggested that the 'temporary' signage outside the new base entrance north of Little Stukeley, should also be questioned in a similar manner.</p>	
42. PLAYING FIELD	<p>Mr. Vincent said that he had received confirmation that Awards For All funding source that our acceptance of grant receipt conditions had been received and that work authorisation was to follow. Mr. Raby reported through the clerk that Natural England had insisted that birds nesting in the hedge to be 'sided' had to be identified, Mr. Raby recommended that the works did not commence until after the nesting season, ie; late July. Mr. Vincent said he would advise the selected contractor accordingly.</p>	
43. POCKET PARK	<p>No further information.</p>	
44. ITEMS TO REPORT	<p>Mr. Vincent reported that there was still a serious problem with bird droppings on the swings at Gt. Stukeley, a decision on the purchase of a form of deterrent could be made at the next meeting.</p> <p>The Parish Council had been asked to prepare a display of there function within</p>	

ITEM	DETAIL	ACTION
	<p>the community, in the church at Gt. Stukeley on Open Garden Weekend, Mrs. Parkin agreed to set the display up.</p> <p>It was informed that for the upcoming 10k charity run that the police had decided to completely close Owl End for the race duration, some one & half hours, every resident of the area would be informed by letter.</p> <p>Mrs. Parkin said that on 29th September 2013, St. Bartholomew's were staging a 'Song of Praise' and that the Parish Council were asked to choose one reading and seven hymns, Mrs. Parkin agreed to look into this as well.</p> <p>Mrs Sly handed the clerk a copy of a letter a village resident had sent to District Councillor Darren Tysoe and District Councillor K. Baker on the subject of the introduction of a 'second bin' charge of £40, it was agreed that the resident be copied into any response from the Parish Council on the subject.</p>	
<p>45. NEXT MEETINGS</p>	<p>On Monday 1st July 2013 at the village hall, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 5th August 3013 at the village hall, Low Road, Little Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p> <p>On Monday 2nd September 2013 in the village hall, Ermine Street, Great Stukeley commencing at 7.30pm.</p>	