

**NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL**

**CASTLE MORPETH LOCAL AREA COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the **Castle Morpeth Local Area Council** held in the Council Chamber on Monday, 13 November 2017.

**PRESENT**

Councillor J.A. Beynon

(Vice-Chair, in the Chair for items 1 - 4, 7, 13 and 14 - 21)

(Planning Vice-chair Councillor S. Dickinson in the chair for items 5 - 6, 8 - 12)

**COUNCILLORS**

Bawn, D.L.  
Dodd, R.R.  
Dunn, L.  
Jackson, P.A.

Jones, V.  
Sanderson, H.G.H.  
Wearmouth, R.

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Bennett, Mrs L.M.  
Bracken, M.  
Fairs, G.  
Horsman, G.  
King, M.  
Lathan, D.  
Masson, N.  
McDonagh, C.  
Murphy, J.  
Sinnamon, E.  
Wardle, S.  
  
Wood, J.

Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Democratic Services Apprentice  
Highways Development Manager  
Senior Planning Officer  
Central Area Highways Manager  
Senior Environmental Health Officer  
Principal Solicitor  
Planning Officer  
Principal Planning Officer  
Senior Planning Manager  
Neighbourhood Services Area  
Manager  
Planning Officer

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE**

Hitchin, J.

Lead Local Flood Authority

**59. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor E. Armstrong, J.D. Foster, D. Ledger and D.J. Towns.

## 60. MINUTES

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Castle Morpeth Local Area Council held on Monday, 9 October 2017 as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

## 61. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor S. Dickinson declared an interest in agenda item nos 7 and 13. He vacated the chair and withdrew from the meeting during these items.

Councillor R.R. Dodd declared an interest in in agenda item nos. 11 and 12.

Councillor L. Dunn declared an interest in agenda item no. 5. She had previously spoken in objection but had received legal advice that she could participate.

Councillor P.A. Jackson declared an interest in agenda item no. 17

Councillor V. Jones declared an interest in agenda items 11 and 12 as she had made a formal objection and in agenda item no. 17.

Councillor R. Wearmouth declared an interest in agenda item nos. 9 and 10. He had chaired Morpeth Town Council during the consideration of these items but had made it clear that he was not expressing an opinion and was only facilitating the meeting.

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

## 62. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The attached report explained how the Local Area Council was asked to decide the planning applications attached to this agenda using the powers delegated to it. and included details of the public speaking arrangements. (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix A)

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted

## 63. 16/02756/FUL

**Erection of two no. dwellings (amended description and amended plans received 09.11.2016, supplementary information received 22.11.16 and 23.11.16). Land South Of Old Smithy, Widdrington Village, Northumberland.** (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix J)

Judith Murphy, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview. Members were informed that the report referred to a site visit which had been arranged in March 2017. However, this site visit had been deferred to allow further archaeological work to be undertaken. She added that the County Archaeologist had no objections to the application. A further objection had been received from a resident of Widdrington on behalf of

other residents and this had reiterated most of the objections already raised. The recent site visit had raised the issue of whether access for emergency vehicles had been checked. It was confirmed that this was always checked and no concerns had been raised. The Rights of Way Officer had also been consulted and had confirmed that no rights of way were affected by the proposal.

**Alison Grant** spoke in objection to the application and her key points were:

- The residents of Widdrington Village strongly opposed the development on the grounds of the principle of development, the impact on highway safety and the impact on nationally important heritage assets.
- The report stated that the development was in accordance with the national policy but this was not the case and was contrary to paragraph 55 of the NPPF which only allowed certain forms of development in the open countryside.
- Permitted developments would be accommodation for rural workers, the re-use of buildings and residential dwellings and buildings of outstanding or innovative design.
- It was claimed that sustainability had been addressed and that the two houses would support economic growth, be socially significant and protect the natural environment. No evidence had been provided to support these claims.
- These benefits were insignificant to the village and should not be used to support new development outside the established and accepted settlement boundary.
- The proposed access failed to meet the requirements as defined in the County Council's highway guidelines, the National Manual for Streets and to provide the required level of visibility.
- The access to the site was not big enough for private vehicles to use safety let alone contractors, delivery or emergency vehicles.
- The close proximity of the proposed development to the Grade 1 Listed Church and the Grade 1 Listed War Memorial would have a significant adverse impact.

