

Thriplow Parish Council

Minutes of the Annual Parish Council meeting held on Monday 13th July 2009 in the Village Hall at 7.30 pm.

Present:

Councillors: Kevin Clarke, Anthony Cooper, David Easthope, Jane Gough, Barbara Pointon, Derek Pinner, Tim Spicer, Terry Smith, Colin Rothwell
County Cllr. Tim Stone
District Cllr: Peter Topping
Clerk: Pat Easthope
Others: Martyn Corbett, Mark Brogan, Marc Carmel, Stephen & Kim Woolford, Mark Bond, Carol Clarke, Kevin Rochfort, Philip & Vivienne Dondi, Tony & Karen Hornbuckle

Action

-
- 1. Apologies for Absence:** Ian Dewar (CPALC) who had been asked to attend by a Heathfield resident
 - 2. Minutes of the Annual Parish Council meeting held on 11th May 2009**
The minutes, having previously been distributed, were agreed as a correct record and were signed by the chairman.
 - 3. Matters Arising from the above minutes, not otherwise covered by the agenda**
None

At this juncture the chairman closed the meeting in order to allow members of the public to speak. He reminded them that they can only speak about items that are on the agenda.

The main points mentioned, in no particular order, were:-

Kim Woolford: Nobody wants anything on the public open space; everything put on the field previously had been vandalised; she understood the childrens vote was for play equipment to go on the small play areas but following a vote by the children for goal posts and a basketball hoop an e-mail from Cllr Clarke said decision had been made to put goal & basketball hoop on the POS, a subsequent e-mail from Cllr Pinner said nothing had been decided; Cllrs Pinner & Clarke had been invited to a meeting of residents and had declined.

Councillors responses to the above points were:- It was felt that those present were representing a minority of Heathfield residents, mainly from Pepperslade. The goalposts and basketball hoop suggested are built to minimise vandalism. Cllr Clarke apologised if his e-mail had been misleading, but Cllr Pinner said his later e-mail corrected this and no decision could have been made because the parish council had not met since the children's vote. Cllr Pinner felt that it would have been wrong to attend a meeting of just a few residents and that the correct place for discussion was the parish council meeting. He has spoken to Jane Lampshire, SCDC's sports development officer who deals with sport for older children and she had said that goalposts and basketball hoop should be at least 100m from any house - the northwest corner of the POS was 110m from the nearest house. There is not room on the smaller play areas for this equipment and also the Parish council do not own the play area off Queensway, this is owned by the Heathfield Residents Association.

Mark Brogan:objects to an area being cordoned off for sport, thus preventing access to others; said a previous survey showed the majority wanted the POS to be left alone and asked how children could turn around a previous vote by adults which revealed that only 1% wanted a sports pitch.

Councillors responses to these points were:- It was not proposed to cordon off any area. The sports pitch referred to in an earlier survey was a multi-purpose sports pitch which was not now being proposed. Play equipment had been voted for by the

residents and a subsequent children's vote had been taken asking them exactly what equipment they wanted. Older children had voted for goal posts & basketball hoop. 334

Marc Carmel: no sports facilities were wanted on the POS

Karen Hornbuckle: People voting in the survey had voted against goalposts and a basketball hoop, she felt there should be another vote to see whether residents actually wanted this play equipment on the POS, to which Cllr Pinner replied that there could not be a referendum on everything.

Kevin Rochfort: said that he understood children had been told off for playing football on the POS. There is a big difference between a full pitch and the goal posts & basketball hoop proposed.

Philip Dondi: said he has told children off when they were playing in the street and footballs were coming into his garden.

Stephen Woolford: suggested residents have lost confidence in the Parish Council

Cllr Easthope said that the parish council had been trying for years to get things moving at Heathfield but with a lack of support from Heathfield residents it had been like hitting ones head against a brick wall. Cllr Clarke joined the parish council just over a year ago and volunteered to take this on and through much hard work he had moved things along. DE explained the background to the Section 106 monies and that the field behind Pepperslade & Kingsway is a public open space and anyone from anywhere is entitled to use it. The District council wanted to see a community hall /sports pavilion on this field but the parish council insisted the wording was extended on the Section 106 agreement to allow the money to be spent on a wider range of facilities/ equipment.

