

GEDDINGTON, NEWTON AND LITTLE OAKLEY PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING HELD ON 2nd SEPTEMBER 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, M Rowley, J Padwick, A Foulke, C Buckseall, S Wenbourne, P Johnson.

146/21: Apologies and Declarations of Interest

Apologies for absence received from Cllrs D Watson and D Rushton.

Declarations of Interest declared by Cllr Johnson for planning application (6 Chase View Road) – a relative is a neighbour to this property.

Declarations of Interest declared by Cllr Buckseall for planning application (6 Chase View Road) – lives near to this dwelling.

147/21: PUBLIC SESSION.

Two members of the public were (virtually) present.

PLANNING MATTERS AND APPLICATIONS.

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

a) Boughton Lodge – planning application has been submitted to KBC but not yet processed or on the website. It is for demolition and rebuild of the farmhouse. The applicant wishes to speak to the Parish Council concerning the application.

The above agenda item was discussed within the public session as the applicants wished to speak concerning the application.

Cllr Batchelor advised them that because of procedural reasons a decision as to feedback to KBC would not be made tonight.

Two councillors had attended the site last week at the invitation of Warkton Parish Council.

The applicant stated a wish to have a more active role in the Boughton Estate over the next few years. Sustainable issues including solar panels, bio diversity and ecological issues were important to him. He invited those present to come and view the site on the Boughton Estate at a time and date to suit all, and said he wanted to build a house that is smaller than the original footprint but bigger than the current dwelling.

Cllr Rowley wished to clarify that he has not been involved in any pre-planning for the application. He added that the invitation to view the site was sent to the Parish Council but it had not been sent out to everyone. The application was not showing on the KBC website as at the date of this meeting. The boundary between Geddington and Warkton goes through the existing building, however most of the land is within the Warkton Parish so the application may go to Warkton. At the time of the meeting it was unknown what the expiry date for consultation was.

The resulting discussion raised the following facts, statements and queries:-

1. This application is for a new build in the countryside: the current building was last inhabited two years ago. The applicant added here that the cost of underpinning and replacing the roof and chimney outweighed a re-build. The plans include ecological details.
2. It will be half a mile away from the road but will be visible, whereas the current dwelling is not. The applicant said that as per the impact study, it should not be visible apart from in the winter months. Additionally, more trees and hedgerows will be planted.
3. At the moment there are talks as to potential access for vehicles for the construction using the main road to the estate rather than going through Geddington and Warkton.
4. There are no plans by Boughton Estates to build any more dwellings in the open countryside. This will be a one off, of considerable size, and very much tied to the Boughton Estate.

The public session then ended.

Two councillors asked that if the application formally comes to this Parish Council, do councillors have a formal site visit? Cllr Padwick said that the advice of the Planning Dept at KBC was needed, as the Parish Council must be transparent and everybody must be treated the same.

There was concern raised as to visibility from the main road as the application shows it will be a large property.

It is unclear at this which Parish Council will be asked to make comments on the application.

***b) KET/2020/0447 - Mr P Eyre, 6 Chase View Road, Geddington.
Raise the roof of existing detached garage. Full Application***

Expiry date for neighbours/consultations 3.9.20

The application details were discussed and the following comments made:-

The existing garage is 9.4 metres in length. The application is to raise the roof by 930 mm and timber clad the sides.

The proposal is higher than the neighbouring property but the Parish Council have not been informed that they have any issues with it.

The garage is on the boundary where the maximum height for such a construction is believed to be 3.4 metres high, the application would take it to approximately 4.5 metres high.

The neighbouring property has sheds on the other side of the boundary wall.

Concerns were raised that the current owner may wish the height to be so that he can use the garage for a campervan, but it may be used for a different purpose in the future.

The view from Wood Street (on Google Street View) indicates that the heightened garage would be as high as the extension to the house.

The houses to the east side of the property are at a lower level.

It is sufficiently far back within the property that the additional height would not be able to be seen from Chase View Road.

It is better for the motorhome to be housed in a garage than parked on the road.

It was proposed by Cllr Batchelor that there be no comments, seconded by Cllr Goode. There were two abstentions, one councillor was against this proposal, agreed by the other councillors present.

148/21: WHITE PAPER “*Planning for the future*” - Response required

(<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future>) Published by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government. .

The above White Paper is at the consultation stage.