**Mr. Ken Johnson**, spoke in objection to the application and his key points were:

- It had always been clear that the boundary of the Old Smithy was the boundary of the village.
- This was an inappropriate housing development outside the village envelope and contrary to national policy.
- The seriousness of this departure should be considered as it would cause problems in other areas of the County.
- Similar developments had been refused elsewhere in Northumberland.
- The heritage in Widdrington should be preserved
- Attention should be given to drainage issues.

**Councillor Valerie Seddon (Widdrington Village Parish Council)** spoke in the local member slot and her main points were:-

- The entrance on Garth Lane was quite narrow (estimated 9/10 feet) and did not have as much visibility as suggested by the plans. There was a utility pole and fence along with an acute corner in the road.
- Emergency Vehicles probably would be able to gain access and the nearest fire hydrant was at Widdrington Farm.
- No consideration had been given to the environment including red squirrels which had been seen in the area and the bats in the church.
- There were TPO on trees surrounding the site.
- Although not a material planning consideration, the access was right against the wall of a very old building. This wall had no foundations and could be damaged and collapse, potentially causing injury.
- The church was a Grade 1 Listed Building and the site of Widdrington Castle was in close proximity. This visual amenity would be taken away.
- The Parish Council was not opposed to new building in the village but there were better sites than this one.

**David Cherrie (agent)** then spoke in support of the application and his key points were:

- It had been pleasing to hear on the national news that small developments such as this were good for villages.
- Much of what had been said was emotive rather than referring to planning reasons.
- The issues referred to in paragraphs 8.1-8.7 in the conclusion of the officer's report showed how the scheme was acceptable and had been found to have no adverse effects on neighbouring amenity, on the setting of designated heritage assets, on ecology, drainage and highways.
- Matters had been addressed to the satisfaction of the the County archaeologist.
- The conditions proposed in the report were robust.

Members then asked questions to officers and the key points from responses were:

- There was sufficient information in the report and presentation to allow members to make a decision. Only Councillor Dickinson had attended the site visit. Councillor Wearmouth commented that he had been unable to attend but was very familiar with the site and had visited it since the site visit.
- There would be a condition relating to a programme of archaeological work and such a condition would not be proposed unless it could be monitored or enforced.
- The archaeological work would need to be undertaken within a narrow timescale but the details would have to be checked by the County Archaeologist.

- At a recent appeal, the Planning Inspector was of the view that two new houses could provide economic benefits. An example of this was at Ancroft.
- Access arrangements were not always perfect or able to meet the requirements of guidance. Where these could not be met, the implications needed to be carefully considered. Vehicle speeds were fairly low here and the two new dwellings could give rise to 15/16 vehicle movements a day. This was viewed as not to be substantial and so was not a reason to refuse.

Councillor H.G.H. Sanderson moved, seconded by Councillor R. Wearmouth, that the application be refused on the following grounds:-

- It did not satisfy the three sustainability tests in the NPPF.
- The archaeological work should be completed before approval could be granted.
- The development was outside the settlement boundary.

Debate then followed and the key points from members were:

- The policies of the Local Plan could only be used in as far as they aligned with the NPPF, otherwise they were considered to be out of date. The NPPF had priority over the Local Plan.
- There were concerns about the archaeological work and members felt that it should be carried out before consideration of whether to approve the application.

Councillor H.G.H. Sanderson withdrew his motion to refuse the application

Councillor R. Wearmouth proposed that consideration be deferred to allow the archaeological work to be carried out. This was seconded by Councillor V. Jones.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed by 3 votes for to 1 against with 1 abstention, that it be

**RESOLVED** that the application be **DEFERRED** to allow the programme of archaeological work to be carried out.

**64. 17/00649/FUL**

**Proposed change of use of coffee shop to agricultural workers dwelling including internal alterations and minor external alterations as amended by additional information and revised site layout/location plan received 28/06/17. Widdrington Farm, Widdrington Village, Morpeth, NE61 5EA.**  
(Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix D)

Chris McDonagh, Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview.

Members asked questions of officers and the key points from responses were:

- The cafe had closed in late 2016. Although it was not a planning issue, the applicant had supplied three years of bookkeeping for the cafe and it clearly showed that the business was unviable.
- This was an operational farm and so consideration of odour and noise would have to be taken into account.

Councillor R. Wearmouth then moved the officer recommendation to grant the application. This was seconded by Councillor H.G.H. Sanderson.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed unanimously that it be

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report.

*Councillor S. Dickinson took over as Chairman*

**65. 17/00794/COU**

**Retrospective - Change of use from petrol station to car wash (as amended 05/09/17). Lynemouth Service Station, Albion Terrace, Lynemouth, NE61 5SX.** (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix B)

Judith Murphy, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview.

