

GEDDINGTON, NEWTON AND LITTLE OAKLEY PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING HELD ON 20th 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, P Goode, D Watson, M Rowley, J Padwick, A Foulke, C Buckseall.

Plus several residents from 7 households.

1. Apologies and Declarations of Interest

Apologies were recorded from the Clerk.

There were no declarations of interest, but it was noted that Cllr Rowley as Borough Councillor would abstain from the debate in Item Two.

2. Planning Application

KET/2020/0369

Larkfleet Homes, Stamford Road (land off), Geddington

26 no. dwellings and all other associated infrastructure including access, drainage and public open space

Full Application *(expiry date for consultations – 23.7.20).*

The Chair welcomed and thanked all Councillors and residents for attending, and invited residents to communicate their thoughts on the proposed development. Residents gave helpful and succinct accounts. These were summarized as follows:

- There was a property in the rear of one garden of Newton Road omitted from the Applicant's plans.
- The proposal did not constitute a 'small scale infill'
- The layout was too dense
- The Applicant had argued that the application went some way to meeting the Borough's needs, but this did not necessarily translate as the Parish's needs
- There were deep concerns with the main Stamford Road outside the proposed development being prone to speeding, hence the (non-working) speed camera present
- Pedestrians exiting the development to reach the village centre and amenities would have to cross the Newton Road which had no pedestrian crossing, then over to the corner of West Street using the available pedestrian crossing, but then meeting a hazard in terms of no path, and having to cross West Street with a blind spot in the form of the Vicarage wall.
- The development would in all likelihood generate a great deal more traffic egressing to the A4300 than in the Applicant's Traffic Survey, which was not site-specific

- There would be insufficient parking, and the natural overflow would be on Stamford Road itself, and nearby Queen Eleanor Road, Newton Road and West Street.
- There were no proposals to put in additional right-turn signage when raveling South from Corby.
- Drainage was a significant concern expressed by many Newton Road and Stamford Road residents. These included: a recent single construction experienced hitting the water table at 1.5m when digging foundations, just metres from the proposed development site; the surrounding gardens became sodden after any excess rainfall; the front gardens on Stamford Road were particularly prone to flooding, with the drainage ditch running along the East boundary being insufficient for the current run-off from the North, having only a 500mm egress pipe, let alone the planned additional capacity from the proposed basin.
- The sites was a renowned ridge and furrow field, evidenced from aerial photographs.
- There were concerns expressed about the impact to wildlife. The field was a known habitat for newts, and the meeting was shown photographs by a resident. There was a badger sett some 4 metres from the West boundary. The resident with the garden bordering keeps bees, and their number is estimated at 300,000 in their peak each years. The 10 hives were deliberately positioned to keep the activities of the bees away from people, and as close as possible to the open countryside. There are bats in the trees overhanging the proposed development site. Unfortunately all these aspects were missed as the Applicant's Ecology Report was completed in January, when all thse species would be hibernating or not in evidence.
- The trees in the above resident's garden were understated in the plans and would shade the rear gardens of the houses planned to the West extreme of the development, there being worries that these mature trees could be cut down. There was a lime tree by the entrance to the proposed development which would probably need to be felled.
- The village school was currently at capacity, and there was no more physical room to expand.
- The bus service alluded to in the Applicant's Traffic Plan was not reliable and only temporary with no assurance that it would continue beyond May 2021.
- The site is Greenfield, outside the village boundary, yet there were two brownfield sites identified in the local consultation. There had been no community consultation as to this proposed development or what local needs were.

These were the salient points, and the Chair thanked the residents for their input.

Councillors then debated the application, and considered the material planning considerations, led by Councillor Claire Buckseall, Chair of the Planning Committee, and facilitated by her nominated working party.

The following points were made in addition to, or as an augmentation fo what residents had raised:

- In the event of a conflict between National, Regional and Local plans, the agreed Local Plans had primacy. Therefore the colloquially known local 'Plan 2' had primacy over the Regional 'Joint Core Strategy', which in turn had primacy over the National Planning Framework. The local Plan 2 clearly identified three locations for development in the village which included an element of affordable housing;
- The proposed development did not meet the needs of the village. The last Housing Needs survey was completed in 2011, and placed emphasis on the need for 3 bedroomed properties, social housing, and housing suitable for the disabled and elderly, thus with additional facilitated access. Some Councillors felt strongly that another Housing Needs Survey should be commissioned and undertaken.
- Councillors debated the drainage issues at length. Additionally, concerns were expressed that the foul water/sewage would need to be routed to the Sewage OWrks on Kettering Road via the pump to the rear of West Street, which had regularly discharged and emitted raw sewage into the River Ise. Critically, whilst the retention pond might be deemed theoretically sufficient for this field when developed, it did not take into consideration the run off from the other fields due North, up a gradient and culminating in this field.
- In general Councillors felt that the development was oversized, and too much for the village – echoing resident's views that whilst it might go a long way to meeting the Borough's needs, the total should be spread amongst various parishes. Concern was expressed that the occupants of the affordable housing would be 'ghettoed' in one area and integration would be more difficult
- There were significant concerns expressed about the lack of places in the village school for occupants of 26 properties, and that this might force out pupils from further afield who had spent several years at the school. It was noted and agreed that the school had physically no more space to expand, being single class per year.
- The planned roads within the development contained no obvious turning circle or method of turning for larger delivery vehicles or refuse vehicles, and once the former was parked, access by an emergency vehicle would be at best touch and go, and at worst, not possible.

At the culmination of the discussion, a proposal as made to not support/object to the development, for all the material considerations listed above. All Councillors voted to object, with one abstention. The motion was therefore carried.

Councillor Batchelor took the action to revert to Kettering Borough Council with the considered view of the Parish Council.

The Chair then thanked residents again.

3. Assets register – for review and sign off.

The recently re-circulated Assets Register was displayed on the screen, and the remaining queries identified by the Clerk highlighted and discussed.

Councillors agreed a change in wording, and the acceptance of the slightly amended Assets Register was proposed, seconded, and duly voted upon. It was agreed unanimously to accept and adopt the document.

There being no further business, the meeting finished at 9.57pm.