

GEDDINGTON, NEWTON AND LITTLE OAKLEY PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11th JANUARY 2021.

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Councillors N Batchelor (Chair), C Buckseall, D Rushton, P Goode, J Padwick, D Watson, M Rowley,

APOLOGIES:

Councillor T Bailey, P Johnson.

184/21: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

185/21: PUBLIC SESSION.

Two members of the public were virtually present at the meeting.

a) **Questions sent in by the public**

No questions had been received.

The two members of the public (Clive Curtis and Richard Broughton) wished to have input as to agenda item 8) Flooding. This agenda item was then brought forward so public input could feed into it if it was desirable. C Curtis stated that his main reason for attending the meeting was that he wished certain facts to be minuted. The facts were as follows:

The Wood Street bund was breached on 23.12.20 but it was almost breached on 9.1.20 as it was on 9.3.2016.

He has been in touch with the Environment Agency to obtain rainfall figures to carry out some analysis for all three of these dates.

The bund had been measured annually since it was rebuilt in 1998 up until 2017, but then it was changed without recourse to the Parish Council to once every two years, although bi-annual was stated in documents instead of biennial. It has not been measured since 2017.

Cllr Rowley stated however that it was measured in 2020. Cllr Padwick that the date of inspection was 29.9.2020.

ACTION 1: Cllr Rowley will forward the 2020 measurements to C Curtis.

Cllr Rowley explained that there is concrete running through the centre of the bund, with metal pins protruding from it. The point to which the height is compared for measurement is now the church spire.

C Curtis also asked when the water entered Bridge Street. Water was coming out the manhole covers in Bridge Street by 3.00pm at least, with the brook overflowing at a similar time. The water came back up again in Bridge Street (after retreating somewhat) within about an hour from 11.00pm. Several other areas of the village were also affected.

Richard Broughton thanked Clive for early intervention and the wider community for their support.

He stated that the bund that was designed as a flood defence significantly mitigated the impact of the flooding for residents in Bright Trees Road and the top part of Wood Street. However, the bund did not do the job that it was designed to do. He wished to ask the Chair to acknowledge the shortcomings of the bund and to confirm the Parish Council's support for the residents of the Parish as they endeavour to engage the relevant stakeholders and ensure the corrective necessary action is undertaken.

Cllr Batchelor gave his assurance as Chair that what the Parish Council can do they will do.

b) Reports from County and Borough Councillors

County Council

Cllr Perry had intended to virtually attend the meet but there was a diary clash. She had sent an email highlighting the following issues: -

Any issues around surface water, drains and gullies – could they be directed to her and she will forward to the appropriate teams.

Some hospitals are discharging vulnerable elderly patients without support and with technology they struggle with. Any issues councillors hear of, please refer them to Cllr Perry as she is liaising directly with Adult Social Care on this issue.

The current consultation on “climate change in North Northamptonshire” need any feedback by 14.1.21. Cllr Rowley said that this was only a two-week consultation that would feed into a working group.

Borough Council

Current matters are the climate change consultation and the budget consultation, as well as getting ready for the change to unitary council. Blueprint meetings on Scrutiny are taking place. There should be an election in May but there is an element of doubt as to if this will be able to take place at the present time.

186/21: MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

a) Approval of Parish Council monthly meeting draft minutes – held 14th December 2020.

It was proposed by Cllr Padwick and seconded by Cllr Goode that the December minutes be accepted. Approved by all councillors present.

b) Matters arising; progress on agreed actions /outstanding actions.

Action 1: 14.12.20 – (NCC to be asked if cameras can be put down two drains and higher maintenance programme for them). The clerk to report this request to NCC via Street Doctor.

This had been reported, both for cameras to be inserted down two drains and for these two drains to be inspected before commencement of every winter. However, the clerk had reported the drain by the Newton Rd / Stamford Road as she believed this was the location of the problem drain, rather than the drain by Thomas Rippin Close.

ACTION 2: This will now be added to the list of issues to be addressed by the Flood Group working party.