Members then asked questions to officers and the key points from responses were:

- The issue of whether there were dropped kerbs all around the site could be checked out.
- If dropped kerbs were not present then they could be addressed as a highways issue which was separate from planning.

Councillor R. Wearmouth moved the officer recommendation to grant the application. This was seconded by Councillor V. Jones.

Debate then followed and the key points from members were:

- The screening had been requested but had still not been supplied.
- This site did not add anything to Lynemouth and was an eyesore.
- The applicant had complied with everything asked of them.
- The sustainability of the business was called into question as it was not open 7 days a week.

Ch.'s Initials.....  


Castle Morpeth Local Area Council, 13 November 2017

Councillor R. Wearmouth proposed that the application be approved with an additional condition that requested the applicants to supply the overspray screens within 21 days from 13 November 2017.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed by 4 votes for to 2 against with 1 abstention, that it be

**RESOLVED** that the application be approved subject to the additional condition requiring overspray screens be fitted on site within 21 days from 13 November 2017.

**66. 17/03021/FUL**

**Demolition of existing stables and the erection of three bespoke dwellings with associated landscaping and highway works.**

**Land South Of 56, Station Road, Stannington, Northumberland.** (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix C)

Geoff Horsman, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview and update. Highways had no objection subject to conditions and the slight rewording to conditions 10 and 11. Network Rail had also raised no objections subject to conditions relating to external lighting and noise. The Parish Council had not responded and so it was assumed that it had no comments.

Members then asked questions to officers and the key points from responses were:

- The site was considered sustainable as there was access to a farm shop, petrol station, restaurant shop and public transport. A school was available on the other side of the A1. Wider services were available in Morpeth and Bedlington.
- In terms of the NPPF, Stannington Station was a village although there was no settlement boundary. Stannington Station fell within the definition of a village.
- This development was considered to be appropriate development in the Green Belt as limited infill within an existing village.
- The development was not of a scale sufficient to request an educational contribution.

Councillor R. Wearmouth then moved the officer recommendation to grant the application. This was seconded by Councillor D. Bawn.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed by 6 votes for to 0 against with 3 abstentions, that it be

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report with amended and additional conditions to reflect the comments of Highways and Network Rail.

67. 16/03778/OUT

**Outline permission for up to 16 dwellings with all matters reserved apart from access. Land To North Of The Avenue, The Avenue, Medburn, Northumberland.** (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix E)

Joanne Wood, Planning Officer, introduced the application and provided a brief overview and update. The following additional conditions had been requested:

- Deliveries should be restricted to between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. Monday to Friday, between 8 a.m. and 1 p.m. on a Saturday and none on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
- No noisy activity should take place outside the hours of 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday to Friday, Saturdays 8am - 1pm, or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
- A watercourse assessment should be undertaken and submitted.
- A scheme which mitigates any overland surface water flows into the development shall be undertaken and any mitigation carried out within the development

**Stephanie Fletcher** spoke in objection to the application, and her key points were:

- There had been 71 applications for dwellings on The Avenue since 2001 resulting in the chaotic and unorganised development in that area.
- This application breached policy on Green Belt land and detracted from the local area resulting in a substantial loss of amenity and was detrimental to highway safety.
- The policies of the Castle Morpeth Local Plan were still in place and relevant and so should be given heavy weighting.
- An appeal had been allowed in 2006 and the Planning Inspector had been concerned that a precedent would be set but ruled that any similar proposals should be judged on their specific planning merits.
- A second appeal had been allowed but the Planning Inspector had been concerned at the reintroduction of agricultural traffic which would affect the amenity of residents.
- Many policies within the NPPF had been breached including paragraph 17 stating that the standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings should be retained.
- The Avenue was constantly blocked and residents trapped on their driveways.
- There had been police reports filed for damage to cars, houses and other personal property suggesting that access to the proposed site was neither safe nor suitable.
- The condition of The Avenue was substandard, there were no passing places and there were safety concerns.
- Numerous photographs and videos had been sent to Northumberland County Council demonstrating the huge risk to safety.

Ch.'s Initials.....

Castle Morpeth Local Area Council, 13 November 2017



- Residents had been told that the hands of the Highways Authority were tied as The Avenue was a private road. Why was the safety and amenity of residents less important than those living on a public road?
- In 2006, a Planning Inspector ruled that one more dwelling would not add a significant amount of traffic at the junction of The Avenue and the C345. Why have the planning officers continued to refuse to object on highways grounds because of this one comment? The comment was made 11 years ago when there were 52 fewer dwellings.
- Residents of Medburn were under siege.
- The planners should fully consider the material planning objections associated with this application.