Other points made by councillors were that children should not have to play in the streets and should be encouraged to play on the recreation areas. They should be able to expect more than jumpers on the ground to mark goals. There were 6 options in the first survey and the option to do nothing with the POS came last.

Cllr Gough suggested another survey asking all the residents whether they want the goalposts and basketball hoop on the POS. It was pointed out that at a recent public meeting the view of residents was that the 1st survey had been flawed and so another was taken. Following the results of this 2nd survey the children were asked to vote for what play equipment they wanted. If some residents disagree with the results each time and demand further surveys when does the PC call a halt?

In summing up the chairman said that he feels the residents of Pepperslade believe the parish council has made a decision even though he has reassured them that none has yet been made. The residents this evening are mostly against putting goalposts and basketball hoop on the P O S but he firmly believes they are in a minority. The Parish Council are here to provide for all residents and children of Heathfield, and proper play equipment is required, not jumpers on the ground!. Good equipment does not get vandalised. The land in question is owned by the Parish Council, parish councillors are the parishioners' elected representatives and the ultimate decision rests with the parish council.

The chairman thanked the residents for their comments and said that they were welcome to stay to hear the parish council discussions on Heathfield which would follow.

The Parish Council meeting was then reconvened at 8.35 pm. Only Mrs Clarke, Mr & Mrs Dondi and Mr Rochfort remained to hear the Heathfield discussions.

4. Heathfield

a) Drains & Sewers

An invoice has been received for 90% of the work. UK Drainage Network had tried to do the work on the last long run between Kingsway and Pepperslade last Thursday but the catalyst had gone off too quickly. They plan to come back on 20th July to complete this run using a slower acting catalyst. A further junction between manholes 84 & 85 has a mass of root ingress. This will need to be cleared and a verbal quote of £650 has been given for this. It was agreed to accept this quotation. Cllr Pinner said that this should be offset by savings which had been made on the contract, also there is a contingency sum of £2000 written into the contract which has not been spent. Andy Height of the HRA has been asked to find out from residents whether there have been any problems with the making good and so far only one complaint has been received. The owner of 46 Woburn Place is unhappy with the

turfing. It was agreed to let this settle for a while before reviewing to see whether any further work is required.

335

Post Meeting Note: A written quotation from UK Drainage Network for £650 for clearing the area of tree roots has been received and accepted.

b) Roads Update

There has been a geotechnical survey, core drilling and percolation tests. Since the last Council meeting a fully detailed design has been drawn up. Cllr Clarke referred to the drawings. Brown on them indicates areas that need heavy duty reconstruction. Green indicates areas in a much better state. The surface will be skimmed off down to the concrete panels and tarmac replaced on top. The blue boxes indicate soakaways. Problems are limited to areas where water accumulates following rain. At 85 Kingsway there will be a track soakaway. There will be an increase in the radius of three corners that are usually 'clipped' by trucks on their way to the pumping station. It is currently proposed that parking areas will have three inches of cellular material. The red lines indicate new kerbs being installed.

Cllr Spicer asked about the location of the soakaway in relation to the corner at 25 Whitehall Gardens. He also asked about continuing the new car park surface all the way around the green. Cllr Clarke explained that each item of work will have a more detailed drawing. The Tender documents have been prepared and sent out. Searches have been done to locate services and other important items in Heathfield.

Some of soakaways need the permission of the landowners. They will be approached.

