

**GEDDINGTON, NEWTON AND LITTLE OAKLEY PARISH COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2020.**

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**APOLOGIES:**

Councillors T Bailey, S Wenbourne, A Foulke.

**155/21: DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Claire Buckseall declared an interest for Planning application KET/2020/0607 (one family member – employment). Cllr Watson declared an interest for Planning application KET/2020/0607 (lives in Newton).

**156/21: PUBLIC SESSION.**

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

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

No questions had been received.

The agenda item “Planning” was then discussed within the public session (see Minute item “Planning” below).

One member of the public then wished to speak within the public session. She said that her expertise was in traffic planning and she was developing a village traffic plan and would appreciate knowing that the Parish Council supported the broad idea of what she was doing.

She summarised the current issues that would feed into the village plan as raising the pedestrian-only idea of the bridge, different ways to make walking and cycling easier and the proposed car park extension. She asked if the extension would be available all the time or only when events were held at the village hall or within the recreation field.

i) She added that the Government were putting two billion pounds into active planning now.

Firm plans need to be in place on paper however to be able to access any grant when it is available.

The walking bus will commence again, and she will be working from one of the units in Grange Road shortly.

Cllr Batchelor informed her that ideas as to the bridge were in their infancy, with the Parish Council looking at the legal viability of the option raised.

Cllr Goode informed her that optional closing of the extension car park did not feature in the original plan. The capacity of the extension was now reduced by one space and the Police as a consultee had fed back that the Parish Council may wish to consider the option of closing the extension off. This may however have to be a seasonal closure.

Cllr Padwick suggested that some cycle racks could be installed in the car park, and raised the issue of electric recharging points for the car park which had been suggested some time ago.

It was decided that the working committee for a travel plan would meet again. A draft copy of the travel plan went to all councillors when the previous work was carried out. A lot of consultation needed to be carried out, with surveys distributed. Cllrs Padwick, Johnson and Buckseall were happy to get actively involved in any help needed.

**b) Reports from County and Borough councillors**

ii) County Council report. There was no County Council report from Cllr Perry.

iii) Borough Council report.

Cllr Rowley reported that it is the last Rural Forum on 13<sup>th</sup> October 2020.

There is a consultation taking place concerning council tax relief for the new Unitary Council.

22 houses and 6 bungalows are being built in Scott Road and Albert Street by KBC, and further housing will be built imminently in Stamford Road on the site of the old Methodist Church and the Laurence site in Desborough.

**157/21: MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

a) **Approval of Parish Council monthly meeting draft minutes – held 14<sup>th</sup> September 2020**

It was proposed by Cllr Goode and seconded by Cllr Padwick that the September minutes be approved. Approved by all councillors present except for two abstentions.

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

*13.7.20 action 4: Cllr Rowley will fix the lock/bracket again. He will carry out the work as soon as he is able to.*

*10.8.20 action 3: The clerk to start a spreadsheet listing the incidents at least since 2014, cross referenced to photographs when they are available. Ongoing, not yet completed.*

*14.9.20, action 6: The clerk to ask the KBC for more training for planning regulations to lead to more efficient planning application feedback.*

No reply had been received from Planning. It was felt that an Ncalc course may therefore be worth pursuing, although there is no planned course on their schedule at the present time. Such a course needs to be a back to basics course, to include – what are the material considerations and what issues do not count at all with Planning and why. A half day course with a number of examples would be ideal, but the course should be based around the role of a Parish Council and the relevant issues that a Parish Council needs to know or interpret.

**ACTION 1: Cllr Goode had circulated a document on material considerations some time ago; he will recirculate this.**

**ACTION 2: The clerk will contact Ncalc to ask about the possibility of a planning training course being provided by Ncalc.**

*14.9.20 action 7: Cllr Foulke will enquire as to “consequential loss” (is it needed?) with the insurers and amend the Risk Assessment register.*

Cllr Foulke was not able to be present at the meeting. An email update had been sent before the meeting commenced, but it was decided to add this agenda item to the next meeting's agenda instead.

*14.9.20 action 8: The clerk will re-circulate the training list.*

Any councillors who have requested to attend the "Off to a flying start" course have been booked on to the course.

*14.9.20 action 9: Matt/ Glynn to be contacted to convey the frustrations and the lack of communication with residents and the Parish Council.*

The email update from Gigaclear had been circulated. Cllr Goode added that they cannot communicate via Facebook, all communication is carried out via Ms Faulkner. Cllr Batchelor reminded councillors to take a photograph and note details of the issues down straight away if any further problems with Gigaclear need to be raised with them.