Members then asked questions to officers and the key points from responses were:

- Planning Officers were comfortable in saying that there was evidence of a five year housing supply. However, following the withdrawal of the Core Strategy land without an objectively assessed need figure it may be more difficult to defend this position at appeal.
- It was unknown who owned The Avenue and it was acknowledged that the road was in a very poor state. Improvements to the road could be encouraged but there was no clear ownership.
- Northumberland County Council had no jurisdiction over The Avenue and the state of the road and the junction could not be used as a reason for refusal as this would not be sustainable on appeal.
- There was no evidence base of any highways safety issues. The Planning Inspector viewed the level of traffic to be light and that vehicles could exit the junction to the C345 without difficulty. At appeal, no evidence could be supplied to justify a refusal. It was recognised that the situation was far from ideal.
- If there were any complaints from residents about deliveries or work outside the agreed times, there would be discussions with the site manager. If necessary, enforcement notices could be served.
- At the point of writing the report, the application for 62 houses at Medburn had not been approved. However, this should have been clarified. The 62 houses would not gain access via The Avenue
- Officers confirmed to members the wording of paragraph 32 of the NPPF.
- It was officers' opinion that a further 16 houses in Medburn could not be seen as overdevelopment and would not be a sufficient reason to refuse permission.
- It was acknowledged that the Planning Inspectors' decisions about the roads at Medburn had been made around 11 to 18 years ago and that Medburn had changed since that time. It would be possible to consider improved screening by trees as part of discussions of reserved matters.
- In officers' opinion it was not possible to ask this developer to repair the Avenue to a satisfactory standard or improve the access as suggested as this would not be reasonable or proportionate given that this had not been sought on earlier permissions.

Councillor V. Jones moved a motion, seconded by Councillor H.G.H. Sanderson, that the application be refused on the following grounds:-

- access from The Avenue and C345 was not safe
- the development was not sustainable as there were no local services and very limited public transport.
- the development was contrary to the Castle Morpeth Local Plan.

Debate then followed and the key points from members were:

- This development had reached the tipping point for Medburn and any further development would not be sustainable.
- Life was impossible for residents at the moment and the developer had been negligent as no transport assessment had been provided for the site.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed unanimously, that it be

**RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED** on the following grounds:-

- The proposed development, due to its scale and density, would result in an increase in vehicular traffic along The Avenue, the current structural condition of which is substandard. The development would also increase the use of the access to The Avenue from the C345, which presented visibility issues. It is therefore considered that a safe and suitable access could not be achieved, and as such the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The site is not located within the developed part of Medburn as defined by Policy MBH1 of the Castle Morpeth Local Plan, but instead lay within an area designated by Local Plan Policy MBH2 as being appropriate only for infill development on previously developed land. The site was not previously developed, and the construction of up to 16 dwellings in this location would not constitute infill development. The proposal would not achieve a sensitive development in-keeping with the low density characteristics of the existing pattern of development along The Avenue. As such, whilst the site may lie within the wider settlement boundary of Medburn, the proposal would represent over-development of the site and would be contrary to the provisions of Local Plan Policy MBH2.
- Medburn as a settlement was poorly served by services/facilities, had an extremely limited access to the public transport network, and as such was not a sustainable location for new housing development. In this respect, the development would, therefore, be contrary to the sustainability objectives of the NPPF.

**68. 17/00884/FUL**

**Conversion of existing Grade II listed building to accommodate 13 No. self contained residential apartments (C1 use class) and development of 4 dormer bungalows (3no. 3 bed and 1no. 4 bed) within former car parking area. Revised plans and information and description.**

**94 Newgate Street, Morpeth, NE61 1BU.** (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix F)

**17/00885/LBC**

**Listed Building Consent: Conversion of existing Grade II listed building to accommodate 13 No. self contained residential apartments (C1 use class) and development of 4 dormer bungalows (3no. 3 bed and 1no. 4 bed) within former car parking area. Demolition of rear hall/gym building.**

**Amended Plans/Documents and Description.** (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix G)

Judith Murphy, Principal Planning Officer, explained that these two applications would be considered in tandem with the recommendations taken separately. She introduced the applications and provided a brief overview and update. A small number of further objections had been received raising the same comments as previously made. A comment had been made that a daylight and sunlight assessment had not been done, however, this would not normally be asked for. The applicant had submitted information following a solar analysis and no problems had been demonstrated. No comments had been received from the Environment Agency. The Local Lead Flood Authority had raised no objections subject to an amendment to condition 30.