Five contractors had been asked to tender. Cllr Clarke had received four replies:-

| | |
|---------------|---------------------|
| Spadeoak | £341,967.83 |
| Cobb | £536,647.00 |
| Breheny | £335,457.42 |
| Miletree | £329,236.26 |
| Durman Stearn | no tender submitted |

Miletree are the cheapest but their plan is not on a reasonable timescale. They can be claims conscious and stop work if there is a problem which can lead to additional costs due to waiting time whilst the problem is being sorted out. They need project management and there is a bigger contingency. Also there are high preliminary costs (£70,000). More supervision will be needed if they are chosen.

Breheny have provided no time quote plan or phasing plan. They are based in Huntingdon and are a big contractor. They are not as claims conscious as Miletree.

Spadeoak have provided phase and time planning. We are advised that they are a good contractor and that they have a good problem solving culture. The preliminary costs are lower (£8,000). Spadeoak have offered to do value engineering with the Council.

Cobb are too expensive.

Cllrs Clarke and Pinner are to meet with Spadeoak on Wednesday to go through the value engineering and finalise a revised price. They suggest that a special Parish council meeting then be called to seek authorisation to go ahead with this contract.

Cllr Pointon suggested that the parish council agree up to a certain figure and only call a special meeting if the price goes over the agreed sum. She proposed, and Cllr Rothwell seconded, a sum of £350,000. This was agreed.

It is anticipated the work will start on the 10th August and end in early November.

Cllr Cooper asked whether the Parish Council were happy that the 106 monies could be spent on the roads. Cllr Easthope said that advice had already been taken from the parish council's solicitor and it was felt that the money could be spent on this project.

Post Meeting Note: Following an e-mail from Cllr Cooper on Tuesday 14th July, a further meeting was arranged with the P.C.solicitors. Cllrs Pinner, Easthope, Clarke, & Cooper met with Mr Roger Covell of King & Co on Thursday 16th. Mr Covell reiterated his view that it was in order to spend the money on the roads and a letter has been received confirming this. This letter has been e-mailed to all parish councillors.

c) Transfer of POS from Croudace

Clerk has spoken again with the Croudace solicitor who says the finalisation of the land transfer is still an outstanding item on his desk. He has promised to chase this up with Croudace Homes. Clerk reminded him that there is still the agreed £6,700 to be paid as well as the maintenance payment due when the land transfer takes place.

336

d) Surfacing of Footpath from Kingsway to POS

Cllr Easthope reported that this had been done satisfactorily. There were motorbike tracks across the grass verge and into the field where the fence had been removed. He felt that if the horizontal wire was reinstated this could be dangerous if anyone tried to ride a motorbike through without realising that the wire had been replaced. He suggested renewing the fence with wire in the autumn and at the same time planting some hawthorn hedging, perhaps using some of the unwanted hawthorns from the Hurdles Way POS.

e) Footpath / Cycleway - Heathfield to Thriplow

Three route options were shown to Councillors. The yellow route is preferred by the landowner, Robert Smith. The green route is that preferred by Cllrs Clarke & Easthope and the pink route is an existing footpath that would need upgrading. Discussion turned to the options for surfacing the route once it is agreed. Estimated prices are:- Graded stone £45,000 but this would need to be reviewed every 5 years, tarmac £270,000, the same surface that is proposed for the Heathfield parking spaces £136,000 and concrete, which is Robert Smith's preferred finish, £150,000.

Cllr Gough thought there would be approximately 15 cyclists who would regularly use the path to school.

Cllr Clarke said that there may be funding available from the County Council's "Safer Routes to School" project although he had doubts we would qualify because there is no footpath on the last part of the journey to the school along Church Street.

If the green route was chosen then Robert Smith would still want to do that part of the yellow route that skirts around the buildings used by his farm and KWS. A further meeting is needed with Robert Smith who will get a more accurate price for using concrete.

The Ramblers Association have been approached but when a route is decided further discussions will be needed with them.

Cllr Easthope proposed that discussions concentrate on the green route - all agreed. It was also agreed that the path should be as narrow as possible and it was suggested that a 'pinch point' or gate might be installed at some point. This to be investigated.