Action 3: 14.1.21 – (Repair of the Geddington notice board).

Parish Notice Board company had replied to the email sent, stating they could come out to view the notice board week commencing 11th January. This however was followed by another email

few days later (with the new lockdown) saying that he did not think he should travel to Geddington in the present climate, but would visit when things were back to normal.

At this point Cllr Goode wished to update to the email he had received from the resident who had suggested use of the industrial units car parking spaces to ease the parking issues at the Grange Road/ Skeffington Road junction, and the resulting reply from the December meeting's discussion. He has replied asking the Parish Council to pursue the suggestion of using the frontage area of the industrial estate. He realised that this has been previously requested but ask if we could ask them to reconsider the request or ask them if they could justify why they feel it is a security issue. He believes that the only security aspect has been created by having a vehicle barrier across the entrance which does not stop pedestrian access.

ACTION 3: Cllr Rowley will raise the issue with KBC again.

Action 4: 14.12.20 – Insurance – to obtain one other quotation for the public liability insurance.

Insurance is an agenda item on the January agenda, but Cllr Batchelor added that the current insurance company had replied to his further query concerning consequential loss, citing some examples. They have still not stated whether the Parish Council is covered for consequential loss.

Action 7: 14.12.20 – (Labosport report) The clerk to send an email to the Cricket Club advising them that the Parish Council needs to hear how the club can address the safety issues raised by the risk assessment in conjunction with the ECB guidelines.

This was sent to the Cricket Club.

Action 8: 14.12.20 – (Cricket Club insurance policy note and details).

The Cricket club have emailed a copy of their insurance policy details, which Cllr Goode said it is a very straight forward and detailed policy. The have third party property damage insurance and public liability insurance, and meets the Parish Council's requirements as a landlord.

Action 9: 14.12.20 – Further email sent from the Cricket Club just before the December meeting, sent to Cllr Batchelor only.

This has now been sent to all councillors as per requested.

187/21: FINANCE

a) Bank statements.

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Community account statement | as at 17.12.20 | £46,931.07 |
| Business Saver account | as at 17.12.20 | £10,779.94 |

b) Accounts received - none

c) Accounts for payment: -

| | | |
|---|----------|----------------------------|
| Anita Curtis | £1106.85 | 1/4ly salary Oct – Dec 20. |
| Anita Curtis (PAYE already pd via AC's own debit card). | £276.70 | PAYE Oct – Dec 20 |

| | | |
|--------------|---------|---|
| Anita Curtis | £ 60.00 | Agreed 1/4ly depreciation of equipment. |
| Anita Curtis | £13.96 | Expenses – Printer ink Oct – Dec 20 |

Cllr Rowley proposed that the accounts be authorised for payment, seconded by Cllr Goode, approved by all councillors present.

d) PC budget for 2021-22 - decision to be made.

Cllr Watson summarised the expected costs to the Council for the coming year. These will be approximately £10,500, plus another £2,500 to allow for a possible election.

The discussion then moved on to the level of precept required.

e) Precept decision for 2021- 22 - decision to be made.

The precept for the last few years has been £20,000. This would give a surplus of approximately £9,500 if there is no election, or £7,000 if there is an election. If the muga is going to be considered for this financial year, or if there are any associated costs for flooding or lighting, they need to be allowed for in the budget as possible costs.

Additionally, a solution might present itself for the Newton turn, and the School PA would like a contribution to the sports project they are looking at for school children and village residents. A discussion ensued as to the recognition that the annual surplus has built up, but should the level of precept be increased or maintained. After several opposing opinions it was pointed out that it has been about four years since the precept was increased to its present level, Parish Council costs have gone up by approximately £2,000 since then. The car park extension will probably use up 50% -75% of the reserves. Additionally, the government have stated that parish and town councils will not be capped for the coming financial year, but if they are for the following year, it would be likely to be at 2% increase. It was felt that a reasonable inflationary increase would be £2000.