The following points were raised within an extensive discussion:-

1. An Ncalc working group is meeting on 4th September; they may be seeking clarification on point 5 “aspects of three terms of growth” - Growth areas would automatically be granted planning permission.
2. It appears that it is the bureaucratic pre-work that the White Paper is looking to shorten.
3. It reads that the larger development sites will possibly be pre-allocated as a consultation would have already taken place and agreed. The principal of development will be that councils will have been consulted anyway.
4. They are trying to involve communities on the development of planning at an early stage. But people tend not to engage at this level.
5. Does the presumption of planning permission only cover the initial planning permission or does it cover detailed planning permission?
6. It reads as if you pull something out from the planning rules then it will be automatically accepted.

7. Planning considerations will still be valid, and the White Paper looks as if the main concern is to shorten the planning process.
8. Several councillors in favour of speeding up planning regulations. One councillor believes views of the locality will still be taken into account.
9. Affordable house targets are to be kept, and viability reports have to be given by developers if they cannot reach the targets for an estate. It may involve getting rid of s.106 and CIL and a more defined figure given, with this monetary figure going to local councils.
10. It is working towards standardising a large part of the planning process. The White Paper includes a lot of principles that are positive but we object to any removal of local discretionary input.
11. The planning portfolio is overbearing and over wielding at the present time. An example of what happens in the current system is Hanwood Park - forced on the Borough by the then Minister in charge resulting in 5000 homes for Kettering East. The White Paper appears to tidy things up but there will be issues that are not agreeable to us.
12. Will Parish Councils and local planning authorities still have the ability to object to individual planning applications.
13. The Site Specific Plan: would this still have significance? It was thought that it would, as designated areas for housing and also for spaces is within the White Paper.
14. The questions are geared to what the Government wants rather than what we wish to know.
15. Developers seem to be much more in control than local authorities. They have less obligation and responsibilities to provide affordable housing.
16. Under 40 – 50 houses – this size development will have no infrastructure levy required for providing affordable housing.
17. The increase to 40/50 houses is contained within the associated "Changes to the Current Planning System" legislation referenced in the white paper which is the subject of separate consultation until October 1st.
18. To speed up the planning process will reduce the time for each stage to take place. Local councils will therefore not have the time or application to fully take on board observations that are made. There is already not enough time for local input.

19. We support the quickening up of the planning application requirement for the level of input from local councils to be maintained, but the current 21 days given for consultation is already too short. With Planning being taken back to the unitary councils the process will be more remote. We do not want streamlining and processes that do not take account of local communities.

20. There are serious concerns regarding residents' rights to concentrate on individual planning applications – will that be taken away?

21. We would welcome some speeding up on the planning process but there must be proper engagement for the Local Plan.

22. We should not be reducing the time for residents' input.

23. The document does not say that the time scale will be reduced.

24. It does not focus much upon the individual applicant for whom the process is long winded.

25. Not everybody has a computer; the notices displayed on lamp posts are still needed.

26. It may result in losing the opportunity to influence local designs.

27. The "renewal" aspect would include the potential Stamford Road development if that area was designated a renewal area.

28. It appears that only with the protected areas would there be an opportunity for local input.

29. We need to express our requirement that the level of input from local councillors be maintained. Example is for the Stamford Road planning application and local input as to flooding risks, animals, traffic issues and how many near misses on this stretch of road.

This item will be added to the monthly Parish Council meeting on 14th September for the comments and input for the response to be summarised ready for approval at the September or October meeting.

149/21: Potential to resume Parish Council meetings at the Village Hall.

Cllr Batchelor informed councillors that the Village Hall caretaker has informed him that the Village Hall has carried out several changes in line with Covid-19 requirements, but masks would have to be worn for the whole meeting. Cllr Rowley has spoken to the Monitoring Officer at the Borough Council, and for the number of councillors involved you would need a room the size of the KBC Chamber. There would also have to be additional provision for any other member of the public who wished to attend the meeting. The Monitoring Officer has advised not to attend the meeting with these circumstances.

As the Parish Council representative for the Village Hall, Cllr Goode advised that there are now sanitising stations and a second door is now in use so there are entrance and exit routes. The hall would have to be cleaned and only one toilet can be used, although there would be no need to disinfect it after every use.

Councillors were reminded that the Minister for Housing and Communities has recently said that we should still be meeting remotely wherever possible, unless there is a major problem with working remotely.

It was felt that as well as the above advice, wearing masks for 2 1/2 hours would be very uncomfortable. Cllr Goode informed councillors that the mask information was incorrect. They would need to be worn in all the common areas but if there was one area where everybody could be two metres apart then they would not have to be worn.

Cllr Batchelor thanked Brian Leaton and Cllr Goode for working hard to enable the hall to be re-opened. The Parish Council would however continue with virtual meetings at the present time.

AOB.

None.

There being no further business, the meeting finished at 9.23pm.