*14.9.20, action 2: (Flood gates by the ford) - The clerk to write to the Highways Authority.*

Highways have replied that the gating of the ford cannot be carried out.

If the option of the bridge being closed to traffic on specific occasions is being raised as a possible option, Cllr Rowley said that this was also Highways decision as to whether it could be allowed.

He also updated the meeting that it had been suggested in the past by a former councillor that a footbridge could be built if the road was closed. Highways were asked at the time whether this would be allowed and the answer was no. Historic England also has to be consulted as to any decisions even if Highways gave a positive feedback..

**ACTION 3: The clerk will write to Highways again to ask about possible closing of the bridge on specific occasions.**

## 158/21: FINANCE

### a) Bank statements.

Community account statement	as at 17.9.20	£49,393.26
Business Saver account	as at 17.9.20	£10,778.18

### b) Accounts received - none

### c) Accounts for payment : -

CommuniCorp (Clerk and Councils Direct)	£75.00	Years subscription from November 2020.
Kettering Borough Council	£120.00	Tree works at the Meadows
MAD Landscapes	£396.00	Replacement and repair to fence at the back of the recreation field.
Anita Curtis	£1077.29	1/4ly salary Jul – Sep 2020
Anita Curtis (PAYE already pd)	£269.20	PAYE Jul – Sep 20 .

via AC's own debit card).		
Anita Curtis	£60.00	Agreed 1/4ly depreciation of equipment Jul – Sep 20.
Anita Curtis	£25.18	Expenses Jul – Sep 2020 – Printing ink and 1 x realm paper £19.47, stamps £5.71. Total £25.18

Proposed by Cllr Batchelor that the above payments be authorised for payment, seconded by Cllr Goode, approved by all councillors present.

**d) Salary review.**

*The clerk was not present for this agenda item.*

*Motion to exclude the Public and Press for this item: In accordance with section 1(2) of the Public Bodies (Administration of Meetings) Act 1960, in that publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted.*

National Local Government salary increase for parish clerk/RFO for 2020 - 21, for decision. 1/4ly salary stated as above is at the 2019/20 salary pay scale. If the increase for 2020/21 National pay scale backdated to April 2020 is approved, this will result in £74.12 back pay for Apr – Sep, and an additional £14.80 to be reimbursed for PAYE to be paid.

Anita Curtis	£74.12	Agreed 1/4ly Back pay Apr - Sep 20.
Anita Curtis (PAYE to be paid by 20 <sup>th</sup> Oct via AC's own debit card).	£14.80	Back payment of PAYE Apr – Sep 20.

The clerk was informed by Cllr Batchelor, by email, after the meeting, that all councillors agreed to the standard increase.

**e) Initial budgetary discussion for 2021-22 to include capital projects for the next financial year (including the Village Hall car park extension).**

Cllr Watson stated that there is an issue around costs for the election next year, but will there be any other costs that will have to be taken up by the Parish Council as a result of the introduction of the unitary authority? He will raise the matter at the Rural Forum tomorrow (13<sup>th</sup> October). There may also be potential help with playground equipment costs. He will put together a formal budget shortly but needs to build in costs such as these, and the budget has to be finalised and approved in January.

**ACTION 4: Cllr Batchelor will contact the school to try to obtain more information as to possible help with playground equipment (for the community) costs.**

Cllr Goode added that where there are any firm changes, the Parish Council is being notified of the increase.

## PLANNING

### a) KBC Decision notices

*KET/2020/0554: Mr A Fosbrook, 8 Bridge Street, Geddington.*

*Replacement windows and doors. Full Application.*

Approved.

*KET/2020/0447: Mr P Eyre, 6 Chase View Road, Geddington.*

*Raise the roof of existing detached garage. Full Application*

Approved.

### b) Planning applications for consideration

*Planning applications were discussed within the public session.*

Several members of the public (virtually present) had input into the discussion concerning this application.

*KET/2020/0607:*

*W M Elliot and Son Ltd, Dovecote Buttery and Farm Shop, Dovecote Farm, Access Road to Church, Newton.*

*Change of use of agricultural/horticultural land to self-storage caravan facility and associated works, including construction of landscaped soil bunds, landscaping and installation of security gate. Full Application. Comments by 23.10.20*

Main comments made were as follows:

Relating to the Planning Statement – s.18 (employment) – The application proposal will not result in any new jobs being created and there are no facilities for an employee on site.