It was therefore proposed by Cllr Rowley that a £2000 increase was reasonable, seconded by Cllr Padwick. All those councillors present approved of the increase except for one councillor.

f) Insurance – to compare quotations – decision to be made for public liability insurance to run from 6.2.21 – 5.2.22.

Two insurance quotations have been received from the insurance broker, both approximately for £480.00, and a further quotation that was considerably higher from an independent insurance company. It was queried as to is consequential loss included in the cover given in the quotations. None of the insurance quotations mention consequential loss and the existing insurance cover with Zurich does not include it. The issue of consequential loss was raised when the risk analysis sheet was updated. Cllr Goode said that the public liability insurance will pay a certain amount for a claim, which would include any damages or other matters that the claimant submits at the time of their claim.

It was pointed out that the reason for obtaining insurance quotations was that Zurich had been asked questions relating to the insurance cover provided and consequential loss but no clear answers has been given. Their yearly cover is also more expensive than the two supplied by the insurance broker, who has recommended the cover given by Hiscox. This is £486.80 or £464.00 locked in for three years. It was stated that insurance costs might rise in the village because of the floods so the three-year option may be a better option. The Clerk stated what BHIB company had conveyed in a telephone call concerning cover. The insurance officer asked if the teenage shelter is covered as if it's not included in the children's playground it should be shown separately. She had never seen a teenage shelter not shown separately before. As a result, if somebody was injured either on or in the teenage shelter the Parish Council would not be covered. She would be happy to include it under street furniture so the Parish Council would be covered. She explained that their insurance is not like for like because of this and other minor anomalies on the Zurich cover. Additionally, public liability is normally set at 10 million pounds but for some reason Zurich have set theirs at 12 million pounds. Cllr Watson pointed out that when the playground was installed the teenage shelter was not part of the quotation, but it was part of the original playground.

Clarification needs to be obtained from the insurance company decided upon whether the teenage shelter is covered within children's playground

Proposed by Cllr Rowley that the Clerk goes back to Hiscox to confirm the schedule but that the Parish Council approve Hiscox as the provider as long as the price does not go up by more than 10% following the above clarification, and to opt for the three years lock in (as the schedule can still be altered). Seconded by Cllr Goode. Approved by all councillors present.

PLANNING

Cllr Rowley abstained from taking part in this Agenda item.

a) KBC Decision notices

*KET/2020/0738: Mr S Harberd, The Old School House, 4 Corby Road, Little Oakley.
Install cast iron guttering and downpipes to front
Listed Building Consent Application.*

Approved

*KET/2020/0605: Bushcraft Company Ltd, Boughton Woods, Acreland Farm Barns (land adj),
Grafton Underwood.*

*Use of land for outdoor adventure camping from 1 May to 25 July and 4 September to 2
October including storage, shower, toilet, drop off and coach turning areas*

*Full Application (this application was forwarded on to Grafton Underwood which was the parish
responsible for making any comments).*

Approved

a) Planning Applications for consideration

KET/2020/0887: Mr D Kwirovski, 6 Queen Eleanor Road, Geddington.

*Two storey rear, single storey front extensions and garage conversion, new detached garage all
to be rendered, raised front boundary wall by 1.5m with sliding gate and hinged gate with
covered patio at rear. Full Application*

The raised front boundary wall directly adjacent to the path in Queen Eleanor Road was thought to be the only issue that would be of any concern.

Proposed by Cllr Batchelor that there was no objection, seconded by Cllr Goode, agreed by all councillors present except for two abstentions.

*KET/2020/0871: Camgrain Stores Limited,
Northants APC, Newton Road (North of),
Newton
Erection of cereal processing plant, conveyors,
silos and ancillary structures and car park with
associated landscaping and infrastructure
Full Application*

The owners are looking to extend their operations to the east of the site and move the silos to put in a cereal process plant. This will be 30 metres high which is smaller than the silos. It will employ 60 staff and HGV movements will increase by 37,000 a year. Noise levels will be no more than 30 decibels at night. This application may go to Committee because of the size of the application.

Comments made: -

There was some concern as to noise levels for the area.

