

GEDDINGTON, NEWTON AND LITTLE OAKLEY PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11th NOVEMBER 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Councillors N Batchelor (Chair), M Rowley, C Buckseall, T Bailey, Sue Wenbourne, P Goode, D Watson D Rushton.

APOLOGIES:

Cllrs. J Padwick and P Berry.

51/20: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr P Goode – for 54/20 - Parish Council representative on the Village Hall Management Committee.

52/20 PUBLIC SESSION.

Eight members of the public were present.

a) Questions from the public.

Questions, queries and input from the public concerned agenda item 54/20 – village car park extension and 58/20b) – Community Speed Watch. Both of these agenda items were therefore classed as being part of the public session.

b) Reports from County and Borough Councillors

NCC: **ACTION 1: The email report from Cllr Perry to be circulated.**

KBC: Cllr Rowley advised that the commencement of purdah meant that it was advisable to not pass comment on matters.

53/20: MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

a) Approval of Parish Council monthly meeting Minutes – held 9th September 2019.

Cllr Goode proposed approval of the minutes, seconded by Cllr Wenbourne, all councillors in favour except for one abstention.

b) Approval of Parish Council monthly meeting Minutes – held 14th October 2019.

Cllr Bailey proposed approval of the minutes, seconded by Cllr Goode, all councillors were in favour.

c) Matters arising, outstanding actions.

14.10.19, action 1: Cllr Berry will contact Robert Wootton, Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator, to ask him to send any crime figures or reports he receives/collates to Cllr Berry so that they can in turn be circulated to all councillors.

Cllr Berry was not able to be present at the November meeting for any reply so this will be carried forward to the December meeting.

14.10.19, action 6 (Maintenance of Geddington village north entrance).

Cllr Rowley will talk to the Head of Environment at KBC to see what the options are for the North end of the village. The Head of Environment (KBC) and the relevant KBC officer will be looking at various sites around the village shortly, including examining the dangerous playground surface.

14.10.19, action 7: Dangerous playground surface.

Cllr Rowley reported that KBC are looking into this.

14.10.19, action 9: The clerk to write to both Gigaclear and Highways informing them that it was stated before installation commenced that Gigaclear would reinstate the golden gravel. It is understood that it is Highways who determine whether there is golden gravel replacement.

Some areas were going to have the golden gravel replacement, some areas were not. Gigaclear has said that areas replaced with golden gravel are dependent on the size of area that had to be dug out.

Councillors stated that when the Highways representative carries out an inspection through the areas of the village where Gigaclear installation has taken place, that councillor representation is needed at the meeting.

ACTION 2: Highways to be contacted to find out when the meeting will take place.

PLANNING

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

a) KBC Decision notices

KET/2019/0589 - Mr A Bright, Paddock Cottage, Corby Road, Little Oakley.

1 no. bungalow with car parking and access road. Full Application

The application was for a bungalow at the back of Paddock cottage.

Refused.

KET/2018/0867 - 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

This application went to the Planning Inspector.

The Planning Inspector was responsible for the interpretation of the planning laws relating to this application. The decision has been made that the appeal is allowed.

b) Planning Applications

KET/2019/0706 - Mr M Speed, 1 Steele Way, Geddington.

Porch to front. Full Application

No issues were raised relating to this application. Proposed by Cllr Buckseall that there was no objection, seconded by Cllr Goode. All Councillors present were in favour, except for one abstention.

54/20. PARISH PLAN – Village Car Park Extension

The Chair of the Village Hall Committee was present. He stated that he understood that the proposal for the Village Hall car park extension had been circulated to councillors and read in advance of the meeting.

He highlighted how irregular the parking can be in the carpark, with occasionally cars parked blocking in other cars, caused by car park spaces being full.

The village hall has had to turn away some bookings for events as they are unsure whether there are enough car park spaces for attendees of the event.

A map of the proposed area was shown. The area concerned is 43 metres by 16 metres which should hold 24 -25 cars.

A dropdown gate would be installed rather than the present gate.

The parking bays would be delineated by small white dots.

The car park would not be classed as permanent so the surface could be re-instated if need be. The makeup of the flooring was explained, with the top layer being gravel which is lower maintenance than grass.

