

## KINGS CLIFFE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Annual General Meeting and monthly Parish Council Meeting held in the Parlour of the Memorial Hall at 7.30pm. on Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> May 2005.

Before opening the meeting, Chairman Michael Day explained that as this was the AGM, until a Chairman was proposed and seconded for the coming year, it would be simpler for the five parishioners who wished to address the council before the meeting to proceed before the meeting proper.

Given below are the statements made by parishioners concerning Planning Application EN/05/00620/OUT

### Mr. W.Court

This is a first application relating to this very important project. The project itself is the most significant change to the village in 100 years I guess. It is therefore essential that it is considered very carefully. Although this application is concerned with the road access only, it sets the pattern for the whole project.

I would like to make it clear that I am not opposed to this development which I consider could be to the great benefit of the village. But I am concerned that it shall be properly designed. The past record of the ENC on Planning matters and design has not been entirely without fault.

The proposal is for only a single road to the site. The Parish Council has always opposed this, feeling that the houses will only integrate into the village if there are additional access roads: on to Willow Lane and Wood Lane as well as Wood Road. This fits the pattern of our existing village. With the proposed single road, effectively two large cul-de-sacs, there will be congestion at "rush hour" and problems with lorries and rubbish trucks having to turn round, and with badly parked cars. Buses could not run through. There is no good reason to refuse additional access points.

Secondly, the District Council are forgetting that when the 15 houses were built they made a promise in writing that access to these 15 houses would be by the new road from the east as soon as it was built, and the 15 houses would NOT be served via Fineshade Close. There was a definite promise to stop the present congestion and dangerous through traffic in Fineshade Close by closing the end, as originally, but the application does not show or say this.

There are many other points to discuss and I feel that a public meeting should be called devoted simply to this application, so that the public can express their views. I would be happy to arrange publicity for it.

### Mr. Roger Coulthard

I am not against development of the village in principle. I have already done some work in support of the KC1 site proposal (for 60 new homes - with a high proportion of 'affordable housing'.)

But any scheme must be properly thought-through and properly managed.

There are many significant problem areas with the new scheme, but I want to address only 2 tonight.

One is the size of the scheme, and the other is the traffic problems that will be created.

The new proposal envisages 100 new homes, that is 40 more than the original KC1 plan.

Why?

New housing is a positive if it helps us to keep local services - but bad if it swamps us with additional problems.

What about the effect on the appearance of the village?

By pushing an additional line of dwellings higher up the site, the skyline will be ruined. We'll have a townscape, not a village any longer.

Where is the justification for the larger increase in numbers? Where is the benefit to this village?

On traffic matters, I fear we're heading for chaos. The original KC1 plan envisaged access via Wood Lane as well as Wood Road, and (I believe) via Willow Lane as well. That would have provided three entry/exit points, so that traffic going to Peterborough would not get snarled up with traffic to and from Kettering, and they wouldn't mix with traffic for Oundle etc.

The new scheme proposes almost twice as many vehicles, concentrated (or congested!) at one point only.

The developer has commissioned a Consultant's Traffic Assessment to support his application. It is rather technical, and I've not had chance to study it in detail. However, at a quick glance, it seems to have at least two glaring errors.

They didn't bother to monitor the West Street/Bridge Street/Park Street/Hall Yard junction. Why? Would it have yielded the 'wrong' answer? We know it is chaotic there at peak times. Add around a hundred extra cars and imagine the problems!

Secondly, the report goes into detail about the allowable volume of traffic in relation to roads of 6 metres width. However, we all know that our streets are in effect reduced to around 4 metres or less, because of (necessary) on-street parking!

Would that 40% decrease in capacity have yielded the 'wrong' answer?

Obviously, the developer wants to make the maximum profit from the venture. But we should be asking 'what's in it for this village' (rather than problems).

We should demand to see proper justification for all aspects of this scheme. We need a public meeting, and we need more time to respond.

Dr. Geoff Mason

I would like to comment on the Flood Risk Assessment.

