



# **Geddington, Newton & Little Oakley Parish Council**

## **Parish Plan**

Approved December 2016.

Prepared in the light of the Summary of Responses to  
the Parish Plan Opinion Survey published in December 2015.

## Contents

Introduction.....	3
1. Traffic; Public Transport; Heavy Lorries.....	4
1.1 Complete the diversion of through traffic from the A4300. ....	4
1.2 Seeking detailed improvements to highway signage. ....	4
1.3 Making safer the de-trunked A4300 within the Parish. ....	4
1.4 Reducing Newton Road traffic problems within Geddington and at Newton, and along related rural roads to the north of Newton. ....	5
1.5 Reducing traffic problems in the rest of Geddington Village. ....	5
1.6 Retaining Public Transport links along the A4300.....	6
2. Street Lighting: Selective Improvements in the “Dark Areas” of Geddington Village.....	7
3. Flooding & Drainage .....	8
3.1 Geddington: risks arising from local surface water run-off flooding. ....	8
3.2 Little Oakley: risks arising from local surface water run-off flooding. ....	8
3.3 Geddington and Little Oakley: increasing risk of flooding from upstream. ....	9
3.4 Whole Parish: co-ordination of efforts of official bodies involved .....	9
4. Dog Mess: Further Initiatives Needed, Building on Success of Recent Initiative .....	10
5. Facilities for Teenagers and Adults.....	11
5.1 Improved facilities for teenagers and young adults.....	11
5.2 Securing the future of the Post Office/local retailing.....	11
6. Securing Superfast Broadband in Newton .....	12
7. Action Plan.....	13
8. Glossary: Abbreviations Used in the Text.....	14
9. Membership of Parish Plan Committee .....	14

## Introduction

The Parish Plan was first created by residents in 2004 and has helped the residents and the Parish Council solve a number of issues that were identified at that time.

Roll forward 10 years and the process of replacing that plan with a new one began with the publication of a parish wide questionnaire. The many responses received were reviewed by a team of Parish Councillors in an attempt to produce some ideas for discussion and prioritisation. From this a group of volunteers from around the parish have worked hard to review the ideas and formulate this new Parish Plan.

This new Parish Plan will take the Parish forward over the coming years and I thank the efforts of everyone who has been involved however small. But the creation of the document is only the beginning, we now need to progress the proposals into fruition and this needs your help again working with our MP, County Council, Borough Council and Parish Council to realise these proposals.

Two issues were raised during the recent public consultation but not at this stage included in the adopted Plan:

Two issues were raised during the recent public consultation but not included in the adopted Plan:

(1) Housing - the absence of Parish Plan coverage was drawn attention to. The Borough Council's site-specific housing and other Planning proposals will not be complete until early 2018.

(2) Village Hall Car Park - Attention was also drawn to the increasing parking problems relating to the Village Hall and Recreation Ground. This will be could be a complex and costly undertaken so needs to be considered more thoroughly.

I hope you find this Parish Plan useful and find something that you feel passionate about and look forward to working with you to bring these proposals to fruition.

### **Mark Rowley**

Chairman of the Parish Council  
December 2016.

## 1. Traffic; Public Transport; Heavy Lorries (Survey Report pages 5 to 7 and 12)

### 1.1 Complete the diversion of through traffic from the A4300.

#### **What is the Problem?**

The majority of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) through traffic has diverted on to the new A43 route, but a number of regular user firms, un-badged contract and other contract vehicles still persist even after reminders. Some, upon contact, appear to be totally disinterested in co-operation.

#### **Action proposed:**

- (1) Volunteer local resident requested to continue observation and letter writing to try to secure voluntary re-routing of HGV through traffic, and where this does not yield results, to request the Parish Council to write more formally.
- (2) The County Council (NCC) will be requested to reinstate HGV monitoring, perhaps now only annually, to measure what actual further progress may be being made on Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) diversion.
- (3) Parish Council (PC) will maintain an active watching brief on the design of major roadworks required by the Kettering East development to minimise the risk of A4300 traffic levels increasing.

