

**GEDDINGTON, NEWTON AND LITTLE OAKLEY PARISH COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13<sup>th</sup> JULY 2020.**

*This was held as a virtual meeting – made necessary as a result of the coronavirus.*

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**APOLOGIES:**

No apologies.

**125/21: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Padwick for 131/21 (resident of West Street).

**126/21: CO-OPTION**

One member of the public (virtually) present wished to observe a Parish Council meeting to obtain a broad outline as to what was involved. He was therefore not ready to put his name forward for co-option at this meeting.

**127/21: PUBLIC SESSION.**

Four members of the public were present.

**a) Reports from County and Borough Councillors**

i) County Council report.

There was no County Council report from Cllr Perry.

ii) Borough Council report.

Cllr Rowley reported that the second tranche of discretionary grants had been handed out.

Planning Development and Executive meetings are taking place now, with the next shadow Cabinet meeting taking place on 6<sup>th</sup> August.

Cllr Padwick asked if there would be any help from KBC to keep the bus service going for Geddington. Cllr Rowley stated that KBC had given £2600 for a Wilbarston bus link, to run via Market Harborough, the Welland Valley and Corby. This was running one day a week until the lockdown in March, but has not run since then. Corby has also been given £2600 to help with running a service incorporating Kettering, and likewise to Rothwell Town Council. Everything has been put on hold since March however, and any help will only run until May 2021 when the unitary authority commences.

**128/21: MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

**a) Approval of Parish Council monthly meeting Minutes – held 8<sup>th</sup> June 2020.**

It was proposed by Cllr Wenbourne that the June minutes be approved, subject to two corrections at 118/21 and 124/21b). Seconded by Cllr Rowley, all councillors who had been present at the June meeting were in favour.

**ACTION 1: the clerk to circulate the corrected minutes.**

**b) Matters arising; progress on agreed actions.**

The two Land Registry search forms that have now been received to be circulated.

*Gigaclear updates:*

**ACTION 2: the clerk to contact Gigaclear to ask for update and /or any information that can be given to Newton residents.**

**ACTION 3: The clerk to send Cllr Rowley Cllr Perry's email as to where the Gigaclear installations are currently taking place.**

*9.6.20 action 3: Replacement bracket for the gate between the recreation field and the berm. Cllr Rowley had replaced and fixed the broken lock. Two weeks later the bracket had been removed however.*

**ACTION 4: Cllr Rowley will fix the lock/bracket again**

*9.6.20: action 6: The clerk to email Rachael G-B to see if she has managed to contact relevant persons (relating to meeting with Boughton Estates regarding Newton entrance).*

Rachael G- B had not replied to the clerk, but Cllr Rowley updated that she had reported that too much land would have to be given up and an ancient hedgerow would be lost. A compulsory order would be the only way forward.

*9.6.20, action 12: Cllr Rowley to request a second bin in the recreation ground, teenage area, or to move one bin to this site. It was thought that another bin may help by the berm gate.*

Cllr Rowley reported that an additional bin would not be provided as there were already nine bins in the recreation field, and five within site of the gate.

**ACTION 5: Cllr Rowley to request one bin to be moved within the recreation field to an area more heavily used.**

**129/21: FINANCE**

**a) Approval of accounts for 2019/20.**

The clerk confirmed that the annual internal audit report for 2019/20 had been completed and had been signed off by the auditor on 5.6.20. Cllr Watson stated that he was happy with the accounts, they had been signed off by the auditor, and proposed that the annual internal audit report, the annual governance statement and the accounting statements be approved and

signed off. Seconded by Cllr Rowley, all councillors present were in favour except for one abstention.