The proposed works plan to collect water from the considerable impermeable areas (roofs, roads, parking areas) and have it discharged via a pipeline along Wood Road and Orchard Lane. Flow would be restricted from leaving the site by installing hydro-brakes, essentially a coiled tube which impedes flow, and having oversized pipe above the hydrobrakes to store the impeded water. The amount of storage is critical to ensure no overflow and potential flooding. The site is divided into two - an upper and lower site both with a hydrobrake at their bottom end, and the upper one leading into the drainage network for the lower site.

Using their rainfall data, which seems to be similar in magnitude to the storm last August, my own calculations without the benefit of any sophisticated program, suggest that the proposal for the lower site by itself may be able to cope but the upper site is four times larger than the lower, and will contribute far more than the storage pipes can cope with, 4--It is not clear what contribution, if any, has been attributed to the upper site in the lower site calculation, but my calculations suggest that the lower site will not be able to cope when the upper site is included. So, there needs to be substantially more work done to assure us that there will not be a flooding problem.

The Environment Agency states that because the development area is just under 5 ha (4.83 ha) the "Flood Risk Assessment will need to be assessed by the Local planning Authority without reference to the Environment Agency". I think that such is the complexity of the modelling and the experience of the village in matters to do with flooding, that any future report needs to be assessed by people of greater experience, for example by someone expert in drainage matters in Anglian Water.

The applicant, I think, realises there is a potential problem because the Planning Statement states, 'infiltration to reduce the overall volume of discharge will be implemented for individual properties if suitable sub soils are found.' The upper site is on limestone seepage and the lower one largely on clay. Any increased infiltration is likely to come out at spring sites, either new or existing, along the line of

the base of the limestone. They reduce the outflow rate by impeding the flow. This may cause problems for some householders.

Mr. Bob Dixon

### **Observations on Planning Statement & Application submitted by Stangate Planning Consultants April 2005.**

References apropos Policy Decisions.

References have been made to (a) DTZ PIEDA Study and b) ENTEC Report

ENC holds copies of these which I will inspect next week and extract particular references to this site and Kings Cliffe.

#### **Policy – ref para 2.18**

Who holds details of “local housing needs”. Can these be produced and who established them?

What supports the statement that “circa 100 dwellings” would support the vitality & viability of existing services and community facilities – if these exist they must already be viable – viz Endowed School which is at full capacity and needs additional accommodation now. Mobile Class Room arriving in September.

Improved Transport Links – what does this mean – more buses running only partially filled or more cars. Please clarify.

The figure of circa 100 dwellings needs to be justified or is it that this site will comfortably accommodate 100 units. (chicken & egg).

Form of Development.

Informal Park.

Will this land remain under control of the developer : who will own it ?

Who will maintain it?

NB. With Private Development it is normal for all viable land to be within the plot boundaries of the individual owners and the public roads, foot paths, sewers etc adopted by the LA.

If the park is retained by the developer is this for future housing : we need guarantees here.

With regards to “maintaining visual amenities” Wood Road is the rear of the village, the road being a local by-pass, and if anything its visual qualities need lifting and improving.

Finally “Focal Point” is a Planning Buzz word and out of context here.

(see later).

My view is that this area of “Informal Park” will form a no-mans land between the village and the new development, thereby creating a separate ghetto. This is foreign to Kings Cliffe where the close knit “grain” of the historic centre and recent new housing demonstrate integration not separation.

I therefore consider the initial design layout flawed. : I propose consideration should be given to the following :-

- Bring the scheme down onto the northern edge of Wood Road.
- Provide more road connections both east and west to distribute the traffic from the site more evenly into Wood Road, Willow Lane and Wood Lane.
- The benefit of moving the development down the slope would mean the existing skyline would be protected and left open and the new development would visually be integrated into the existing village roof scape – viz views of the valley from the surrounding ridges.

- Transport Links : organise the local bus services to run through the development with one or more stops. These can be real "focal points" where an activity takes place and should be designed as such.
- Building Design

Copying the village characteristics – beware.

(i) No developer could afford to copy the original forms of the Historic Buildings, let alone the materials. The Area is littered with crude "pastiche" of historic interpretations.

(ii) Simplicity is the answer, coupled to the correct choice of materials and components. Please avoid "Landmark Buildings" at all costs. The local design standards are not up to providing this and the ENC would be lost.