**Colin Wardle** spoke in objection to the application and his key points were:

- One of the plans shown in the presentation was not the up to date version.
- Generally there was no objection to the conversion and re-use of the building but the peripheral development was an issue.
- Two properties in Orchard Mews and Kirkville were particularly affected.
- There were 18 trees on the site and nine would be removed. Two of these trees were lime trees and had an important role in the Conservation Area. One of the trees was in a landscape area so there should be no need to remove it.
- The report states that there will be no windows looking onto the properties at Orchard Mews, however, the plans showed otherwise. There were a number of issues of overlooking both from windows and raised gardens which would compromise the privacy of the properties at Orchard Mews.
- The 1.65 m wall will not prevent a loss of privacy to these properties.
- The development would block out light to existing properties.
- The proposals fell well short of what was acceptable and will impact on residential amenity.

**Councillor Beyard (Morpeth Town Council)** spoke in the local member slot and her main points were:-

- Morpeth Town Council had not had time to consider the updated design and access statement.
- Sympathetic development was supported but the development of four bungalows and the car park were still a concern along with road safety concerns.
- The site currently provided 50 informal car parking spaces which were used all day. These cars would be displaced and may start to park onto Cottingwood Lane.
- 26 parking spaces would be provided for residents but this may be insufficient resulting in cars being displaced elsewhere.
- The proposed bungalows constitute overmassing.
- The development would harm the setting of a Grade II Listed Building, the Conservation Area and Heritage Assets.
- The development was not consistent with policies Her1, Her2 and Inf1 of the Morpeth Neighbourhood Plan.

**Peter Smith (applicant)** then spoke in support of the application and his key points were:

- The developers wanted a scheme to be proud of and intended to keep money within the town by using local workmen and apprentices. It was intended to prevent the site from being developed by outside developers.
- Since submitting the planning application the plans had evolved into the current scheme.
- Following consultation with the public and officers, there was now a mix of units ranging in size from 1 to 4 bedrooms.
- The proposal was a sensitive redevelopment of the site to preserve it for the future.
- Parking had been provided on the site. There was currently illegal parking and anti-social behaviour in the area.
- The development team had worked tirelessly to address all the issues and members' support was sought to help provide an award winning scheme.
- Overshadowing and privacy issues had been looked at and frosted glass would be used for overlooking windows and these would not be habitable rooms. Acute angles would be used and the distances had been considered.
- The report stated that there would be 'less than substantial harm' to the setting of the Grade II Listed Building and the character and setting of the Morpeth Conservation Area.
- Trees would be removed but it was the tree roots that were the problem not the tree trunk itself.
- 40-50 cars were parking on the site at the moment and this would be reduced when parking was for residents only.

A copy of the correct revised plan was circulated to members at the meeting and members confirmed that they had access to the plans via the Planning Portal.

Members then asked questions to officers and the key points from responses were:

- The lime trees were not protected by TPO's but protected through the Conservation Area.
- The financial contribution towards affordable housing was based on a figure of 15% and would take into account the Vacant Building Credit.
- It was confirmed that the glass in the overlooking windows would not be frosted and that these rooms were living rooms.

Councillor D. Bawn proposed, seconded by Councillor J.A. Beynon, that the application be refused on the following grounds:-

- overlooking, massing, and loss of privacy
- impact on the trees
- impact on the Conservation Area
- harm to the Grade II Listed Building and Conservation Area was not offset by the public interest.

Debate then followed and the key points from members were:

- It would seem more appropriate to defer for one month to allow the further information to be provided.
- The scheme was generally good and sympathetic and the applicant had tried to meet all the requirements.
- Further information (including photographs and site levels) was needed on the position of the lime trees, views of the site from various places, and confirmation on whether certain windows were to be frosted.

Councillor D. Bawn withdrew his proposal.

Councillor R. Wearmouth proposed, seconded by Councillor S. Dickinson that consideration be deferred for one month to allow the following information to be provided:-

- position of the lime trees,
- views of the site from various places,
- confirmation on whether certain windows were to be frosted, and
- section drawings of the levels across the site.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed by unanimously that it be

**RESOLVED** that the application 17/00884/FUL be **DEFERRED** for one month to allow the further information requested to be provided.