There was some concern that the area is currently used for storage, but what is planned is a processing operation, in an area of tranquillity.

It was commented that there must be trees planted to help absorb the noise.

There were some concerns as to the increase in lorry movements.

It was proposed by Cllr Goode that there would be no objection subject to enforcement of the traffic management plan, with no exit or entering the site from or to the A4300. All traffic needs to turn right when coming off the site and access the dual carriageway (including the construction vehicles). Additionally, to ensure there is sufficient noise mitigation (planting of trees etc). Seconded by Cllr Batchelor, all councillors present approved the motion except for one abstention.

*KET/2020/0895: Boughton Estates Ltd
Moat Farm (barns adj.), Corby Road, Little
Oakley.
Conversion and extension of existing barns to 1
no. dwelling including demolition of an
agricultural barn, with new shared vehicular
access and detached garage
Listed Building Consent Application*

*KET/2020/0876
Boughton Estates Ltd
Moat Farm (barns adj.), Corby Road, Little
Oakley.
Queen Eleanor & Buccleuch. Full application*

Both the full application and the Listed Building Consent Application were discussed as KET/2020/0895 in the meeting. The barn will be joined by a new room with a pitched roof.

Cllr Bailey was not able to be present at the meeting but had informed the Chair that villagers objected to anything changing concerning the existing wall that fronts the site.

There is no impact on neighbouring properties apart from the pitched roof. The gable end section of the roof section is the only visual change from the road view or for neighbours.

It was felt that there would be minimum impact to this part of the village.

Proposed by Cllr Buckseall that there would be no objection to the application, seconded by Cllr Goode, agreed by all councillors present except for one abstention.

188/21: CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED AND CIRCULATED - to note or comment upon.

This agenda item was not discussed at this meeting - caused by time issues with the meeting having to end at 10.00pm.

The Clerk was going to raise the email received from a resident concerning use of the industrial units in Grange Road for parking, but this was discussed under agenda item 186/21 b).

189/21: TO APPOINT A POLICE LIAISON REPRESENTATIVE TO ACT AS A SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT WITH NORTHAMPTONSHIRE POLICE - discussion.

This agenda item was not discussed at this meeting - caused by time issues with the meeting having to end at 10.00pm.

190/21: FLOODING

a) To discuss and review the flooding on and around 23rd December and causes.

Councillors gave a collective summary of what had happened and when.

Cllr Batchelor started to receive concerned calls from mid-afternoon on 23rd December advising that water run-off north of Newton Road was high. Residents thought the last time it had been so high was over 20 years ago when Newton Road had flooded. Cllr Watson added that water was pouring off the fields in Newton Road near the Buttery, went down the drains but was coming back up again near the first few houses on the north side of Newton Road, then carrying on down Newton Road. It was thought however that there was not the same volume of water here as was pouring off the fields and affecting the properties at the Stamford Road end.

Parts of West Street had started to flood, including a garage that had never been flooded before. Newton Road started to flood shortly after this, with the first three houses (Stamford Road end) to the right and left being breached. The water run off was from the fields and went straight through these houses, being 12 – 18 inches deep in places.

The second place affected was the top of Bright Trees Road, with the water building up in the field at the back of Bright Trees Road and then pouring over the bund and through the gardens of properties to the lower end of Bright Trees on both sides of the road. A manhole cover was opened which alleviated some of the water pressure, with the rest of the water going down Wood Street through residents' gardens. GVFB knocked on doors down Wood Street to warn residents of potential flooding but apart from going through some gardens this did not materialise.

The third place affected was one cottage near the end of Wood Street which had water bubbling up from the floors with the water table being so high.

The fourth site was on Bridge Street with water coming out of a manhole cover near the Cross by mid-afternoon. Water was also coming out of the manhole cover near the bridge. This was a split-topped one which meant the road had to be closed. KBC was asked to supply sandbags and three pallet loads were supplied.

The fifth site was the bridge end of Queen Street, opposite the Post Office and on both sides of the road. Two houses were flooded here in the late evening.