**b) Bank statements.**

Community account statement	as at 17.6.20	£51,375.01
Business Saver account	as at 17.6.20	£10,778.18

**c) Accounts received - none**

**d) Accounts for payment:**

Parish Clerk – Anita Curtis	£1077.29	Salary Apr – Jun 2020 ( <i>c/fwd. from last month</i> )
Parish Clerk – Anita Curtis	£60.00	Depreciation for equipment Apr - Jun 2020 ( <i>c/fwd. from last month</i> )
Parish Clerk – Anita Curtis	£269.20	PAYE paid via AC's card to HMRC Apr - Jun 2020 ( <i>c/fwd. from last month</i> )
Parish Clerk – Anita Curtis	£29.26	Expenses – £21.46 for printer ink for 2 qtrs., £7.80 postage, total £29.26. ( <i>c/fwd. from last month</i> )
CPRE	£36.00	Year's membership to June 2020
Fortus Midlands Ltd (Haines Watts)	£510.00	Preparation of accounts to yr. end 31.3.20

Cllr Padwick proposed that the payments be approved for payment, seconded by Cllr Rowley, approved by all councillors present.

**e) The option of online banking usage when/where it is more efficient. Decision needed.**

This was partially discussed at the last meeting but no decision was made. Councillors queried the authorisation of payments process, and were payments allowed with only one authorisation. The clerk conveyed that two electronic authorisations were needed for each payment, the councillors authorised are the same as those authorised to sign cheques. The clerk had asked Barclays as to the robustness of the process (and providing an audit trail) - Barclays had confirmed that a payment cannot be authorised without two authorisations, like signing of the cheques. They will not release payment until their process is correctly followed.

Cllr Goode said that Financial Regulations 5 (banking arrangements) would need to be changed.

Proposed by Cllr Batchelor that the option of online banking is put in place. Seconded by Cllr Padwick. Approved by all councillors present.

**130/21: ASSETS REGISTER - for review and sign off.**

Cllr Watson stated that there is only one item of value that currently is relevant for the accounts, which is the value of the recreation field, everything else in the accounts is at zero value. All the other details are minor. He added that there is a concept of accountancy call materiality: if the other minor points are not material, the Assets Register can be approved.

**ACTION 6: The clerk to circulate the Assets Register once more so that councillors can fill in the one or two highlighted minor items to complete.**

**131/21: RISKS ASSESSMENTS REGISTER – for review and sign off.**

Cllrs Foulke, Padwick and Batchelor had a meeting to discuss a revised document. This had then been sent out to Cllr Watson to address finance issues and Cllr Goode as the deputy Chairman. A few queries had arisen as a result of this, which Cllr Foulke will address on the register. Names need to be taken out so there are no GDPR issues. Cllr Watson added that the document needs to state that it will be reviewed on a six-monthly basis, other thoughts were on a quarterly basis. The frequency of the reviews will be listed. Cllr Foulke will amend the register and circulate before the next meeting

**PLANNING**

*This agenda item was discussed within the public session.*

**a) KBC Decision notices**

KET/2020/0171

*Mrs J Richards, 17 Grafton Road, Geddington. Replace windows with double glazed wooden units. Listed Building Consent Application.* Approved.

KET/2020/0187

*Harkers Barkers, Cobley Lodge Farm, Corby Road, Little Oakley. Single storey front extension to dog kennels building. Full Application.* Approved.

**b) Formation of Planning working group – to be discussed.**

Members believed that the Larkfleet Homes application needed a detailed response which would be more comprehensive if a planning working group was formed. The application is on a huge scale for a village, and discussion within a normal monthly Parish Council meeting would not do any response justice.

The proposal was to set up a specific Parish Council meeting, at which members of the public could be present and have input. The meeting would have to be a Zoom meeting, at which councillors and residents could receive and go through all comments and input received.

It was commented that 21 days is not enough time to correlate all the information needed to feed into comments to be made to KBC, but Cllr Rowley reminded all those present that this is a legal requirement. He added that the Council could ask for an extension to the 21 days if it was needed unless pressure was being received from the developers.

Although a proposal had been made for formation of a working group, members of the public wished to express their thoughts whilst present at the virtual meeting and some initial information was given:-

- The area for the planning application is outside the village envelope.
- The proposed 26 homes would all be affordable housing. This is a high density of affordable housing for any application.
- Larkfleet Homes are taking advantage of a new policy brought in last year.
- Larkfleet Homes put forward a similar proposal for Hackleton (in this county).
- One resident lives on the boundary of the proposal; He runs a bee keeping business, the hives are situated at the end of the garden by the boundary: the 300,000 bees may cause a problem.
- Another resident said that their property had been left off the plans completely, even though the proposed development comes within 10 metres of their boundary.
- The issues raised would be complex.
- A further resident said he would like to be part of the next meeting.
- One resident asked if any consultation with residents could take place in person, rather than as a virtual meeting. He was informed that the village hall was not available as any meeting currently has to be Covid 19 secure and meetings in person are not allowed as per the current legislation.