### 1.2 Seeking detailed improvements to highway signage.

#### **What is the Problem?**

Some current road signage can seem unclear or possibly misleading, resulting in traffic not clearly directed on to the current A43. In particular, there appear to be obsolete road surface arrow signs at junctions, including:

- the northern end of Rockingham Road, Kettering
- the northern end of A4300 near Stanion, on the roundabout approaches.

#### **Action proposed:**

- (1) PC will continue to draw the attention of the County Council (NCC) as highway authority to any highway signage appearing to encourage unrelated Trunk Road traffic to use the A4300 through Geddington instead of the A43.
- (2) PC will monitor the continued visibility of road signage in the light of reducing funding for highway landscape maintenance.

**Suggested Priority: HIGH.**

### 1.3 Making safer the de-trunked A4300 within the Parish.

#### **What is the Problem?**

Reduced traffic levels have allowed higher traffic speeds within the Geddington 30 mph section of the A4300. Carefully-chosen traffic management measures could now contribute to a safer environment both for local traffic and local residents.

#### **Action proposed:**

PC will request NCC to implement a programme of traffic-speed reduction and other safety measures for the A4300 30 mph zone within Geddington. This might include some of the following:

- (1) 7.5 ton weight restriction: for (a) the full length of the A4300 or (b) specific to bridge safety on New Road
- (2) Traffic speed-sensitive traffic lights: to deter faster speeding motorists within the built-up area
- (3) Flashing traffic-speed indicators at entrances to the village: (as at Weekley).
- (4) "Village gates": could include road-narrowing, rumble strips and outbound traffic having priority.
- (5) Double yellow lines: to make crystal clear where any parking is considered to be unsafe.
- (6) Increased grass verge maintenance: from village entrance signs/walls inwards, so as to "announce" the start of the built-up area as well as display more clearly the real pride already taken in the village and especially in its Conservation Area.

**Suggested Priority: HIGH.**

#### **1.4 Reducing Newton Road traffic problems within Geddington and at Newton, and along related rural roads to the north of Newton.**

##### ***What is the Problem?***

*(1) Excessive traffic speeds experienced along the whole road length between A4300 junction and the large new A43 roundabout, both adjoining the built up areas and in open countryside. There are similar problems on the roads to the north linking Newton to Great and Little Oakley.*

*(2) Lack of progress in finding funding for the approved improvement scheme for the acutely dangerous blind junction at the entrance to Newton village.*

##### **Action proposed:**

PC will press NCC to review its overall approach to these narrow, winding rural roads:

**(1) Whole rural part of Newton Road:** Reconsider introduction of a general speed limit of 40 mph from the edge of Geddington to the A43, plus the roads linking northwards to the Oakleys.

**(2) Newton Road, Geddington:** (a) evaluate extending the existing 30 mph zone westwards to incorporate the nearby pair of blind bends; and (b) to evaluate installing a Village Gate or similar measure in order to slow down in-coming traffic at the edge of the built-up area,.

**(3) Newton village access junction:** identify funding for this small but urgent project.

**Suggested Priority: HIGH.**

#### **1.5 Reducing traffic problems in the rest of Geddington Village.**

##### ***What is the Problem?***

*(1) The Geddington 20 mph zone: criticised as ineffective; its existence and its advisory status appear to be widely unknown. Signage at entry points has been criticised as much too high for car drivers.*

*(2) Speeding Traffic: Opinion Survey critical comments focus on Grafton, Grange and Queen Eleanor Roads, and on West & Queen Streets.*

*(3) Parking: acute problems (a) around Grange Road/Skeffington Close junction resulting from very high housing densities in part of Grange Road and generally in the streets within the Conservation Area; (b) at key times of day, only, in the vicinity of the Primary School in Wood Street, and (c) adjacent to the Village Hall.*

##### **Action proposed:**

**(1) Review 20 mph zone signage:** PC will request NCC to: (a) reduce the height of the 20 mph sign roundels, and (b) to introduce widely “reminder” signage, preferably as road surface signage.

**(2) Creative 20 mph zone publicity:** PC will consider working with the Primary School and others to publicise creatively the Zone to grown-ups, perhaps majoring on Child Safety, e.g. the Lamp Post banner campaigns introduced in other parts of the country.

