

**GEDDINGTON, NEWTON AND LITTLE OAKLEY PARISH COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2018**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Councillors N Batchelor (Chair), M Rowley, C Buckseall, T Bailey, P Goode, D Rushton, D Watson, S Wenbourne, P Berry and J Padwick.

**APOLOGIES:**

None

**76/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**77/19 PUBLIC SESSION**

**Four members of the public were present.**

**a) Police Report / Crime figures - latest available as at 4.12.18.**

<b>Crime figures - latest figures available, for Dec PC meeting</b>			
<b>Geddington</b>	crime on or near recreation field	Burglary	Investigation complete; no suspect identified
	" "	Burglary	Under investigation
	crime on or near Chapel Lane	Burglary	Under investigation
	" "	Vehicle crime	Investigation complete; no suspect identified
<b>Newton</b>	Nil		
<b>Little Oakley</b>	Nil		

There were no comments

**b) Questions from the public**

One member of the public gave an update on the traffic working group. She summed up the main point, and added that a survey was out for secondary school pupils. A further member of the public had concerns with the number 8 bus generally. There were also concerns as stated last month concerning the lack of school run buses which was causing a lot of problems.

Geddington Primary School has been contacted to ask if they would like free travel plan help.

The survey results were given out, some of the main points are as follows:-

88% of residents use a car as their main mode of transport. Secondary forms of transport are 49% walk, with cycling and bus transport also featuring.

One of the group's main resolves is to sign a government petition concerning transport and funding issues.

A copy of the draft travel plan and any other documentation will be sent to the Parish Council email address.

The Traffic Working group's next meeting is on Friday 4<sup>th</sup> January at 7.00pm, and anyone is invited to attend.

### **c) Reports from County and Borough Councillors**

There was no County Council report.

Borough Council – Cllr Rowley reported that a new committee was needed because of the unitary authorities work. The setting up of it was due to be approved at a meeting to be held shortly.

Elections are being put back to May 2020.

### **78/19. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

#### **a) Approval of Parish Council monthly meeting Minutes – held 8th October 2018**

The October minutes were re-submitted for approval – proposed by Cllr Goode, seconded by Cllr Wenbourne.

#### **b) Approval of Parish Council monthly meeting Minutes – held 12th November 2018**

Approval of the minutes proposed by Cllr Goode, seconded by Cllr Berry. All those present agreed with the proposal.

#### **c) Matters arising; progress on agreed actions.**

There were no outstanding actions. Noted that:-

*Action 1, 12.11.18 - current schedule for attendance of a PCSO at the Parish Council monthly meeting.* – under current plans the Police are unable to attend the Parish Council monthly meetings. If there is a specific issue however, a representative will attend. Cllr Watson commented that the same issue occurs as to attendance at the Rural Forum. They have been informed that it takes PCSOs away from street patrols. The way the Police wish to communicate now has had a strategy change. It was noted that it would be beneficial if councillors can decide on any items that they would like to see a reply to. If there is anything that councillors would like to convey to Sargent Offord these can then be compiled. Additionally, dates for PCC meetings are regularly sent so attendance at one of these is an option.

**ACTION 1: A PCSO needs to patrol the area at school times – this request to be sent to Sargent Offord.**

Additional notes as per the actions – Cllr Goode will give feedback to the Bowls Club at the next Village Hall committee meeting. A Bowls Club representative had asked for permission to park on the recreation field and the Village Hall felt that they had been given permission to say that they could. They also stated that between 2010 - 2013 the PC gave permission to the Village Hall for parking on the recreation field to be allowed. Cllr Goode asked if the public liability insurance was for the Village Hall only. He was informed that it is.

**ACTION 2: The clerk to look at the minutes between 2010 and 2013 concerning permission given.**

There are no more events planned on the recreation field that require parking until early May 2019.

There is a scheduling issue: events should not be doubled up on the same day.

Two marshals were in place all day.

Communication needs to be better. Cllr Rowley concluded by stating that the permission or otherwise needs to be sorted before May.

Summary: public liability insurance is a major factor, and the Parish Council needs to establish if the Village Hall were given permission to allow parking on the field.

**ACTION 3: Indemnity insurance to be checked prior to payment.**

**The check also needs to include if it covers businesses trading on the Parish Council premises (the mobile fish and chip van in the car park).**

## **PLANNING**

### **a) KBC Decision notices**

*KET/2018/0837 - Mr R Broughton, 1 Bright Trees Road, Geddington.*

*Single storey front and side extensions. Mr R Broughton.*

Approved.

### **b) Planning Applications**

*Cllr Rowley did not take part in this item of the agenda.*

*Mr & Mrs G Dickens, 35 Stamford Road, Geddington.*

*Variation of condition 2 of planning approval KET/2017/0636, to correct levels error on previously approved scheme*

*Application Type Delete/Change/Vary Conditions (S73 TCPA) Application*

The following comments and observations were recorded:- The variation application concerns the variation and height of the neighbour's property. Noted that the new property cannot be any higher than the neighbour's property as per condition 2. It has been built to a new build of 2.26m higher than neighbour's property.

It has been built at the same dimensions but to the wrong height – the footings should have been and need to be lower.

The original application was approved for the new build to be built no higher than the neighbouring property.

The most recent height of build by an independent surveyor is 86.73m (33 Stamford Road) and the new build is 88.79m. The difference of 2.26m is the height of the railing (another floor height approximately).

The application is being made for an amendment - the building work has been stopped as per Planners.

Noted that the building as it stands breaks Core Strategy 8. This was the only reason that the planning permission was granted –to protect the right to light and the neighbour’s privacy. Section 2 in the report refers to the height of the building and roof space not to be extended. Developers have admitted to planners that they made an error. It has been stated that the building should not have been built there. The developer stated that they were excavating it down into the ground. They did not, they merely took the footings out and levelled the existing ground.