- Parking

Rear parking ideal in theory but not necessarily in practice. Analysis of the parking habits and behaviour of the average human demonstrates that even with their own off-road parking, garages etc. they still prefer to park in the road. To overcome this the Central London Boroughs favour harsh enforcement (money). On the continent some French villages now have a narrow one way system the width of 1½ cars so that illegal parking blocks traffic. If you had this here parking for residents and visitors at the rear would work.

- Landscape Buffers – excellent but we need to save the Historic Hedge and organise its maintenance.
- Play Areas : How will these be organised, controlled and maintained.
- Planning Gain : We have a one shot opportunity to gain advantage from this development. The village urgently needs cash injection to improve the facilities for the existing community. This development could provide this where as ENC & KC Parish Council could not.

I support the principle of this application but have considerable reservations as to both its content and intent. I trust the above will be of assistance. However it is vital that this application is put on hold while further examination of the developers supporting evidence is examined and justified.

I have grave doubts as to the accuracy of this evidence viz flooding, drainage, transport/highway movements and number of dwellings.

Furthermore only ENC can establish Planning Gain and therefore I recommend that while the application is being further examined, discussions are entered into with the Developer at which Kings Cliffe is represented and present and a party to the negotiations and agreement.

Mrs. Margaret Knights

Mrs. Knights main concern was the increase in flooding risks, but acknowledged that most of the points she had intended to raise had already been covered by other speakers.

Chairman M. Day thanked the speakers and other parishioners who had attended and invited them to stay for the remainder of the meeting if they wished.

**05/001 Present :-** Councillors M. Day, B. Howard, K. Howard, N. Ford, L. Crane, D. Sharpe, T Isaac, B. Wright, B. Wyles and J. Dixon

**05/002 Apologies :-** Councillor A. Howard

### **05/003 Election of Chairman**

The Clerk asked for nominations for Chairman; Councillor M. Day was nominated and this was unanimously agreed

Proposed : Councillor D. Sharpe      Seconded : Councillor N. Ford

### **05/004 Election of Vice-Chairman**

Councillor A. Howard had indicated he was prepared to remain in the post, Chairman M. Day therefore proposed Councillor A. Howard; this was seconded by Councillor T. Isaac.

**05/005 Apologies for Absence :** Councillor A. Howard

**05/006 Declarations of Interest :** None

### **05/007 Formation of Sub-Committees**

#### **Burial Board**

Councillor D. Sharpe stated that in view of the amount of effort which would be required for the New Cemetery, more Councillors were needed on the Committee. Councillors K. Howard and B. Wright volunteered to join the committee. Councillor Sharpe agreed to remain as Chairman.

#### **Neighbourhood Watch**

Sub-committee Chairman B. Wright said the existing committee were doing an excellent job and it was decided there would be no changes.

#### **Amenities**

It was agreed that there was still no requirement for a separate committee for this; the Clerk and Chairman were managing any matters which arose in this area.

#### **Children's Play Area**

Councillor T. Isaac said in view of the refusal by ENC to allow the land off Wood Lane to be used and the impending proposals to the KCEA regarding the purchase of land and the proposed new housing application, the forming of a new committee should wait until any decisions have been made on the above. This was agreed.

### **05/008 Appointment of Wardens**

The Tree Warden, Footpath Warden and Bus Warden remain unchanged.

**05/009 Nominations to Other Bodies :** No requests had been received

**05/010 Dates of Meetings :** Councillor D. Sharpe pointed out that two dates on the list were incorrect; these will be amended.

## **05/011 Minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2005**

The minutes were read and approved

Proposed : Councillor D. Sharpe      Seconded : Councillor B. Wright

### **05/012 Clerks Report**

Parishioners are reporting difficulty in reporting problems to the Street Doctor; I contacted Clarence (who is still in force for a couple of month) and they say they are having difficulty manning the telephones; on the NCC web-site the e-mail for Street Doctor turns out to be Clarence. Therefore I am still reporting problems to Clarence and would suggest everyone does the same.

The Environment Agency have sent a letter say KC is identified as a flood risk area, although the agency map does not agree with this, and they are again asking for a nominated flood warden. I have asked them to send the leaflets they advertise and this will be a future agenda item.