A one metre anti-trap fence would be installed around the children's play area.

The ball stop netting would be erected in April and taken down in September. It would be six metres high, plus a three metre high ball stop would be adjacent to it. The net cost would be £29,906.76. The ball stop netting would be installed by the Village Hall Management Committee. The flooring company concerned are currently holding the flooring at a lower than current price.

Questions asked:-

Will the present disabled bays remain? Yes. The village hall committee will re-mark the bays themselves.

Photos circulated showed drivers parking illegally. The query was raised – are they causing an obstruction? The photos did not appear to show that the carpark was full. 24 new car parking spaces would be created.

If the lease for the recreation field was changed, would the carpark have to revert back the grassed area? Boughton Estates may wish it to, but the lease does not expire until 2049.

Why could the flooring not be tarmac? This is because there is a significant drop down to the existing car park. The construction of the subbase needs to be flat even when on an angle. The proposed flooring is free draining, whereas tarmac flooring would need to free drain down to the berm.

The Bowls Club are having problems with fixtures: people are not turning up as they can't park.

There may be the possibility of getting more car parking behind the Tennis Club and Bowls Club – one councillor said he would sooner see the money invested in a new car parking area in this area of the recreation field. The Village Hall Committee Chair stated that Boughton Estates were not interested in such a scheme at the present time.

Money would be available this financial year as £30,000.00 was committed for the Newton turn but now mirrors are going to be installed. Commented by another councillor that the proposed car park work would benefit the majority of residents relatively quickly.

The Parish Council are being asked pay for the equipment and related work – three quotes would be needed.

Adequate storage facilities are available for the fencing when it is taken down, with the posts being telescopic.

KBC Environmental Services would need to be contacted to give assurances that they can cut around the fence. A manual cut may be needed, and cuts on the recreation field may go back to one cut only per year which is all that it is entitled to have. It currently gets four cuts a year.

The area immediately adjacent to the fence could be built into the proposal as the Cricket Club's responsibility to cut. The areas within the posts would need to be maintained by the clubs.

The netting was objected to, with one councillor saying it would look awful. If there is an issue with cricket balls then the orientation of the pitch needs to be changed.

A further councillor said that realignment of the pitch was spoken about a few months ago.

Cllr Batchelor then brought the discussion to a close, stating that the decision would not be voted upon within this meeting. The present car parking difficulties were within the Parish Plan. He suggested that the Village Hall Committee refine the proposal. He also added that it would be nice to see comments from Boughton Estates relating to the proposal.

He added that the cricket nets are a separate issue to be voted upon. The Village Hall Committee Chair informed him however that if you don't have the nets you won't have the car park, as three cars have been damaged already.

ACTON 3: Any additions to the above queries, comments or thoughts to be sent to the Parish Clerk, who will compile them all and send to the Village Hall Committee Chair.

55/20: CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED AND CIRCULATED – to note or comment upon.
No correspondence issues were raised.

56/20: FINANCE

a) Bank statements.

Community account statement	as at 17.10.19	£39,265.96.
Business Saver account	as at 17.10.19	£10,766.14

b) Accounts received - None

c) Accounts for payment

Royal British Legion	£35.00	Wreath £18.00 + donation to RBL £17.00
*Kensigns	-	Estimate given
Information Commissioner	£35.00	Data protection fee renewal 1yr from 1.12.19. Direct debit to be completed now (£35.00 rather than £40.00)
Barriers Direct	£1533.31	2 x mirrors + installation for Newton turn.

*It was decided that the Chairmen's' board would look better if the name and serving years was displayed slightly differently. A new quotation therefore needs to be obtained.

Cllr Batchelor proposed that the above payments were authorised for payment. Seconded by Cllr Buckseall; all councillors present were in favour.

d) Budget and precept discussion

Cllr Watson advised that the precept for 2020 – 2021 needed to continue at the same rate to be able to prepare for the work and projects within the Village Plan. Cllr Rowley advised that an additional project is the adult exercise equipment.

The discussion concluded with Cllr Batchelor reiterating that continuing to budget for build for the projects would need the continuance of the same level of precept.

ACTION 4: The clerk will circulate the budget as per Cllr Watson's email.