Cllr Cooper asked about using the path after dark as he has concerns about Health & Safety however it was agreed that lighting the path is not an option.

f) Public Open Spaces

(i) Woodland Areas

Cllr Clarke and Bill Wittering (our tree warden) had met with Roz Richardson, SCDC trees officer to discuss the wooded areas of land to the west of Hurdles Way and Ringstone. She said that the woodland was intended to provide a screening function but recommended that 40 - 50% of the hawthorns could be removed. SCDC can provide 5 species of native trees some of which can be planted where some of the hawthorns have been removed. On the southern strip (which still has to be transferred to the Parish Council by Croudace), Roz recommends leaving the hawthorns for another season or two to see how many have taken before removing any of them.

Cllr Clarke will get some quotations for carrying out the work on the northern part that is already owned by the P.C.

KC

(ii) LEAP for pre-schoolers

Cllr Clarke reported that the children wanted a combination unit, a roundabout and climbing and balance equipment. Peter Topping said that as the District Council had made a mistake by asking for a LAP (local area for play) rather than a LEAP (local equipped area for play) they may find some funding from their sports budget. Cllr Clarke said that a LEAP should have at least 5 items of equipment but it was agreed that the Parish Council does not have to provide a LEAP but can put as few or as many items of equipment as it feels

appropriate. Cllr Clarke had received some quotes and would like to go forward with two companies, SMP and Timberline. This was agreed. KC
Cllr Easthope offered to follow up the funding with SCDC. DE

337

(iii) Play equipment for older children

Cllr Pinner said that surveys had been carried out which showed clearly that the older children wanted more than "just jumpers on the ground". The Parish Council now had to make a decision "either to go for it or not". Cllr Smith agrees we need something more robust than the goal posts that were previously supplied by a resident and that if we put equipment on the POS the children are more likely to go and use it. Illustrations were shown to councillors of the type of unit proposed, a football goal with integral basketball hoop and side extensions to stop balls going behind the unit.

Cllr Easthope said that if both Heathfield councillors were in favour of putting this equipment on the POS then it would get his support. Cllr Rothwell said that his original survey which included the option of a multi-sports pitch had shown similar results to Cllr Clarke's more recent survey. He felt the provision of goal posts and a basketball net was a very good idea and Cllr Spicer agreed with this.

Cllr Spicer then proposed and Cllr Rothwell seconded that the parish council go ahead with plans to provide this play equipment. Cllr Gough abstained but all other councillors were in favour.

Cllr Clarke will speak further to Jane Lampshire (01954 713349).

KC

Further information will be available at the next Parish Council meeting.

Post Meeting Note: A letter has been received from Mr & Mrs Dondi fully supporting the Parish Council's decision to locate the goal posts and basketball hoop on the POS. This letter has been e-mailed to all councillors.

g) Bus Shelter cleaning

Cllr Easthope has not seen his window cleaner since the last meeting but will pursue this.

Post Meeting Note: Window cleaner has given a quote of £25 for the first clean because the shelter is so dirty, and then £16 per clean after that, assuming it is cleaned every 2 or 3 months. Cllr Easthope will accept this quotation. DE

h) Notice Board to serve Hurdles Way & Ringstone

The clerk had spoken to Mike Cooper who confirmed that the County Council have adopted the road but not the grass verge that runs along south side of Hurdles Way behind the Citroen garage. She has also spoken to Croudace Homes who say they do not own the grass verge either. Croudace's solicitor suggests we put up a notice board.

Cllr Pinner will get a price from Fowlmere Joinery for a 10' x 5' board with legs, in the same style as the one at Woburn Place. DP

5. **Web Domain for Thriplow**

Cllr Clarke gave a demonstration of what is proposed for the web site. Several councillors raised concerns over the placing of their personal details on the site. The clerk reminded the meeting that all correspondence/enquiries should be made through the clerk and it was suggested that contact details are only given for the clerk and the chairman. Cllr Clarke made it clear that the domain is still being finalised. Cllr Rothwell pointed out that all enquiries sent to the HRA website are filtered out to the directors via a central e-mail address. Cllr Clarke said he would look into a similar arrangement for the parish council.