Cllr Batchelor proposed that a full Parish Council meeting to be held early next week, and Cllr Buckseall to meanwhile set up a working party prior to the meeting to start to pull together any relevant information. The working party should include at least three parish councillors. Seconded by Cllr Rowley, agreed by all councillors present.

Cllr Batchelor then suggested Monday 20<sup>th</sup> July for the Extraordinary Parish Council meeting.

Cllr Buckseall proposed that the four original councillors who had suggested a working group were included – Cllrs Padwick, Foulke, Buckseall and Goode (if he was available).

### c) Planning Applications

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

*KET/2020/0399*

*Mr P Frampton, 48 West Street, Geddington. Single storey annex within rear garden. Listed Building Consent Application.*

*and*

*KET/2020/0398*

*Mr P Frampton, 48 West Street, Geddington. Single storey annex to rear. Full Application*

Cllrs noted that the application is an annexe – virtually an outside shed. 3 x 6m with a flat roof, with plastic windows.

- To be situated in the far corner of the garden. It cannot be seen from the road. It is within the conservation area.

Comments made were as follows: -

It will be on the boundary of a neighbouring property. Cllrs believed that it should be at least 2.3 metres from the boundary.

- It exceeds the height that should be allowed?

- Windows are facing the boundary with the neighbour. If they are allowed to face this way then they should have obscured/ frosted glass.

- It is too close to the boundary – windows will overlook the neighbour's property.

Cllr Batchelor proposed that the application was neither supported or not supported, but that the comments above were relayed to KBC – in particular that it is too close to the boundary with the neighbours, and that the windows are overlooking the neighbour's property, to be taken into consideration when the planning decision is made.

Seconded by Cllr Padwick, approved by all councillors present except for two abstentions.

*KET/2020/0337*

*Mr J Prentice, Weldon House, Corby Road, Little Oakley. Timber carport. Full Application.*

Noted that the garage development is on the opposite side to the graveyard, and it would be seen from the road. Cllr Bailey was not aware that neighbours have been consulted for this application.

There was some concern that the neighbours do not appear to have been consulted – the Parish Councillor for Little Oakley has seen no planning notice on the street in the proximity of the application. One may have been posted, but it may be on a road/driveway to the property that no one else would access?

All other planning applications for Little Oakley have had notices posted and visible, except for this application.

**ACTION 7: This issue has been sent to Cllr Mark Rowley who as the Borough Councillor may be able to check this concern raised.**

**132/21: CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED OR CIRCULATED** - to note or comment upon.

A letter has been received from a resident in West Street which has been circulated. The resident is asking if road markings can be added on the road opposite to 25 & 23 Glebe House.

Councillors appreciated the difficulties with parking and viewing oncoming cars, especially from the main road. Cars are parked for the full length of West Street and there is nowhere else to park. Taking extra parking spaces out of West street if yellow lines were painted on a section of the road would cause a parking difficulty for residents of West Street as a whole as it would take parking away for at least three cars. A balance has to be taken for the rest of the village.

It was also pointed out that yellow lines painted opposite the resident's driveway means they are outside another person's property. Additionally, lines on the opposite side would not make any difference as to visibility. -

Councillors summarized the discussion by saying that they sympathized with the resident but the facility it gives takes away from other residents of West Street.

**ACTION 8: The clerk to reply to the resident.**

**133/21: ENVIRONMENT**

**a) Village signage**

**i) Information signage**

It was decided that the following signs / placements to be considered: -

1. A sign by the Congregational Church in Queen Street
2. A sign at each entrance to the village (but can they be affixed to the nearest lamp posts?)
3. A sign facing in each direction on the disputed lamppost in front of the Congregational Church
4. By the bridge.
5. At the entrance to the children's play park.

Signs may need to specify "parking in the village hall car park", others may need to indicate the direction of the Village Hall.