Residents said that there would be more traffic generated to and from the site on a narrow country road especially in the evenings and at weekends, as people do not only drop their caravan off or pick it up but also make journeys to wash caravans, pack caravans, carry out maintenance and work on caravans etc.

Further concerns were raised that with so many caravans there could well be illicit overnight stays. A further resident who has used caravan storage facilities for many years stated that that does happen.

Concerns were raised that such a development may affect insurance for the postcode area as a whole. Would there be lighting for the site? If so, this would have an environmental impact on Newton, particularly if the lighting was on throughout the whole of the night. If lighting was not installed, such a site would be prone to activities by unscrupulous people which may also affect the surrounding area and Newton village.

A further lighting issue was raised, that CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England) had carried out a study in the past and Newton area is one of the few dark places in the country without the impact of light pollution. It was noted that lighting issues were not addressed within the planning application pack.

Also pointed out that a four metres bund next to the road and so close to the road would be a major security concern – no one would be able to see you from outside the site if an unscrupulous person did manage to access the site, which the meeting was told would be quite easy with only a four metres high bund in place..

It was pointed out that if the proposed bund was made of soil, approximately 600 lorry loads would be needed to be transport the soil to the site to build it. If it included hardcore, another 200 lorry load journeys would have to be made. This was submitted by a waste management consultant. If soil from the site was used the archaeological services of the County would need to be consulted.

A further observation was that the four metres high bund would need to encircle a massive area and would be visible from Newton Road. Additionally, prime agricultural land should not be used for such a proposed use of land.

It is stated that the application would result in negligible amounts of increase in traffic: All visits will be via the A43 to the west of the site. However, it was pointed out that this is patently untrue as the direction of traffic to and from the A43 is not legally enforceable

The road to the site (Newton Road) is a narrow, winding country road, that has few straight stretches along its length. If traffic enters Newton Road from the A43 it will have to go past the Newton turn which is already a dangerous junction. Apart from the traffic and safety implications, this will also compromise the rural location of Newton.

An average sized caravan is over half the width of much of Newton Road and passing would be carried out with difficulty, and not at all on Geddington Road – if a car is parked on this road you would not be able to access the proposed storage site. Pointed out again by another resident that such wide vehicles (caravans) on such a narrow in places and winding for much of the length of it would raise so many safety issues. It is unacceptable from the point of highway safety to encourage more wider-width traffic along a narrow winding country road. It is an unsuitable development for the area with that level of access.

The transport and highway issues were then summed up by the Parish Councillor for Newton stating that with so much extra traffic in and around the Newton area and the Newton turn it would be chaotic and dangerous, in particular by the very narrow road at the Newton approach.

The landowners are not being helpful as to solving or alleviating the dangerous bend at the Newton turn (Newton approach road) but this application would make the Newton junction so much more dangerous.

It is also a concern that the postcode for this site will bring traffic into Newton village, not the Buttery.

Research had been carried out by a resident as to the commercial need and viability of such a proposal. He conveyed that there is a lot of surface capacity at the next nearby site. A new site of nearly 100 caravan capacity is not a financially viable as a commercial venture.

Residents were concerned as to the environmental impact – turning a greenfield agricultural site into a brownfield site.

It was also pointed out that this application is for siting nearly 100 caravans: if they were houses it would not be permitted at the site as it is outside the village envelope.

Stated that this site is outside the village boundary and Newton is classed as a

protected village.

Concerns were also voiced that it is adjacent to a historic monument of archaeological significance (the dovecote being Grade 1 listed).

The present gates to the Buttery are the only way to access the site, to reach a proposed gating facility at the bottom of the field that will access the proposed storage site. It was pointed out by residents that that is where the children's playground is and where multiple caravans would be accessing and exiting the storage field. From the point of view of health and safety this would be dangerous.

Also pointed out that the track from the main entrance to the Buttery is single track, virtually a dirt track path. It does not state in the application that this will be widened.

It was proposed that the Parish Council object to the application on the following grounds:

It is outside the village boundary, it is on prime agricultural land, it breaks policy set up in the joint core strategy and emerging plan 2, it is unacceptable as to highway issues and safety grounds for the Newton Road and Newton approach road, as per para. 109 of the National Planning Policy framework. It is unsuitable on highway issues and safety grounds as to the level of access on and from a narrow country road.

Seconded by Cllr Padwick, the proposal was approved and agreed by all councillors present, with two abstentions.