Cllr Pinner requested that all councillors are given the opportunity to review the site before it goes live. Cllr Clarke agreed to e-mail all councillors and also to send instructions for downloading Firefox which is a programme currently needed to view the site. KC

6. **Health & Safety**

All councillors were asked to ensure that they have done their health & safety checks before the next meeting. All

7. **Highway Matters**

- a) Heathfield Way road name sign In the absence of any response from Diane Duncan the clerk had asked District Cllr Topping if he could help. PT has not received a response from her either but will chase again.

338

8. Tree Planting & Tree Works

- a) Tree Works Applications
C/11/17/091/02 Works to horse chestnut in front garden of 2 Fowlmere Road. Councillors agreed with the tree warden's comments that this tree is prominent in the village and any treatment to it must be carefully carried out. Slime flux can kill a tree in time but this one looks healthy at present. It is also in the early stages of attack by the caterpillars of a leaf miner moth in its lower branches which could spread elsewhere. The 25% thinning of the canopy suggested should be carefully carried out so as not to reduce the attractiveness of the tree. "Lifting the canopy" has been agreed with Roz Richardson but we do not know exactly what she has agreed can be done. We presume a certain number of the lower branches may be removed and as these are the ones that have been attacked by caterpillars it would be a sensible thing to do but it must be done properly.
- b) Other Tree Matters None

9. Planning Matters

- a) Responses to Applications
S/0545/09/F Extension at 94 Kingsway, Heathfield - All object on the grounds that the proposed extension will block daylight & sunlight to the adjoining property. Design is appalling & insensitive.
S/0545/09/F 94 Kingsway, Amended plans - Generally feel this is an improvement on previous proposal. Still concern about blocking of light to neighbours. 1 councillor objects stating plans are inaccurate in that they don't show the roof window of No.92. Majority have no objections
S/0701/09/F Extensions at 35 School Lane - No objections
S/0551/09/F Raising of garage roof to form bedroom & porch extension at 55 Church St. - No objections
S/0669/09/F Cycle shelter, fencing & gates at Thriplow Primary School- No objections
S/0783/09/F Extensions at 16 Middle St. - No objections
S/0360/09/F Change of use of swimming pool from private to public at Heath Cottage, A505 - Revised plan showing vehicular splays received for information only.
- b) Planning Decisions Received
S/00250/09/CC Replacement site office & 2 light columns at Recycling Centre - Approved
S/0360/09/F Change of use of swimming pool from private to business at Heath Cottage - Refused
S/0545/09/F Extension at 94 Kingsway - Approved
- c) Planning Appeals - None notified
- d) Other Planning Matters - Following the refusal of a planning application for a house on land in Heathfield Way Cllrs Smith, Easthope and the clerk had met with Mark Blundell (Landmark Real Estate) and his architect on Monday 6th July to see whether there was a way forward for a future planning application that could be mutually beneficial. At that meeting it was felt that a possible way forward would be for smaller houses than originally proposed, which would be more in keeping with the existing houses, and a landscaped area at the southern end of the site. The architect agreed to produce a sketch proposal in time for the parish council meeting. Councillors Smith and Easthope promised to put this to the meeting but stressed that their final views would reflect the views of the parish council as a whole and that the views of our Heathfield councillors would be important in any decision.
Cllr Smith explained the rough sketch proposal that had been received showing two smaller houses on the northern end of the site with a parking/turning area in the centre and one affordable home to the south of this. The southern end of the site (approximately a third of the total site area) is shown as a landscaped/amenity space.

