

**GEDDINGTON, NEWTON AND LITTLE OAKLEY PARISH COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING HELD ON 27<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2021 AT**  
**7.30PM**

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**193/21: APOLOGIES and DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no apologies received or declarations of interest.

**194/21: PUBLIC SESSION.**

Four members of the public were (virtually) present.

**195/21: PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION.**

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

*KET/2020/0878*

*Boughton Estates Ltd*

*Corby Road (barns South of), Little Oakley, NN18 8HA*

*Demolition of existing agricultural barns and erection of two dwellings with new shared vehicular access and new/replacement site boundary treatment*

**Conservation Area Consent**

*KET/2020/0877*

*Boughton Estates Ltd*

*Corby Road (barns South of), Little Oakley, NN18 8HA*

*Demolition of existing agricultural barns and erection of two dwellings with new shared vehicular access and new/replacement site boundary treatment*

**Full Application**

The application details were summarised by Cllr Buckseall.

Cllr Bailey commented that a resident of Little Oakley had pulled together comments submitted by several Little Oakley residents and these had been circulated to councillors prior to the meeting. He commented that the submission applied equally to the application that was discussed at the Parish Council meeting of 11<sup>th</sup> January 2021 as well as this further application.

The comments by Little Oakley residents and answers to questions from councillors were as follows: -

1. The flood risk is very apparent, as shown in the photographs of the area included with the Little Oakley residents' comments.
2. Do the details of the new building mimic the gable of the moat farm application

discussed last month (KET/2020/0876 and 0895)? No – there is a huge difference in the design.

3. The dwelling will change the look of the village when entering from the east.
4. A historically and visually important green space is directly opposite the site of the proposed new build (on the opposite side of the road). (HV1026).
5. They are trying to mimic other styles within the village but several of the proposed build items do not fit within a village subject to Conservation Area Consent.
6. It will be taller than the adjacent new build that was discussed last month (KET/2020/0876 and 0895)
7. The issue with the flooding risk is of water on the field behind the proposed dwellings. There is an open-sewage-run-off-water on the field behind the new dwellings. The flooding issues have to be sorted as this is a huge issue as has been documented by residents in this area over the years.
8. Further concerns were raised regarding flooding and sewerage. Photographs were shown of flooding of the area going back to April 2017. It was stated again that flooding is caused by water from Boughton Estates fields flooding the land and roads, then backing up to the boundary of the proposed building. Highways and Environment Agency have both said that this problem needs to be dealt with by Boughton Estates. The flood water would breach the garden area of the two buildings, and would back up right to the boundary of the buildings.
9. Three more dwellings (the two in this application plus application KET/2020/0876 and 0895 would create additional water having to drain away although it would not increase the surface water problems.
10. It would be an imposing building, and would result in a loss of privacy, with eleven windows overlooking The Old School building. The building as proposed does not blend into the surrounding area. Two huge black dormer windows do not fit into the village as a whole – there are no other similar dormer windows on properties in the village. The red roof is a stark roof in otherwise mellow stone building in the village, and it is out of character. The proposed build is too modern and imposing to be built as it stands in an area which needs conservation area consent. The street scene would be very much changed.
11. It has seven bedrooms – resulting visitors may lead to a big increase in traffic.
12. There are no traffic calming measures in the village – as you would exit the driveway there is an obstruction to viewing the road easily where the telephone kiosk is sited. Noted that the exit from the proposed properties is almost blind on the corner.
13. A concern was raised as to loss of agricultural land, with the character and the rural feel of a conservation consent area should be preserved.

**It was proposed by Cllr Padwick that the Parish Council object on the summarised issues as follows: -**

- There is an excessive number of windows overlooking the Old School House opposite the proposed site.
- The nature and style of the huge black dormer windows do not fit into the village setting as a whole.
- The black cladding is not appropriate for this area within the village.
- The flooding is a huge issue.
- Sewage has to be directed away from the site before any build could be considered.
- It is over development for the size of the village.
- The visual aspect, particularly approaching the village from the east as well as the street scene, would be detrimental to the village and the area.
- The impact on a Grade 2 list building directly opposite the planning application site and the historically and visually important green space directly opposite need consideration.
- New foundations for the proposed buildings will probably go lower than the existing barns which might also be detrimental to the existing flooding of the surrounding area
- The visibility splay aspect for ingress and egress of vehicles from the shared driveway is concerning and needs to be considered.