*KET/2020/0617:*

*Mr B Armer, 13 Wood Street, Geddington. Single storey side extension. Full application*

It was commented that the land in this area is depressed, and probably the extension will not be as visible as the plans may indicate.

Cllr Padwick proposed to support the application. Seconded by Cllr Goode. All councillors present approved the proposal except for two abstentions.

*KET/2020/0606*

*Mr & Mrs N Richardson, 17 Queen Street, Geddington. Two and single storey side extensions, two storey rear extension, replacement detached garage with external staircase, modifications to the existing drive and boundary wall and associated works Full Application.*

Comments raised included the following:

It is not a listed property, but it is situated in a conservation area.

The amended drawings concern the garage. The construction will be matched to the neighbouring Café Oak with timber construction used.

The current garage construction is built on top of the wall. The plans show that the garage will be rebuilt with separate foundations.

It appears to be ambitious, but three of the four extensions will be barely visible from the street.

Cllr Goode proposed that there be no objection to the application and the amended

plans concerning the garage. Seconded by Cllr Padwick. Five councillors approved the motion, and two councillors abstained.

*KET/2020/0614: Mr A Parker, 5 & 6, Newton.*

*Carport and works to driveway*

*Full Application*

*and*

*KET/2020/0615: Mr A Parker, 5 & 6, Newton.*

*Timber framed carport and resin-bonded gravel finish driveway*

*Listed Building Consent Application.*

An extension for the application had been obtained from KBC. Cllr Watson conveyed that Newton residents are comfortable with the application. This to be conveyed to KBC.

*KET/2020/0698: Mr & Mrs Checkley, 25A Queen Eleanor Road, Geddington.*

*Raise roof height to create first floor accommodation and convert car port to habitable room. Full Application*

*Comments made were as follows:-*

- Noted that timber cladding would be used to extend upwards on top of the existing stone building.
- The building is not listed.
- The building is a non-dedicated heritage asset.
- There is significance for the street view – the stone building will be 1.2 metres higher than at present.
- The proposed upwards extension materials are not sympathetic with the existing building.
- There is no problem with the increased size (upwards extension) or the style, but there is a recognition that the street scene would be significantly different because the proposed materials to be used are very different from the existing building.

It was proposed that the Parish Council object to the specific use of the proposed materials on the street side of the building and the end of the building (ie the North and West sides – the aspects viewable from the street. Seconded by Cllr Padwick. The motion was approved by all councillors present except for one abstention.

#### **159/21: THE WHITE PAPER - “*Planning for the future*” to approve the working party’s comments for submission.**

Cllrs Padwick and Goode said that Cllr Buckseall had captured the relevant points well, with nine of the twenty nine points covered – there was a lot of duplication in the consultation document. It was proposed by Cllr Goode and seconded by Cllr Padwick that authorization be given to Cllr Buckseall to complete the document summarising the Parish Council’s position, circulate it to all councillors, and then for the clerk to submit the document prior to the next meeting. All councillors approved, except for one abstention.

**ACTION 5: The clerk to send the document as above..**

**160/21: CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED AND CIRCULATED** - to note or comment upon.

One item of correspondence had been received after all the documents had been circulated to councillors. This will be discussed at the November meeting.

**161/20: ENVIRONMENT.**

*Items a), b),cii), d),e),and f) to be carried forward to the November meeting (time constraints).*

- a) Gigaclear – updates for south side of the village and Newton.**
- b) Stonepit Land – Land Registry update**
- c) Village Hall Car Park –  
i) the planning application process.**

Cllr Goode informed the Parish Council of the different bodies who were consultees to the planning application – the Police, NCC, NCC archaeologists and Sports England. The latter have asked Planning if there is room for existing boundaries for the cricket field to fit within the car park extension. This was raised with the Cricket Club Committee.

Sports England have also said that a ball strike risk assessment needs to be carried out. This will cost £250 by a company called Labo Sport. Proposed by Cllr Watson that the spend is authorised up to £250.00. Seconded by Cllr Padwick, approved by all councillors present.

There are a few other minor issues but these can be carried forward as an update to the November meeting.

**ii) the tendering process**

- d) Repair of the fence at entrance to the recreation ground.**
- e) The potential for the Bridge to be pedestrianised.**
- f) Ford flood signage.**

**Cllr Goode**

**Cllr Batchelor.**

**NEWTON**

No issues raised

**LITTLE OAKLEY**

No issues raised

**AOB**

No issues raised

*There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10.00pm.*

-----