In the discussion that followed it emerged that some councillors believe planning permission will eventually be granted for this site and that by working with the developers the parish council would at least get a pleasant landscaped entrance to Heathfield, not working with them would give the parish council no control over what development was eventually applied for. Cllr Easthope felt that in the event that Heathfield councillors and residents were strongly opposed to any development of the site then the Parish Council should support them. Cllrs Rothwell and Spicer felt that Heathfield Way had enough traffic problems already and any development allowing further vehicular access onto the road would be dangerous. They were also confident that there would be strong opposition from Heathfield residents and therefore they would strongly oppose any development of the site. It was subsequently

339

agreed that the Parish Council would support the views of the Heathfield Councillors and could not, therefore, work with the developers. Cllr Smith & the clerk will draft a letter to Landmark Real Estate stating that the parish council cannot support them at the present time.

TSm/Clerk

It was pointed out that councillors will have a further chance to comment under the normal procedures when a full planning application has been made.

10. Financial Matters

| | Net | VAT | Total |
|--|-----------|---------|-----------|
| a) Authority was given to pay the following: | | | |
| Thriplow Parish Council (transfer to P O a/c-see item 17e of previous minutes) | 8000.00 | - | 8000.00 |
| Agrovista (treatment of recreation ground to deter moles) | 95.00 | 14.25 | 109.25 |
| Playsafety Ltd (RoSPA inspection of Thriplow recreation ground) | 69.00 | 10.35 | 79.35 |
| LGS Services (internal auditors) | 95.00 | 14.25 | 109.25 |
| John Cobb & Sons Ltd (surfacing footpath Kingsway to POS) | 6646.00 | 996.90 | 7642.90 |
| CGM (Cambridge) Ltd (Hurdles Way & Pepperslade grass cuts 5th & 18th May) | 190.00 | 28.50 | 218.50 |
| " " (cut verges May & " " " " 1 & 16 Jun) | 373.00 | 55.95 | 428.95 |
| Wormald Burrows (H/field roads-1st payt against total of 9053.60 incl VAT) | 2000.00 | 300.00 | 2300.00 |
| Allianz (motor mower insurance) | 148.09 | - | 148.09 |
| UK Drainage Network (drain/sewer works at Heathfield) | 29,649.94 | 4447.49 | 34,097.43 |
| LexisNexis (Charles Arnold Baker - Local Council Admin. 8th edition) | 59.05 | - | 59.05 |
| K C Clarke (kids party ex's £95.43 + hosting web site 7.61 + 1.14 VAT) | 103.04 | 1.14 | 104.18 |
| P J Easthope (salary Apr - Jun 09) | 868.14 | - | 868.14 |
| Thriplow PCC (churchyard upkeep - precepted sum - S.137) | 135.00 | - | 135.00 |
| St Georges church (church fabric - precepted sum - S 137) | 250.00 | - | 250.00 |
| TVHMC (donation -precepted sum - S 137) | 1000.00 | - | 1000.00 |

b) Credits Received

£1630.14 Cambs CC grasscutting grant

£1711.82 Interest on 2nd investment

c) Section 106 Funds

2nd investment matures 30 Nov 09 - interest will be £535.57, maturity sum £139,569.56

3rd investment matures 11 Nov 09 - interest will be £252.86, maturity sum £60,686.68

4th investment matures 19 Oct 09 - interest will be £1265.38, maturity sum £246,026.55

d) Bank Signatories

The clerk has completed the change of signature forms as much as possible but now needs councillors to complete their parts. This to be done a.s.a.p.

11. Reports

a) Duxford Airfield Liaison Committee

Cllr Pinner reported that the traffic signs used for the Flying Legends show had been incorrect in that they directed traffic along Church Street. He will speak to Richard Ashton about this. The IWM is still trying to buy the runway from the County Council. The formula one testing had seen many more visitors to the IWM that day. There had been no complaints from Heathfield and there had been more in favour of the testing than objected. Cllr Smith felt the noise from the testing was no more intrusive than the air shows.