Items for consideration:

The impact on the existing property.

The application - clause 2 to adjust the height.

Further alterations – the side window on the garage.

The window by the balcony – this is a further alteration.

Building should have been set into the ground by a further 2.6 m.

The application is for planners to retrospectively approve the variation to address the 2.6m height difference.

Proposed by Cllr Goode: that the Parish Council objects to the amendment as the property seeking approval is different to the original approval.

It is an overbearing development causing a loss of light and privacy to the neighbouring property. Councillors object to the removal of section 2 which was fundamental to the original plan.

Seconded by Cllr Padwick. 9 councillors in favour, and one abstention.

**79/19. CORRESPONDENCE**

There were no comments as to the correspondence that had been received and sent out to councillors.

**80/19. FINANCE**

Community account statement	as at 17.11.18	£28,375.13
-----------------------------	----------------	------------

Business Saver account	as at 17.11.18	£10,744.69
------------------------	----------------	------------

**a) Accounts received**

None

**b) Accounts for payment**

SLCC	£106.00	Years membership 1.1.19 – 31.12.19
Alison Holland	£55.00	Transport questionnaire costs
Mark Rowley	£10.77	Fittings for the village Hall parking signs.

Clerk – qtrly salary- query with HMRC which has not yet been answered. Clerk will put this through in January therefore.

The payments were approved by Cllr Goode, seconded by Cllr Bailey. Nine councillors present agreed to the proposal, with one abstention.

**c) Parish Council budget for 2019 - 2020 – further discussion**

Cllr Watson showed councillors the proposed budget for 2019-20, which was similar to the current year's budget. He said that it was a combined budget and cash flow. The meeting in January will need to confirm the budget.

**d) Capital projects – Proposal for Newton junction - for discussion.**

After a discussion it was generally felt that it would be better to leave the precept at its current level so that the Parish Council could move forward on the project(s). The consensus was that the capital projects are under discussion and going ahead so there is no reason to reduce it.

The Newton junction was discussed, and it was noted that disposal of the soil is part of the tender. Once there is agreement as to the proposal it then has to go out to three tenders.

**ACTION 4: A letter is needed from NCC confirming their position as to not reduce the 40mph speed limit.**

Letters relating to the traffic along that particular stretch of road were sent 18 months to two years ago.

Rachel Gladstone-Brown can be asked for Boughton Estates position.

Cllr Padwick commented that he would like to see the Parish Council requesting reduction to 30mph, but it is a country lane. 30mph stretches of road also have to have street lights installed.

**ACTION 5: Cllr Watson asked for a copy of the plan for the alterations to be sent to Boughton Estates and Kier.**

One councillor did not agree to the project stating the cost per Newton resident was too high. Cllr Batchelor said that a risk assessment would be within the completed document and it would include near misses and near accidents that had been reported.

Cllr Watson reminded the councillors that the map showing the proposed alterations was the recommended solution from the professionals. It is the only safety related scheme available.

Other comments:-

There is no sign indicating that the entrance leads to Newton.

Cost per capita on a safety issue is distasteful.

One councillor said he could not sit on the council if the money could not be allocated to a project that could potentially save a person's life.

**ACTION 6: Cllr Watson to collate the number of near misses with Newton residents and people using Newton on a regular basis.**

## **81/19 - ENVIRONMENT AND RECREATION**

### **a) Flooding in Little Oakley – update**

Cllr Bailey said that the Water Authority has got all the details and they would also be passed to the Highways Authority. Doug Hodgkinson had confirmed that he was not given the dates of the photos/ videos from the Whittakers.

### **b) Adoption of Flood Plan.**

There are some cosmetic alterations to be carried out. The Flood Wardens role needs to be explained, and an explanation for what the bund is needs to be included. It was proposed by Cllr Berry that subject to the minor alterations it should be adopted as soon as possible. Seconded by Cllr Wenbourne, agreed by all councillors present. It will be classed as version 1.

**ACTION 7: Cllr Buckseall will circulate it as a PDF version.**

### **c) Stone pit land lease**

The colour coded map of the land is not held at the solicitors. The key to the filing cabinet was given to Cllr Rowley as it may be found there.

### **d) The stile on the footpath by Nancy Moore Steps.**

Two residents have approached Cllr Goode to find out if the Parish Council could approach the land owner to consider changing the stile to a gate on the grounds of easier access. However, it was pointed out that the tenant farmer often keeps a bull in the field, and it would be the tenant that would have to bear the cost of changing the stile.

Cllr Watson wondered if we could write to Boughton Estates asking if, given the good work they have done to the other stiles in the area, replacing the stiles with gates on the Newton side of the estate, are they consider doing it with the stile at Nancy Moore Steps, plus the next exit from the field at the other end.

### **e) Location of roadside broadband cabinets in Geddington - Cab Locations - CDC's 10, 12 and 13 - decision to be made.**

1. The location of one of the cabinets by Priory Court is not desirable.
2. The cabinets by the ford are fine, but consider moving it back 5 metres to the north because of potential flooding.
3. Location of the cabinet in West Street is impractical- the road and path are too narrow here. The new suggestion is to put it in Lees Way.
4. Question: - how waterproof are the cabinets? They may be subject to wetness and flooding.
5. There is a new bridge on the main road. There is no reason why cable cannot be run under this bridge to Skeffington Close and Grange Road from Queen Street if this is the only obstacle.

## **NEWTON**

No other issues raised.

## **LITTLE OAKLEY**

No other issues raised

## **ITEMS FOR NEXT MONTHS AGENDA**

To sign off the precept.

To add co-option to the agenda.

*There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.42pm.*