Seconded by Cllr Bailey, approved by all councillors except for one abstention.

*Outstanding issues from the Parish Council monthly meeting dated 11<sup>th</sup> January 2021 were added to the agenda for this meeting to consider, as they were unable to be discussed because of statutory time constraints for a meeting.*

**196/21: CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED AND CIRCULATED – to note or comment upon.**

Cllr Bailey has received a letter from Land Registry which he will convey the details of under agenda item 7b) - Minutes reference 181/21 b)

**197/21: TO APPOINT A POLICE LIAISON REPRESENTATIVE – to act as a single point of contact with Northamptonshire Police – discussion.**

Ncalc are looking for a Police Liaison Officer, which will involve 5 – 10 hours a month, it could be a resident, a person involved with Neighbourhood Watch, a councillor, there is no particular specification.

Councillors thought this was a worthwhile issue, but as councillors are usually invited every month to meet the Police Commissioner they were not sure how much interest would be generated for this role. It was felt that councillors and residents were being given an opportunity to raise their concerns in a different way and it would be a shame if the opportunity was not supported. The role would give the Police one person in each community to forward issues on to.

**ACTION1: Cllr Batchelor will cover the vacant post in an article for the next newsletter to see if anybody was interested in taking on the role.**

Cllr Padwick said that if no other interest is shown by anybody else then he would be happy to carry out the role.

**198/21: PARISH PLAN**

**a) The Post Office.**

Cllr Rowley said that Boughton Estates had not been able to speak to the tenant for 12 months. If they did wish to opt for the legal route and apply to evict the tenant, this could not commence until April as evictions from commercial premises cannot be heard at least until then.

The Post Office has been closed for nine months, with no service from the Post Office or the shop. When Rachael Gladstone-Brown was last contacted concerning this matter she said that “commercially sensitive issues” could not be conveyed. It was thought that it might be worth raising the issue with the new Estate Manager, asking if he could give the latest position that could be shared with residents.

It was said in summery that there was very little that the Parish Council could do. Residents were not getting a service and the tenant might need help. Proposed by Cllr Goode and seconded by Cllr Batchelor that the following action be taken:-

**ACTION 2: The Clerk to ask Boughton Estates for an update on the situation as far as they are able to, as residents are pressing for a resolution to lack of Post Office or shop in the village.**

There was also concern that if no contact is made with Royal Mail, they may say that Geddington does not need a Post Office as residents have managed without it for nearly a year.

It was thought however that Boughton Estates should be asked if there was any movement on this issue first. If a reply is non-committal, then a letter to the Post Office could be sent. This sequence of events was proposed by Cllr Batchelor, seconded by Cllr Bailey, approved by all councillors present.

Cllr Batchelor stated a concern relating to the tenant’s mental health. Cllr Rowley will try to obtain a contact number so that he can telephone or write to the tenant. He also has the daughter’s telephone number.

**ACTION 3: Cllr Batchelor will write a letter for the daughter, and Cllr Rowley will find her telephone number. Following this action, the next step may be to contact relevant agencies.**

Proposed by Cllr Batchelor, seconded by Cllr Padwick, approved by all councillors present.

## **199/21: ENVIRONMENT**

### **a) Recreation ground play equipment and teenage shelter – repairs needed.**

Water based removal was carried out initially by volunteers, with KBC staff then following this up with a stronger remover which stripped the paint from the teenage shelter after the graffiti vandalism. The aluminium frame now looks unsightly and needs to be professionally painted in a muted green. Competitive quotes are needed. There is also graffiti on the climbing frame but this is a plastic rubber compound. Proposed by Cllr Batchelor, seconded by Cllr Rowley that quotes to be obtained to paint the bandstand. Approved by all councillors present.

**ACTION 4: The Clerk to carry out the above action.**

### **b) Stonepit land - Land Registry update.**

Cllr Bailey has sent the application to Land Registry, has paid the fee and has received an acknowledgement. He is anticipating that he will be contacted to provide Land Registry requirements for the application as the next stage.