Cllr Pointon said that she had been asked to report that Betty Parker, Church Street, had found the noise quite distressing. The next testing day is 29/7 with the date for the final day this year to be decided. Renault had paid for Duxford school children to visit on a testing day and would also be prepared to pay for Thriplow School to visit.

b) Thriplow Recreation Ground

The RoSPA report had been received and there were only 2 items that need attention. Denise Lea has requested to hold a free informal party with bouncy castle in the recreation

ground. They carry their own insurance and the date would be between 12 ^ 26 August. There were no objections to this. Cllr Smith will inform her. TSm

c) Village Hall Management Committee

Cllr Gough had nothing to report - the next meeting is on Wednesday 15th July.

d) School Governors

The chairman has received a letter from Sharon McGinty stating that parking at the school is dangerous and asking if there is anything the parish council can do about getting more yellow lines. The police have visited the school and are happy to write supporting this. Cllr Gough will chase PC Chris Wiseman for this letter. When we have this the clerk will write to Mike Cooper asking what can be done and will also copy the letter to County Cllr Tim Stone.

JG/Clerk

340

e) Police & Neighbourhood Watch

Countryside Watch have asked us to join for a subscription of £30 but Cllr Gough feels they have nothing to offer. The first four digits of the police telephone number have changed from 0845 to 0345. There are problems with vehicles chasing around the path between Heathfield and Thriplow, the police have the number plate details.

f) Village Maintenance

The clerk had reported a loose drain cover in School Lane and Mike Cooper has agreed it is the County Council's responsibility and has asked for it to be replaced as soon as possible.

In reply to an e-mail from Cllr Smith, Mike Cooper has agreed to resurface the uneven footpath to the right of the shop (although he can't say when this will be) and to fill the potholes in Church Street during the next 2 - 3 weeks. He also says that the yellow and white lines in School Lane were refreshed last year and in his opinion they do not need re-doing at this time.

g) District Council Information

Peter Topping had left the meeting and so there was no report.

h) County Council Information

Tim Stone had to leave to go to another meeting but had e-mailed the following report to the clerk:-

Election Thank you to all those who voted for me and offered help at the recent county council election. The majority of 540 was 500 up on last time.

The overall county result was pretty well a stalemate. The Conservatives remain in control, having won three seats from the Liberal Democrats. The Liberal Democrats won three from the Conservatives and one from Labour while a Green candidate won one from Labour. The final result is therefore:

Conservatives 42, Lib Dems 23, Labour 2 and Greens 1. One seat in Ramsey is yet to be decided because the death of a candidate caused the election to be postponed until 23rd July in that Division.

I am still chairman of the Audit and Account committee and a member of both the Development Control Committee and the South Cambridgeshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee.

Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvements

At today's meeting of the South Cambridgeshire Traffic Management Area Joint Committee we once again expressed our disappointment at the way parish bids for funding had all failed for this financial year. It is likely that next year's bids will be scored the same way and therefore we shall see no more than a few dropped kerbs and bits of white lines. We have asked for the whole scheme to be re-evaluated for the year 2011/12.

Hanley Grange

Hanley Grange has gone quiet recently. This is because it is wrapped up in the new Regional Spatial Strategy negotiations. The East of England Regional Assembly is to report on 17th July giving its views on all the submissions by the region's strategic planning authorities. We are all holding our breath as to whether Cambridgeshire's proposal to freeze the figure of new housing at the 75,000 level in the 2021 plan will be accepted. The new plan takes us to 2031. The county has an alternative to allow 15,000 additional houses to take the total to 90,000 but we don't know if that will be accepted either. In any event the plan will go out for a 12-week consultation in September.

Meanwhile Bidwells have been circulating a proposal for substantial development in Duxford. I have been to see the chief planning officers of both the County and South Cambridgeshire District Council on the subject.

The consensus is that Bidwells have two ways of playing this: they can either put in an application as an exception or wait to see if they can influence revision of the Local Development Framework, which is due to begin in a year or 18 months. There is no chance at this late stage of influencing the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy and this is not a strategic proposal in any case.