**(3) Speed reduction measures:** PC will request NCC: to evaluate “speed cushions” and other lower-impact measures such as the lines of granite sets (as used on the approaches to the Ford) or rumble strips, with a view to discouraging sudden, dangerous bursts of speed between parking bottlenecks.

**(4) Creating a high-quality pedestrian environment:** PC will develop through the Village Design Statement detailed proposals to create a high quality, pedestrian-predominant area between the ancient bridge and West Street/Grafton Road focused on the Eleanor Cross. This would enable creation of an attractive focus for tourism by day and be Pub-friendly of an evening, while having an over-riding objective of protecting the ancient Cross from damage by fast-moving HGVs.

**(5) Grange Road/Skeffington Close parking:** PC will keep under continuing review the practicability of inserting hardened parking bays into the junction grass verges.

**(6) Primary School vicinity parking problems:** “Yellow Line” Orders are now in course of implementation to regulate parking at peak times by the end of 2016. PC will support initiatives by the School to promote related good practice by parents and carers, including “walking bus” and similar initiatives to reduce the dropping off of car-borne children in Wood Street.

**(7) Village Hall/Recreation Ground:** PC will keep under continuing review the need for further action to maintain a reasonable balance between increasing community use and the level of car parking provision.

**Suggested Priority: HIGH for (1)&(7), MEDIUM for the remainder.**

## **1.6 Retaining Public Transport links along the A4300.**

### ***What is the problem?***

*Continuing public expenditure could readily mean the availability of the Public Transport subsidies continues to reduce. So far this has had a particular impact on rural public transport services because of the impact of lower usage level on their need for subsidy in order to survive.*

### **Action proposed:**

PC will continue to monitor closely any continuing pressure to reduce subsidy levels on the Kettering to Corby bus service and to resist any proposed reductions to an already very poor service with particular regard to the needs of both low-income working people and secondary school children.

**Suggested Priority: HIGH.**

## 2. Street Lighting: Selective Improvements in the “Dark Areas” of Geddington Village (Survey Report page 9)

### ***What is the problem?***

*The Survey support indicated concern about some gaps or “dark areas” within the pattern of street lighting in Geddington.*

### **Action proposed:**

It is suggested that later in 2016 Councillors and Parish Plan committee members walk round the areas of Geddington listed below to consider priorities for a medium-term programme of improvements to be implemented once current uncertainties over Lighting Authority responsibilities in the Kettering area have been resolved. These areas reflect the priorities suggested by the 126 responses received to the Opinion Survey:

- (a)** Skeffington Close: the sloping southern section of the road, adjoining Grange Road.
- (b)** Wood Street: the general vicinity of the Primary School.
- (c)** West Street: the already-planned replacement light in the very dark section near western end.
- (d)** Queen Street: to fill a gap in provision between the White Lion entrance and the Post Office.
- (e)** Queen/Bridge Streets: sort out the general unevenness of lighting levels on and approaching the bridge.

**Suggested Priority: MEDIUM.**

### 3. Flooding & Drainage (Survey Report page 13)

#### 3.1 Geddington: risks arising from local surface water run-off flooding.

##### *What is the problem?*

Surface water, rather than upstream water levels on the Ise Brook, appears to have been the principal cause of most recent flooding. The bund (or barrier) adjoining the top of Wood Street plus the berm (or overflow channel) on the Ise around the edge of the Recreation Ground have both been created in response to the 1998 flood and, through the work of the Borough Council, have made a major contribution to flood risk reduction. Year-to-year maintenance of, and improvements to, established drainage arrangements remain essential in view of uncertain future weather patterns.

##### **Action proposed:**

**(1) The bund adjacent to the top of Wood Street and the berm at the Recreation Ground:** PC will ensure that KBC continues, annually, to inspect these installations and takes any necessary action to maintain them in full working order.

**(2) Highway gullies and related pipework within and draining through Geddington village:** PC will request NCC, annually or more often, to carry out maintenance needed to ensure these facilities are in good working order. Action requests may need to involve adjoining landowners where their ditches form a part of the drainage system between NCC highways and the brook. Suggested priorities for action are:

**(a) Kettering Road:** adjoining the Speed Camera: solving the reported blockage to the related storm sewer in order to terminate dangerously deep standing water after rain storms.