Three houses on New Road and one at the top end of Queen Street were also affected with water flooding the gardens, and one further property in New Road was flooded. One house in Stamford Road suffered from sewage in their conservatory. Cllr Rowley added that the water flowing down Stamford Road came off the fields, through the gates where the proposed new development is, along the footpath and hence to properties.

It was noted that GVFB sorted out the sandbags as to best use, brought and helped to use pumps and stripped carpets out. Kettering Fire Service and the Environmental Agency were also present and helping until early hours of the morning.

Cllr Rowley added that the report from Highways received recently stated that there had been heavy rain three to four days previous to the 23rd December, with torrential rain on the 23rd. The flooding was all caused by surface water.

Cllr Padwick noted that this was the first major incident since 1998 with saturated land and torrential rain happening with both incidences. With Newton Road the main water flow took a different path, with the water coming down the fields from the west and then down Newton Road. The properties very close to the brook did not become inundated with water as far as he knew, but this time far more of the water came down the roads from the back of the Chase. He added that the land where the planning application for 26 houses is sited was flooded for a very large part of the site. This area is shown on the.gov.uk site for flooding information, that it is an area that is in danger of being flooded.

The bund did not quite hold all the water, partly caused by torrential rain falling on saturated ground. However, if the field and the ditch had been properly maintained the flooding may not have been as bad. Walking to the top of the Chase via the left of the Brickyard Garden shows that the land is saturated. There are ditches all the way up to the top of the Chase, but they are not being maintained, hence water from the preceding months was still lying there prior to several days of considerable rain. The ditch in the field at the back of Bright Trees Road is also not being maintained. KBC officers cleared some of the field between the bund and the road a few months ago. Boughton Estates were reminded of this obligation (to inform the tenant farmer) some months ago.

The berm did what it was designed to do, but there was just too much water. The river overflowed just before midnight.

Cllr Watson added that Newton Road ditches have also not been maintained. Clear ditches may have let the water be absorbed over a longer period of time.

Some houses in New Road were affected for the first time he believed.

It was commented that when you see water going over a drain or coming out of a drain it does not necessarily mean that it is blocked. There is a maximum capacity of flow in all the surface water sewers, and once that is reached the sewer cannot take any more water.

Surface water drains - in the Pathfinder flood report of 2016 it says that surface water drainage in the village is minimal. The only plan shown is down Wood Street, from the drain by the bund, then underneath the houses on the opposite side of the school. It then branches off at the corner of Grafton Road, one branch going down to the brook between the priory and Priory Close, and the other branch going towards and down Bridge Street. A small drain starts in West Street and goes down Bridge Street, and another small drain starts by the Post Office and goes down to the brook. The manhole cover in Bridge Street by the bridge does not go into the wasteland at the side of the river, the pipe goes down the ramp to the ford, with the outlet pipe being visible 6 inches above the waterline. The one in Queen Street also goes down to the ford and the outlet is visible. The pipe on the other side of Bridge Street crosses over at the bridge and goes out on the wasteland with the outlet visible two or three feet above the waterline. Cllr Rowley concluded that this is the problem with surface water in Queen Street and Bridge Street, and the water coming

down from the Chase, in that if the brook rises up by a foot, the outlet pipes are effectively blocked.

Cllr Buckseall added that the water table at the Stamford Road end of Newton Road is exceptionally high and the field at the back seems to direct the water to this area of Newton Road.

b) Consideration of forming a working group and if this is agreed, to agree the terms of reference and tasks/outputs of a Flood Working Group.

Cllr Batchelor wished to look at any actions that need to be undertaken, to carry out what a working group are able to do but to come back to the Parish Council when decisions need to be made. Cllr Rowley added that there was an action list in the Village Plan that has not been actioned, and the Pathfinder report also states what needs doing and a list of actions to carry out. Cllr Watson thought that the Parish Council may need some professional advice. A report may be produced that contains amateur assumptions otherwise.