At present it is highly unlikely that an application would succeed. South Cambs's policy is to concentrate large-scale development in those villages which are sustainable - that is with a mix of shops, doctors' surgery, dentists, community facilities and (though he didn't say so explicitly) a secondary school. At present Duxford has a primary school, a bank, an antiques dealer and one shop. It does have a hotel and a number of pub/restaurants. The range of employers is very restricted.

341

Awaiting revision of the Local Development Framework is unlikely to be much more tempting. The present policies have worked pretty well in South Cambridgeshire and it is unlikely that

341 Awaiting revision of the Local Development Framework is unlikely to be much more tempting. The present policies have worked pretty well in South a major departure would succeed. But a delay does give more time for Bidwells to lobby.

The proposed road link from Moorfield Road to Ickleton Road would certainly help to reduce traffic on Moorfield Road and Hunts Road. But neither of the officers I spoke to seemed to think it was much of a trade-off in getting a desirable road link in exchange for a development cuckoo. Many of the arguments against Hanley Grange would apply to this site as well. I think the ball is very much in Bidwells' court.

Neighbourhood Panel

The Neighbourhood Panel met at Sawston on 6th July. There was nothing to report for Thriplow. In general these meetings stress anti-social behaviour and speeding. This time it seemed as if criminal and anti-social behaviour were weighing more heavily. Those people receiving reports on e-cops will have noted the number of cannabis dealing arrests.

12. Other Correspondence and Information received to 13.07.2009

- a) SCDC - letter acknowledging receipt of changes to Register of Members Interest forms
- b) SCDC - Gypsy & Traveller site consultation 10 July - 9 October 09 -CD & written information
- c) SCDC - Housing Transfer Ballot results

- d) SCDC Standards Committee Newsletter
- e) SCDC - Comprehensive Equalities Policy 2009 - 2012
- f) Linda Browne - e-mail introducing herself as the new Community Liaison Support Assistant for SCDC
- g) Ron Beech (Bassingbourn) - Request for last 3 years accounts as he researching the financial responsibilities of parish councils. Clerk has supplied the information requested.
- h) Cambs. County Ccl.-Position Statement - Children's Centres Development in Cambridgeshire
- i) Highways Agency - Summer getaway 2009 for the south-west - map & info
- j) Highways Agency - Planned roadworks on major roads in East of England June - Aug 09
- k) Cambridge County Council - information on Minibus Brokerage Scheme - due to lack of time this will be raised at the next meeting Clerk
- l) South Cambs Parish Forum - revised dates Wed 23 Sept at Cambourne, 10.00 am or Thurs 8 Oct at Sawston Village college 7 pm - due to lack of time clerk will e-mail info to councillors Clerk
- m) CPALC - chairmanship training course corrected date of 28 November; CILCA Accounts training courses details; Councillor Professional Development Training courses details;
- n) SCDC - Register of Electors updates June & July
- o) NALC - Development Briefing - Publication of report 'Local Authority Investments'
- p) Cambs CC - changes to Stagecoach & Whippet services (none in our area)

- q) Clerks & Councils Direct & Local Council Review magazines
- r) Cambridgeshire Horizons - Green Vision News 2nd edition
- s) Cambs CC - Cambs Archaeology Historic Environment Team annual report 2008-9
- t) Carillion WSP - change of address - all correspondence to go to head office at Sandy
- u) Community Action (ACRE magazine)
- v) COPE - issues 56 & 57 (handed to Cllr Pointon)
- w) Cambs CC - latest information leaflet on Highways maintenance
- x) Various sundry advertising material

13. Date of Next Meeting

Monday 14th September 2009

The chairman asked whether anyone had any further business they wished to raise.
Cllr Clarke said that Kevin Rochfort had almost been hit by someone jumping the red lights on the A505. Cllr Gough will mention this to PC Chris Wiseman. JG

The clerk asked councillors to let her know their holiday dates. All
Cllrs Clarke, Pointon, Smith & Rothwell responded.

There being no further business, the chairman thanked everyone for attending and the meeting closed at 11.40 p.m.