The Church are holding a Special Morning Service on 15<sup>th</sup> May, stopping to sing and pray in various locations and ending with refreshments on Maltings Green. I have taken it for granted no-one will mind and given PC permission for this.

Replied to Mrs. Wagstaffe letter regarding Geoff's fall in Park Street and explained should be dealt with properly at some point in the near future; to the Police saying we did not need our PC to attend every meeting but monthly crime statistics would be most helpful

Arthur Wooding was sent a letter thanking him for past services

K & N Waite Construction have been asked to contact the scaffolding firm who damaged the Dog Bin in Morehay Lane to ask for monies to replace this

KCEA have been informed that the PC had agreed in principle to accepting the ownership of any land purchased for playing fields etc.,

Various blocked drains and lights out reported.

Regarding the Rural Settlement Policy, Terry Begley is disappointed that that no Councillors have volunteered to attend meetings, next one being on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> May; but they will still be welcome in the future.

### **05/013 Accounts payable :the following accounts were approved for payment:-**

Curators Salary (Current month)	£ 140.00
Clerks Salary (May 2004)	£ 200.00
Clerks expenses (January – April 05)	£ 74.42
Smith Hetherington –Grass & Hedge trimming	£ 196.00
BT ( ¼ to April 05)	£ 62.68
GP Lawnmowers (mower service & repairs)	£ 70.61
J.A.Neesham – contribution to Horsewater repairs	£ 107.52
Resource at Kings Cliffe (Youth Club fee)	£ 48.00

Proposed : Nigel Ford      Seconded : Councillor J. Dixon

The first half year payment of the precept - £6300 - was received on 23/04/05

## **05/014 Planning**

### **Applications:-**

#### **Outline residential development : Willow Lane / Fineshade Close : EN/05/00620/OUT**

This application was debated and discussed at great length, with all Councillors raising salient points regarding this proposal. The Chairman proposed that the Council should agree to this outline application in principle but ENC would be informed that we reserve the right to have very full and detailed debate with them when a detailed application is proposed. A show of hands carried the proposal.

#### **Dwelling adjacent to 48 Bridge Street : Amended application : EN/05/00653/FUL**

There were no objections to the materials to be used but it was felt that the addition of a conservatory should be refused as it was not in keeping with the main dwelling.

### **Possible Breach of Planning**

6 Forest Approach : EN/05/00075/PPD : Noted

### **Tree Preservation Order**

100 Wood Road : TPO 226 : Noted

## **05/014 Landfill Liaison Meeting**

Councillors had received notes of the above meeting, held at the site on 28<sup>th</sup> April. The new Augean management appear to be far more efficient and it was a very positive meeting. The new planning applications for the site have not yet been received from ENC but these are apparently nothing very radical; these will be carefully considered when received by the Parish Council.

## **05/015 Sub-Committee reports**

### **Burial Board**

There has not been a meeting to date for May. The proposed revised charges were questioned and Councillor D. Sharpe said these were in line with the recommended parochial fees. Councillor B. Wyles questioned this and stated that the Council precepted for these fees, therefore there should be no increase at present; this was therefore rejected by the PC on a show of hands thus the present fees will stand.

### **Neighbourhood Watch**

A meeting was held on 25<sup>th</sup> April attended by five committee members. A "Post Coding" day will be held on 25<sup>th</sup> June; notices will be posted in advance. There will be a Home Security Talk on 4<sup>th</sup> July; this will also be advertised nearer the date.

Zone co-ordinators reported that 2 cars had been broken into in Bridge Street. A car had been stolen from Wood Lane.

Sub-committee Chairman B., Wright and Mr. G. Wagstaffe are going to the next NHW meeting in Oundle

The next meeting of KCNW will be on 19<sup>th</sup> September.

**05/016 Correspondence received**

Various correspondences were discussed or circulated

**05/017 Any Other Business**

Councillor N. Ford reported that the pavement to Kingsmead is being overgrown by bushes. The Clerk will report this to ENC.

Councillor B. Howard again raised the issue of the footpath to Apethorpe; Highways will be reminded that a request has been made to re-instate the old footpath.

After several interruptions from very noisy Youth Club members during the meeting it was decided this will be discussed fully at the next meeting.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 9.20.pm. The next meeting will be on Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> June in the Parlour.

Signed..... Date.....