**(b) West St/Bridge St/Grafton Rd/Wood St junctions, plus all of Bridge Street and the storm sewer from Wood Street direct to the Ise:** PC will request an early technical study to map clearly the routes and varying sizes of the complex web of piping in the historic centre of the village, its state of repair. This in turn will enable remedial works that may be required in order to reduce the health risks from surcharging producing a mixing of storm water and raw sewage, as experienced most recently in early-2016.

**(c) Stamford Road southwards from edge of Geddington Chase:** will periodically request clearance of blocked gullies, storm drains and ditches to reduce heavy on-road water flows through the village during heavy storms.

**(d) Wood Street:** same situation as Stamford Road.

**(e) Newton Road:** PC will monitor reports of standing water on road after storms and to report to NCC any significant problems for remedial action.

**(f) Grange Road, east of New Road:** PC will assess the need for NCC to introduce gullies to be installed in this sloping section of road, and for KBC to increase street cleansing in this area, in order to cope with (i) exceptional levels of tree debris accumulation in gutters because of the many nearby mature trees and (ii) the absence of gullies resulting in New Road storm water draining all the way into Queen Street.

**Suggested Priority: HIGH for (a) and (b); MEDIUM for (c) and (d); LOW for (e) and (f).**

#### 3.2 Little Oakley: risks arising from local surface water run-off flooding.

##### *What is the problem?*

Recurrent flooding of a limited number of residential properties.

##### **Action proposed:**

PC will seek to bring together the landowning interest, the Environment Agency and any other involved agencies to define and secure implementation of measures to redirect surface water run-off draining towards Harper's Brook to alleviate repeated flooding incidents.

**Suggested Priority: MEDIUM.**

### **3.3 Geddington and Little Oakley: increasing risk of flooding from upstream.**

#### ***What is the problem?***

*There is continuing large scale urban development in Desborough, bringing with it the potential risk of downstream flooding, initially at Geddington. In particular, this has a potential impact on the ancient bridge connecting the two halves of the centre of the village. In parallel, there is an emerging need to monitor any further large scale development in southern Corby. Their storm water would drain down Harper's Brook past Little Oakley, with a risk of impact on the village that needs to be minimised at the Planning stage of development.*

#### **Action proposed:**

- (1)** PC will continue to maintain its active monitoring of all major Planning Applications upstream from Geddington affecting the Ise Brook.
- (2)** PC will seek to do the same for Little Oakley in regard to Harper's Brook.
- (3)** PC asked to make objections where considered necessary to reduce the risk of increased downstream flooding at Geddington or Little Oakley.

**Suggested Priority: HIGH.**

### **3.4 Whole Parish: co-ordination of efforts of official bodies involved**

#### ***What is the problem?***

*Flooding is perhaps the greatest threat to our villages. Regular preventative work needs to be consistently undertaken regularly. Arrangements for co-ordinated response by all involved organisations need to be kept under regular review, as formerly.*

#### **Action proposed:**

- (1) Strategy: A partnership approach:** PC will seek the creation of a regularly-convened Monitoring Group of all agencies and landed interests concerned with flooding and land drainage, e.g. The Environment Agency (EA) and the County Council. Objectives might include response to changing legislative/administrative frameworks, sourcing of flood prevention expenditure, exchange of best practice and other co-operative action to maximise local flood security.
- (2) Tactics: Keeping the two brooks clear of major blockages and free-flowing:** PC will ask its Flood Wardens annually to inspect accessible key stream bed locations on both brooks to ascertain any significant increases in fallen trees or other potential obstacles to free flow of storm water. Where concerns are raised, for the PC then to contact, as appropriate, riparian landowners and/or the EA to request appropriate action for which they are in law responsible.
- (3) Flooding Responsiveness: Detailed Parish Council arrangements:** PC will request its Flood Wardens to review annually and update as necessary the check list constituting the Parish's Flood Response arrangements in the light of (1) and (2), above.