The discussion concluded by Cllr Rowley saying that as the Chair of the Planning Committee and the Borough Councillor, he had spoken to the Head of Planning after the floods to say he wanted a site visit to highlight what had happened on the corner of Newton Road, and for it to be fed into the planning application. There was already an objection in from NCC stating that the area floods.

c) To agree a Chair and members of the Flood Working Group.

Cllr Batchelor proposed that Cllr Rowley lead the working group, seconded by Cllr Padwick, approved by all those present.

Cllrs Padwick and Buckseall said they would like to be part of the working group. Cllr Batchelor asked C Curtis if he could be called on for help and advice. An update at the next meeting would be desirable.

191/21: PARISH PLAN

a) The Post Office.

This agenda item was not discussed at this meeting - caused by time issues with the meeting having to end at 10.00pm.

192/21: ENVIRONMENT.

a) Labosport UK - ball strike report - update.

Correspondence has been received from ECB stating that they do not endorse or accredit Labosport UK for doing surveys; this is contrary to what the previous ECB correspondent said. Cllr Goode conveyed that the email dated 30.9.20 said ECB would only recognise Labosport UK as the only company that would satisfy ECB for a ball strike risk assessment. The comments in the most recent correspondence appear to back track on other requirements within the September email. They state that the use of the ball strike risk assessment is mainly through the planning application, and the report looks to mitigate risk against external development and structures. They appear to be downplaying the need for a risk management report from a Parish Council's perspective.

The Cricket Club's response is that they have spoken to Northamptonshire County Cricket and ECB and they have agreed potential mitigation measures that they would like to discuss with the Parish Council, to address issues raised in the risk assessment report. ECB are going to meet with Sports England very shortly, and intend to advise them that they would no longer have the same objection to the planning application for the extension carpark. The Parish Council still need to have the requirements of the risk management report to be addressed. The joint response from NCC and ECB appears to be that they will look at not using certain cricket wickets that are closest to the club house and car park

which would move or reduce the level of mitigation stated in the report. The Cricket Club wish to meet with the Parish Council, with the second option being that the Parish Council ask them to convey the risk mitigation proposals in writing to the Parish Council.

It was agreed that a virtual fact-finding meeting be held with the Cricket Club, with Cllrs Goode and Padwick stating they would like to attend, and Cllrs Batchelor and Watson depending on the date of the meeting.

b) Village Hall car park extension – update.

This was covered within the Labosport UK update.

c) Road run on Sun April 18th – discussion and feedback.

The company running the proposed road run event. They asked if the Parish Council would support it. Under the Parish Council's insurance "Statement of Fact", it states that the Parish Council should not undertake or organise any kind of race on Highways or where public roads need to be closed or crossed. The Parish could have no official role in the race as it would not be covered by insurance. The impracticalities that hosting a race in the centre of the village would cause, implications for West Street, traffic problems for the centre of the village made the race an undesirable event. It was decided that it brought no economic value to the village but it would cause a lot of inconvenience, with road closures needing to be in place for a couple of hours. It was however appreciated that they had thought of The Cross for the race starting point. Cllr Goode proposed that the reply should be that the Parish Council regret to inform them that it does not feel it in a position to support the proposed road run, based on the information that had been given, seconded by Cllr Rowley. All councillors present approved except for one abstention

ACTION 4: The Clerk to convey the above answer to the company.

d) Recreation ground play equipment and teenage shelter – repairs needed.

This agenda item was not discussed at this meeting - caused by time issues with the meeting having to end at 10.00pm.

e) Stonepit land - Land Registry update.

This agenda item was not discussed at this meeting - caused by time issues with the meeting having to end at 10.00pm.

f) Speed signage – to discuss the project in principle.

This agenda item was not discussed at this meeting - caused by time issues with the meeting having to end at 10.00pm.

Cllr Rowley added that he had some road speed signs if any were required.

NEWTON

There were no issues to report.

LITTLE OAKLEY

There were no issues reported.

AOB

The clerk added that Cllr Johnson had given updates for two issues when he had submitted his apologies today, and she would circulate the email after the meeting.

There being no other business, the meeting ended at 21:59hrs.