57/20 YOUTH CLUB STONEPIT LAND LEASE – discussion

This agenda item was discussed in conjunction with agenda item 58/20a) below.

58/20 ENVIRONMENT & RECREATION

a) Discussion of points raised in letter from Youth Club, sent 8th Sept 2019

Cllr Bailey had examined the letter and other documentation that had been sent to the Parish Council. The following report reflects Parish Council's response to the letter that was conveyed to members of the public.

GEDDINGTON NEWTON AND LITTLE OAKLEY PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES RE YOUTH CLUB LEASE

Councillor Terence Bailey (TMB) reported in response to the various matters raised by the Youth Club (YC) and where appropriate, by the correspondence and other documents submitted or referred to, to the Council.

Referring to the 1977 draft lease and letter, the YC had been asked to give notification of anything which was not clear and in any event that Lease had been superseded by the later Lease of 1st January 2001 (the Lease).

In relation to the Lease, much of the problem and misunderstanding had arisen from the description of the "demised land". There were 2 edgings on the plan which should have been coloured on the draft when it was copied and almost certainly were coloured on the original Lease.

TMB explained the extent of the land demised - leased - by the Lease. As YC contended, it was not limited to the area on which the YC building stood but included the concrete area and path immediately surrounding the building as shown on the plan. It did not include any land beyond that area.

Under the terms of the Lease the land which the Club was entitled to occupy was that land with the building on it and no more.

YC's desired to occupy 2/3 of the "ground" (which might be regarded as the "common access"). There is no right to this: it would appear that either this was overlooked *or refused by the P.C.* when the draft documents were discussed because this was not included in the Lease.

YC's request for clarification of the area leased was unfortunately too late as the Club had executed the Lease 3 months earlier: it having been signed by the Chairman and witnessed by one of the Trustees.

TMB addressed the phrase "*The word premises on the Lease demises land not the building*" referred to in YC's minutes of the 2nd. April 2001. It did not have any significance. The land leased included the building which was the Club's main interest. This shouldn't be a point of contention, except of course that the Club contend that it doesn't include enough land.

With regard to the specific points raised in the letters from YC to the P. C. dated 9th. March 2019, 9th. July 2019 and 8th. September 2019:-

- It was not correct that the club pays only for the footprint of the building: it pays for the land (which should have been) edged green which includes the area on which the building stands.
- While the YC's proposals may be desirable and fall within the Village Plan, no one has the right to carry out any works or development on the land without the consent of the owner i.e. the Parish Council.

- The Lease *did* include land other than the footprint of the building. It includes the curtilage to the extent of the “Concrete Yard” surrounding the building shown on the plan. (This is mentioned above).
- The YC is correct in saying that the Lease does not cover only the footprint of the building but it is incorrect to interpret it as including anything beyond the “Concrete Yard” (see above),
- The YC is not correct in the assertion about the division of the 2/3rds of the Stone Pit Land.

Whatever was discussed or desired by YC it was not included in the demise either by oversight or because the P. C. refused to grant it. Even if the Geddington Volunteer Fire Brigade had come to an agreement with the YC it would not have been binding on the P.C. The GVFB lease contains no such provision indicating that that was not the intention of what was agreed.

While it is harsh to say it the club should have declined to sign the Lease until it represented what they desired or felt had been negotiated. Putting it bluntly these concerns should have been resolved when the draft lease was being discussed and not after the Lease had been signed.

With regards to the specific points raised in the Lease:-

- **Clause 2(c)** Maintenance of boundary: this was no doubt a provision inserted to absolve the council tax payers of the cost (and possibly part of the deal). It might also have been taken into account when the rent was agreed. (It is understood that the rent has not been reviewed, or at least increased, since the Lease was granted).
- **Clause 2(e)** This is a standard clause. It is a fundamental term and the right of a landlord to decide what his property may be used for. Again, the rent has not been increased and was no doubt a concessionary one due to the nature of the Club and its activities as a Youth Club. It does not prevent the Club using it for other purposes *provided that the P.C.'s permission is obtained, in writing in advance*. There was nothing unusual about this.
- **Clauses 2(g) & (h)** The P. C. is entitled to ensure that all is in order. This is not necessarily to “check up” on the YC, but rather a prudent clause which their Solicitor would have included as standard.
- **Clauses 4 and 5** Restrictions: these were probably reserved by previous owners of this and other much larger areas of land and/or estates (Boughton Estates?). The P.C. does not have the right to grant any rights which were excluded when it acquired the property.
- **The tarmac area** This is a very difficult issue as expense has been incurred by YC. Nevertheless none of the works should have been carried out *without the prior written consent of the P.C.* The Lease expires in 2 years so the Club should have been aware that they could only rely on this facility up to the end of 2021.
- **Steel building** TMB had no knowledge of this.
- **Clause 2 (m)** YC were obliged *“to allow common access and usage of the site”* apart from the GVFB area. This would be totally at variance with the Club having a lease of any land other than the land “edged green” on the plan.