**Suggested Priority: HIGH.**

#### **4. Dog Mess: Further Initiatives Needed, Building on Success of Recent Initiative (Survey Report page 16)**

##### ***What is the problem?***

*While the recent publicity initiative reduced significantly the level of dog mess left on footpaths, etc. in Geddington village the problem still remains noticeably. Additionally in the Recreation Ground and Play Area in relation to dogs off the lead (contrary to existing regulations): (a) uncollected dog mess, and (b) the safety risk to young children of dogs off the lead and close to very young users of the Play Area.*

##### **Action proposed:**

PC will

- (1)** Investigate the practicality of fencing and gating the Play Area to keep out dogs, on or off the lead, in accordance with current best practice.
- (2)** Seek firm enforcement of existing and future Regulations at Play Area/Recreation Ground by regular utilisation of the KBC Dog Warden.
- (3)** Review the whereabouts and clarity of all dog mess signage and fill any identified gaps with new and better signage.
- (4)** Develop a fresh “dog owner-friendly” policy for signage, to include positive messages about areas in village suitable for letting dogs off leads, including the Meadows existing dog-friendly area.
- (5)** Pair this enforcement with an additional, clearly signed off-the-leash dog-walking option, perhaps along the adjoining flooding berm.
- (6)** Emphasise prominently the acceptability of bagged dog mess in Litter Bins.

**Suggested Priority: MEDIUM.**

## 5. Facilities for Teenagers and Adults (Survey Report pages 20-22)

### 5.1 Improved facilities for teenagers and young adults

#### ***What is the problem?***

*The recent Play Area re-equipment project has proved to be a considerable success. So now seems a good time to go on as intended and respond to the parallel challenge of provision for rather older residents i.e. how best to fill the difficult-to-bridge gap in provision covering the needs of teenagers and young adults who are:*

- *too old to continue to benefit from current Youth Club facilities, and yet*
- *too young or lacking in funds to acquire their own transport to get into Kettering or beyond.*

*Other localities within the Borough have been equipped to meet their needs. To set matters in motion, two concepts in particular have been drawn to the Committee's attention:*

- *Augmenting the children's play area with outdoor exercise machines for use by young people, parents with children in the play area, and other adults,*
- *Providing an open access all-weather, multi-use sports pitch also available for School use. Additionally, skate board ramps and an outdoor gym could be considered for inclusion.*

#### **Action proposed:**

Now that the new Play Area is well bedded in, the PC will set up a Working Group of interested persons, perhaps done under the auspices of the Parish Plan Committee, to assist the Council in doing the following:

- (a)** Agreeing the most appropriate provision for young people, both up to and beyond 19 years of age
- (b)** Determining the best location(s) for such provision
- (c)** Establishing that there is sufficient public support
- (d)** Ascertaining the likely capital and running costs
- (e)** Identifying appropriate funding streams for the capital costs.

**Suggested Priority: HIGH.**

### 5.2 Securing the future of the Post Office/local retailing

#### ***What is the problem?***

*The absolute necessity of promoting a secure future for Geddington's Post Office and only remaining food sales outlet.*

#### **Action proposed:**

With the agreement of the current proprietor, the PC will seek to set up a Working Group of interested persons, again perhaps under the auspices of the Parish Plan Committee. The Group remit might be to explore the problems and to try to identify the solutions in seeking to modernise and extend the commercial offer, including the potential need for Listed Building Consent. In addition to the current proprietor, the Working Group would benefit greatly from the presence of the specialist involvement of the landlord interest and also Kettering Borough Council (as Local Planning Authority) plus, perhaps, sources of local collective opinion such as the W.I. and the Volunteer Fire Brigade.

**Suggested Priority: HIGH.**

## 6. Securing Superfast Broadband in Newton (Survey Report page 24)

### **What is the problem?**

*Geddington has access to High Speed Broadband but (at mid-2016) only standard Broadband speed was available in Newton and Little Oakley via the Great Oakley exchange. In response to an inquiry by the Parish Council to assist Parish Plan preparation the following has been indicated as the local part of the Roll Out plans for the Superfast Northamptonshire project:*

**(1) Little Oakley:** *confirmed as currently in the Roll Out plans and should be receive Superfast Broadband by December 2016.*

**(2) Newton:** *“is currently expected to be within roll out plans for Superfast Broadband.” “At present I cannot give you a firmer timescale ... other than within 2017.” “Please note that Newton is not currently listed on the Roll Out schedule but will appear when more information is available.”*

### **Action proposed:**

It is proposed to work with the Borough Councillor to maintain the closest possible scrutiny of the Superfast Broadband Roll Out Schedule to ensure that the commitment given above does not “disappear off the radar” during 2017.