**c) Speed signage – to discuss the project in principle**

This issue was raised by Adrian Foulke whilst still a councillor, and he had forwarded the response by Steven Barber at Highways to Cllr Goode. He has provided information on the parish self-purchase scheme, where parishes can apply to have speed signage, and the costs can be covered by the Police Commissioners Road Safety Funding scheme which pays up to £5000 to finance (or part finance) such a scheme. A battery portable speed indicator costs around £1700 to £2500, for a solar powered one it is a further £450 for the panel and another £450 for the pole, and for a mains unit it is an extra £600 for the post, £500 for the hook up and about £150 for the meter. The recommendation if the Council wished to apply for the Police Commissioners Road Safety Funding scheme would be an SID device – one form consists of vehicle activated signage (which tells you if you are going too fast) and the the second option gives the speed indicator signage which states your mph and if you are going too fast. The Police tend to prefer the second option for applications to the funding scheme for grants up to £5000 for installation.

It was asked if councillors approve the scheme in principle and if so implications for Geddington need to be known.

Cllr Padwick thought that it should be pursued and for the second option but with solar power.

It could be considered as an option for the Newton entrance initially.

Cllr Batchelor proposed that the scheme be pursued, seconded by Cllr Goode, approved by all councillors present.

**ACTION 5: Cllr Goode will contact Highways.**

**d) Labosport Risk Assessment Report, feedback from meeting with Cricket Club and approval of further action**

It was reported that Cllrs Batchelor, Watson, Padwick and Goode attended a virtual meeting with the Chair and two further members of the Cricket Club. The Cricket Club were informed that this was not a decision-making meeting, it was to take information back to the Council. The Cricket Club gave their initial thoughts as to not using all of the pitches. Their suggestion would still result in requiring significant mitigation fencing of 15 metres high. ECB feedback was that levels of enforcement of the report would be required. ECB have informed the Cricket Club that the needs for a risk assessment report are usually for when there will be a development that may have an impact on the playing of cricket. They would not normally see it as a risk management tool.

The written confirmations of the suggestions by the Cricket Club were received today, and it has been suggested that the next step should be a joint meeting. The report recommends that the Parish Council discuss the plan with the England and Wales Cricket Board, possibly Sports England, and the Cricket Club to discuss any proposal that is being considered for the Cricket Club's use of the field. A list of different clubs at all levels has also been given to the Parish Council to see how other clubs with the same measurements from the wicket to the boundary manage the risk. It was thought that at some stage Labosport need to be asked about the information on which they have based their report.

The Parish Council's authorisation is now needed to have a second meeting with the Cricket Club and the ECB to obtain a balanced view.

It was proposed by Cllr Goode and seconded by Cllr Batchelor that the above meeting be authorised. Approved by all councillors present.

**ACTION 6: Cllr Goode to organise the meeting between the Cricket Club , the English Cricket Board and Parish Representatives.**

Cllr Bailey added here that he wondered if the Parish Council can be added to the insurance of the Cricket Club: If somebody is negligent would the Parish Council's existing policy cover the Council? This needs to be considered going forward.

**AOB**

Cllr Bailey wished to thank GVFB for the work they had carried out concerning flooding, and added that the affected villagers of Little Oakley were very grateful for the help provided.

Cllr Padwick asked for confirmation that a response had been sent to acknowledge the letter received from John Goodall. This had been sent.

It was clarified in answer to a question that the YouTube link is added at the top of the agendas that are displayed on the boards stating clearly that the link is for viewing the Parish Council meetings, and informing them of who to contact if they wished to speak within the public session:–

*“The meeting can be viewed on YouTube at -*

*<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCbXT8qd9CDP9Tcd3v8pVjjA>*

*If you wish to raise concerns or ask questions at the meeting within the public session please email the address at the bottom of the agenda or contact one of the councillors so you can be given the joining instructions”.*

Cllr Watson asked Cllr Rowley if he knew when the decision was going to be made for the planning application for a caravan park at Dovecote Farm. Cllr Rowley did not know, but had a Chairs brief on Monday and would try to ask this question. Cllr Goode checked that the notification of a planning application going to Committee does come in to the Parish Council. The Clerk confirmed that they do, and are forwarded on to Cllr Buckseall.

*There being no further business, the meeting finished at 9.30pm.*

*Anita Curtis - Parish Clerk.*

*Email: [geddingtonparishcouncil@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:geddingtonparishcouncil@yahoo.co.uk)*