Councillor R. Wearmouth moved the officer recommendation to grant planning application 17/00885/LBC. This was seconded by Councillor J.A. Beynon.

**RESOLVED** that the application 17/00885/LBC be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions outlined in the report.

**It was proposed by Councillor S. Dickinson, seconded by Councillor J.A. Beynon and RESOLVED to suspend Standing Orders to allow the meeting to continue beyond three hours duration.**

**69. 17/01201/FUL**

**Proposed construction of new building for organic free range egg production including new access track and hardcore area.**

**Land East Of Beukley Mast, Great Whittington, Northumberland.** (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix H)

**17/01202/FUL**

**Proposed construction of new building for organic free range egg production including new access track and hardcore area.**

**Land East Of Beukley Mast, Great Whittington, Northumberland.** (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix I)

Daniel Puttick, Senior Planning Officer, explained that the two applications would be considered in tandem. He introduced the application and provided a brief overview.

**Keith Butler (agent)** spoke in support of the application and his key points were:

- The proposal was for an acceptable agricultural use on agricultural land.
- No objections had been received from any statutory bodies.
- There would be no adverse effect on the land.
- The proposal should be seen in the context of the adjacent site and highly visible telecommunications mast.
- There were no drainage issues as the ground was permeable.

**Mr. T. Oliver (applicant)** spoke in support of the applicant and his key points were:-

- There was unlikely to be anything of archaeological interest on the land. He often permitted metal detectors to be used on his land and nothing had been found.
- There was a limited top soil of 6 inches and no sub soil. Nothing had previously been built on this site.
- Consideration had been given to the positioning of the buildings and they were not really visible from anywhere.

Councillor H.G.H. Sanderson moved the officer recommendation to grant application 17/01201/FUL. This was seconded by Councillor J.A. Beynon.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed unanimously that it be

**RESOLVED** that application 17/01201/FUL be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report.

Councillor D. Bawn moved the officer recommendation to grant application 17/01202/FUL. This was seconded by Councillor R. Wearmouth.

On being put to the vote, it was agreed by unanimously, that it be

**RESOLVED** that application 17/01202/FUL be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report.

## **OTHER LOCAL AREA COUNCIL BUSINESS**

*On the conclusion of the development control business at 5.40 pm, the meeting adjourned as the remainder of the agenda consisted of other Local Area Council business scheduled to begin at 6pm.*

### **70. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The Chair explained that this item provided an opportunity for members of the public to have their say.

**Councillor Andrew Tebbutt, Morpeth Town Council**

**When would Northumberland County Council be able to consult with Parish and Town Councils on the 2018/19 budget?**

Councillor P. Jackson stated that the same arrangements would be in place as in previous years. All Parish and Town Councils would be able to go ahead and set their own budgets. A timetable would be published soon but the public consultation was expected to take place in December/January. Financial reviews were ongoing and the Council would then be able to determine the way forward. It was expected that a scrutiny committee would be held to which all County Councillors and the public would be invited.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS - CORPORATE**

### **71. REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

#### **1. Ponteland Neighbourhood Plan**

Members received a report relating to the Ponteland Neighbourhood Plan which would be considered by the Cabinet on 23 November 2017, with a recommendation that Northumberland County Council should formally 'make' the Plan. Members were asked to note the content and recommendations contained in the report. (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix K).

**RESOLVED** that the content and recommendations in the report be noted.

**72. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF LOCAL SERVICES AND HOUSING DELIVERY**

**1. Winter Services Preparedness and Resilience**

Members received an overall update of the pre-season preparations ahead of the forthcoming winter services period. (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix L).

Councillor H.G.H. Sanderson reported that this service was aiming to be more efficient by doing the same job as previously but in a better way. It was not intended to cut any services.

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

**2. Local Pothole Fund Update**

Members received an overall progress update on the Local Pothole Fund. (Report attached to the signed minutes as Appendix M)

Councillor H.G.H. Sanderson reported that the scheme had been well received and it was hoped that the next tranche would open soon. The scheme had given some power back to Councillors and it was hoped to build on this further and to devolve further powers to the Local Area Councils. It was noted that there had been less take up in some other Local Area Council areas.

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

**73. LOCAL AREA COUNCIL WORK PROGRAMME**

Members received the latest version of agreed items for future Local Area Council meetings. (A copy of the report is filed with the signed minutes as Appendix E).

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted

**74. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held on Monday, 11 December 2017, at 4.00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Morpeth. This meeting would deal with planning matters only.

CHAIRMAN *M. Beynon*  
DATE *11 December 2017*