**Suggested Priority: HIGH.**

## 7. Action Plan

<u>Issue</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Lead</u>	<u>Partners</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Timing</u>	<u>Cost</u>
<b>1. Traffic; Public transport; Heavy goods vehicles</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>Completing the diversion of through traffic from what is now the A4300</b> - apply pressure to HGV operators, informally, then more formally	PC	NCC	High	Short term	Low
	<b>1.2</b>	<b>Seeking detailed improvements to highway signage</b> - in order to remove any obsolete A43 routing details remaining	PC	NCC	High	Short term	Low
	<b>1.3</b>	<b>Making safer the de-trunked A4300 within the Parish</b> - promotion of a programme of traffic speed reduction measures	PC	NCC	High	Medium term	Medium
	<b>1.4</b>	<b>Reducing Newton Road traffic problems within Geddington and at Newton, and along related rural roads to the north of Newton</b>	PC	NCC	High	Short term	Low
	<b>1.5</b>	<b>Reducing traffic problems in the rest of Geddington village:</b> - speed reduction?; pedestrianisation?; parking?	PC	NCC; School	High & Medium	Short & Long term	Part: Low Part: Medium
	<b>1.6</b>	<b>Retaining Public Transport links along the A4300</b> - responding to potential reductions in future service levels	PC	NCC	High	Long term	Low
<b>2. Street lighting</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Selective improvements in the "dark areas" of Geddington village</b> - responding to the Parish Plan Opinion Survey responses	PC	NCC; KBC	Medium	Medium term	Medium
<b>3. Flooding &amp; Drainage</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>Geddington: risks arising from local surface water run-off flooding</b> - maintaining all current facilities in full working order	PC	NCC; KBC; EA	High to Low	Various	Medium; mainly revenue
	<b>3.2</b>	<b>Little Oakley: risks arising from local surface water run-off flooding</b> - bring together interested parties to agree and achieve a solution	PC	NCC; KBC; EA Boughton	Medium	Short term	Low
	<b>3.3</b>	<b>Geddington &amp; Lt. Oakley: increasing risk of flooding from upstream</b> - responding to Planning Applications in Desborough and Corby	PC	KBC; EA	High	Various	Low to nil
	<b>3.4</b>	<b>Whole Parish: co-ordination of efforts of official bodies involved</b> - start regular periodic review meeting between all agencies involved	PC; Borough Councillor	NCC; KBC; EA & others	High	Long term	Low
<b>4. Dog mess</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Further initiatives needed, building on successes of recent initiative</b> - improved signage, increased enforcement, Play Area fenced, etc.	PC	KBC	Medium	Short term	Low
<b>5. Facilities for teenagers &amp; adults</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>Improved facilities for teenagers and young adults</b> - Working Group to assist Parish Council develop and implement ideas	PC	KBC & others	High	Medium term	High
	<b>5.2</b>	<b>Securing the future of the Post Office/local retailing</b> - Working Group to assist Parish Council develop and promote proposals	PC	KBC; Boughton	High	Short Term	Unclear initially
<b>6. Broadband</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>Securing Superfast Broadband in Newton</b> - work to ensure Newton not left out of Superfast Broadband provision	PC; Borough Councillor	KBC; BT	High	Short term	Nil

## 8. Glossary: Abbreviations Used in the Text.

Boughton	Boughton Estates
EA	Environment Agency
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
KBC	Kettering Borough Council
NCC	Northamptonshire County Council
PC	Geddington, Newton & Little Oakley Parish Council
WI	Women's Institute

## 9. Membership of Parish Plan Committee

Ms V Allport  
Mr P Berry  
Mr J Goodall  
Mr A Groom  
Mr F Harding  
Ms K Peters  
Mr K Richardson  
Mr N Turner  
Ms J Tingle  
Ms J Tysoe  
Cllr J Padwick (Chair)  
Cllr D Hodkinson  
Cllr D Rushton