Also:-

- (i) The heading of the letter of 3rd. December does not imply that the whole of Stone Pit Land was to be included in the Lease;

- (ii) The 1977 lease did not grant the whole of the Sand Pit Land; and,
- (iii) The situation is governed by the 2001 Lease.

The P. C. could, of course from time to time, grant a licences to YC to use the surrounding area if it thought fit.

TMB.

Geddington.04-xii-19.

ACTION 5: The clerk will carry out a search for the history of the stone pit land, compiled by a former councillor.

**b) Community Speed Watch – update and discussion of involvement in 2020
Community Speed Watch programme**

A resident has written to the Police, who have said that they will come out and view the 20mph signage.

A device will be put on a lighting column for one week to monitor speeds of vehicles. The Police have confirmed that it is a speed device, not an ANPR (number plate recognition).

ACTION 6: The clerk to register interest in the Community Speed Watch scheme.

Cllr Rowley advised that an article on Geddington Facebook page may result in several volunteers coming forward.

ACTION 7: A letter of support from the Parish Council is needed, to include the reason(s) for why it is needed and possibly a list of names of volunteers.

ACTION 8: Facebook: Cllr Batchelor will register residents' interest and add a closing date for the volunteers to come forward.

The resident who was present at the meeting was happy to be the co-ordinator,

c).Geddington bridge - inspection/repair work request

Maintenance to the bridge appears to be needed. It was last examined by Historic England in February/ March 2019 and they stated at that time that the condition of the bridge would be monitored. Cllr Goode has some up to date photographs of the bridge. He will send them to the clerk so that a further chase up email can be sent.

ACTION 9: the clerk will request examination of the bridge again and attach the up to date photo(s) when they are received. Additionally, Cllr Watson will forward contact details of a resident of Geddington who works for Historic England which will be another option if no reply is received.

d) Newton Junction mirrors – progress

The mirrors have been ordered. Cllr Goode will take delivery of them and then liaise as to a date for installation.

e) Police ANPR – request for use of street lighting column.

Councillors confirmed that the Parish Council does not own the lamppost and that there has been a long running dispute with NCC concerning this.

ACTION 10: The clerk to reply stating that it is actually not owned by the Parish Council, but the Parish Council do not object to the ANPR being placed on the lamppost. Emphasis to be stated again that it is not a Parish Council owned lamppost.

59/20: TO CONSIDER THE NEED TO PROMOTE CANDIDACY AT THE MAY 2020 ELECTIONS.

Ncalc have suggested that this topic be raised well in advance of the May elections so that if a parish council knows that there will be vacancies come the local elections, everyone can give a thought to suggestions for filling the vacancies.

ACTION 11: Cllr Batchelor will find out the last date for submission for articles to be included in the Christmas newsletter.

ACTION 12: Cllr Rowley will find out if there is a cut-off date for co-option.

NEWTON

Cllr Watson reminded councillors that it has been nine months since Gigaclear were first asked as to was Newton going to get super-fast broadband and if so, when. He pointed out that Newton has a speed of 0.875, which is in the bottom two percent of the entire country. It is also difficult to get a mobile telephone line.

There is no Gigaclear update for this at present.

LITTLE OAKLEY

No issues raised.

ITEMS FOR NEXT MONTH'S AGENDA

1. Meadow grass (Cllr Rowley believe he will have an update by next month.)
2. Update as to the stonepit land.
3. The Geddington Cricket Club and a grant from McGeorge. No permission has been given.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.49pm.