Kensigns have offered some free signage.

Cllr Foulke had obtained pricings from two companies – Nordis (who NCC/Kier use) - £48 for each standard road sign. "Safety signs for less" charges £20 for each sign (2mm hard plastic).

Cllr Rowley proposed that Cllrs Foulke and Batchelor pursue possible free signage by speaking to Peter Moat (Kensigns), and to authorise a spend of up to £200 if necessary. Seconded by Cllr Batchelor, agreed by all those present.

ii) Road markings –review of parking constraints in the village.

iii) Cllr Foulke said that last year the Parish Council had missed the date for review of parking constraints within the village. Sarah Barnwell is happy for the PC to complete a request form for a potential review of Bridge Street and Queen Street, pending future chosen consideration.

Details as to what councillors would wish her to look at and consider can be carried out at a later date. If a review highlights something that could benefit this area, they will then carry out a public consultation. Cllr Goode added that she needs proposals for the areas to be looked at.

It was proposed by Cllr Batchelor that Cllr Foulke sources and fills out the appropriate form in that states the Parish Council would like to express an interest in a review being carried out. To be shared with Cllr Batchelor and the clerk. Seconded by Cllr Rowley, approved by all councillors present.

**ACTION 9: Cllr Foulke to fill out and send off the above form.**

iv) Adequacy of flood signage for the ford

Sarah Pasker-Lee (the flood warden) would like to see a proper board saying “road closed”. Cllr Rowley asked if it could be deferred to the next meeting and an agenda item of flood gates/flood signage be discussed.

It was agreed to defer this item to the next meeting.

b) **Light in Village Hall car park** – Decision as to quotation received.

The quotation of £175.00 from the electrician had been circulated. Cllr Rowley proposed that the quotation be accepted, seconded by Cllr Padwick, approved by all councillors present.

**ACTION 10: The clerk to contact the electrician.**

c) **Stile by Nancy Moore Steps - update**

Cllr Goode said that this had been raised with Rachael Gladstone-Brown, and alternative designs had been given to her. The design for a metal kissing gate at the bottom of the field was Boughton Estate’s preferred option. This will cost (for two gates) £1200.00. Cllr Goode said he was happy to supervise the removal of the old gates.

**ACTION 11: Cllr Goode to ensure he obtains in writing from Boughton Estates that they are happy to pay for the gates.**

d) **The fallen fence at the back of the Recreation Field.**

The fence has broken at the back of the skate park in the recreation field, with part of the fence being in the brook. This will have to be replaced as it is a Parish Council responsibility. The possibility of a metal fence was discussed, but it needs to be repaired quickly for health and safety issues. The clerk was advised that the same people could be used as before when the fence needed repairing, and this needed to proceed.

Cllr Watson also suggested an article could be put in the next newsletter advising parents that they are effectively paying for a replacement fence.

**ACTION 12: The clerk to contact the company who had repaired the fence previously.**

**ACTION 13: An article to be written for the next newsletter to raise publicity of the vandalised fence. Cllr Batchelor will liaise with the newsletter.**



**e) The possibility of village toilets. – discussion.**

It was agreed to defer this to the next meeting because of time constraints.

**134/21: VIRTUAL PC MEETING PROTOCOL – draft document for discussion/ amendments**

This is now finished. It states the facilities to record the meetings but it was acknowledged that the level of recording could be made easier. It was suggested that the following needs adding – “the meeting will be broadcast live on YouTube” for when that is introduced. Cllr Batchelor was happy to have that added. Proposed by Cllr Padwick and seconded by Cllr Rowley that the document with the slight addition can now be the working protocol for virtual meetings. Approved by all councillors present.

**135/21: THE POSSIBILITY OF A VILLAGES EVENT TO MARK THE END OF COVID 19.**

It was recognized that this is not possible at the moment. It is a responsibility of the Parish Council to bring the villages together whenever possible but not at the present time.

**NEWTON**

No issues.

**LITTLE OAKLEY**

No issues.

**AOB**

An August meeting to be held as it is needed due to the number of issues outstanding and coming forth.

*There being no further business, the meeting finished at 10.00pm.*