

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

CASTLE MORPETH LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At a meeting of the **Castle Morpeth Local Area Council** held in Morpeth Town Hall, Market Place, Morpeth, Northumberland, NE61 1LZ on Monday, 10 September 2018 at 4.00pm.

PRESENT

Councillor E. Armstrong
(Chair, in the Chair for items 43 - 45 and 53 - 60)

Councillor S. Dickinson
(Planning Vice-chair, in the Chair for items 46 - 52)

COUNCILLORS

Bawn, D.
Beynon, J.A (part)
Dodd, R.R.
Jackson, P. (part)
Dunn, E.

Jones, V.
Ledger, D.
Sanderson, H.G.H.
Towns, D.J
Wearmouth. R.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

Bird, M.
Churchill, F.
Filby, U.
Horsman, G.
King, M.
Lally, D.
Laughton, R.
Plaice, W
Sinnamon, E.
Soulsby, R.
Wardle, S.

Senior Democratic Services Officer
Interim Director of Planning
Solicitor
Senior Planning Officer
Highways Delivery Area Manager
Chief Executive
Planning Officer
Environmental Health Officer
Interim Head of Planning Services
Planning Officer
Neighbourhood Services Area
Manager
Planning Technician

Willis, C.

Inspector L Hall - Northumbria Police

65 members of the public and one member of the press were in attendance.

43. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Foster.

44. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Castle Morpeth Local Area Council held on Monday, 9 July 2018, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

45. DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor Wearmouth declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in item 10 on the agenda, the Tree Preservation Order for land at St Mary Park, Morpeth, as his cousin lived nearby, and Councillor Bawn indicated the same as he also lived nearby.

For transparency, as declarations were being made about proximity to sites in question, Councillor Sanderson declared that he lived a few miles from Eshott Airfield.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

46. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The attached report explained how the Local Area Council needed 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.

47. 18/01707/VARYCO

**Variation and removal of conditions attached to planning permission CM/84/D/608C relating to operation of airfield namely conditions 1 (approved plans), 2 (personal permission), 3 (aircraft type restriction), 4 (hours of operation), 5 (airfield membership numbers), 6 (maximum number of resident aircraft on site at any one time), 7 (outside storage) and 8 (recording of aircraft movements) and further condition regarding hours restriction on use of machinery, all changes to better reflect current operational requirements and to remove any ambiguity regarding airfield operating times
Bockenfield Aerodrome Ltd, Eshott Airfield, Felton, Morpeth, Northumberland, NE65 9QJ**

Geoff Horsman, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application by firstly explaining that the application had arisen out of a number of enforcement complaints being received. 84 representations of support and 44 of objection had been received before the agenda was published. Thirston Parish Council had also objected. He updated members that since the agenda had been published a further eight objections had been received and a formal response received from Felton Parish Council, which Mr Horsman read out in full:

"The airfield operator has stated that it does not have any control over the flights and

actions taken by pilots using the airfield, as can be seen by the fact that planes already fly from and to the airfield outside of the current licensed hours. There also appears to be a stated intention to increase contracts for the use of the airfield by military aircraft. These statements are of great concern to Felton Parish Council, in light of this application to extend the airfield's hours and to increase the number of aircraft and members permitted. The change in conditions will seemingly allow increased use of the airfield, over extended hours, by planes (both civilian and military over which the airfield operator has no control as to route, frequency or duration. It is not clear from the application what the real impact of the proposed change in conditions will be, nor what the anticipated use of military aircraft is.

"Felton Parish Council therefore objects to this application, on the basis that there will be a real impact upon Felton residents, in particular on their enjoyment of their homes and gardens, and on their animals, due to the increased noise and nuisance from overflying air traffic. Felton Parish Council recommends that this application is refused, and that clearer conditions and a better assessment of impact are provided should a further application be made."

Mr Horsman continued introducing the application with a slides presentation, during which he explained details of the conditions which were proposed to change, for which details of amendments were presented at the meeting:

1. With the exception of landings/take-offs only by military aircraft, emergency services aircraft and/or aircraft in emergency situations, the airfield shall not be used other than by gliders, microlights, helicopters and propeller driven aircraft. No such individual aircraft (landings/take-offs by military or emergency services/situations aircraft excepted) shall exceed 5700 kilograms in weight.

REASON: To limit the use of the site and thereby ensure that the amenity of the occupants of nearby residential properties is not adversely affected by the development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

4. There shall be no outside storage within the application site without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority except for the outside storage of plant/equipment associated with airfield operations and the development approved on the 21 March 2018 under planning permission reference 17/04453/FUL.

REASON: To limit the use of the site and thereby ensure that the amenity of the occupants of nearby residential properties is not adversely affected by the development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

6. No external lighting additional to that already provided on site shall be installed unless and until:

- (a) Details regarding the location of bat sensitive lighting zones on the application site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and*
- (b) Where such external lighting would be sited within those approved zones, details of that lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such lighting details should be designed so that lighting levels are minimised in accordance with the document, ' Bats and Lighting in the UK',*

Institute of Lighting Engineers and BCT, 2009. Following approval, any such external lighting shall be installed and operated in strict accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To prevent the risk of harm to protected species in accordance with Policy C11 of the Castle Morpeth District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The public speaking objection slot was then shared by Fiona Krzyosiak and Ron Hall. Mrs Krzyosiak spoke first, of which her key points were:

- she was speaking as a resident of Felton, which was under the flight path
- the current planning consent had been granted to the previous operator, not the land. The applicant's report was full of technical and regulatory errors
- Northumberland Fire and Resuce had only assessed the access to the site. The availability of handheld fire extinguishers was insufficient for the site
- the Civil Aviation Authority provided full guidance about regulations and confirmed that the Local Planning Authority had the right to impose what was necessary to control operations
- if this application was passed, the Planning Authority would be responsible for the regulatory oversight and ensuring that there was compliance with Civil Aviation Authority guidance. Currently only propellor driven aircraft were currently allowed, and the application would lead to no limits on military aircraft.

Mr Hall's key points were:

- he was speaking on behalf of residents who had objected. They were due to be represented at this meeting by Mr Tweddle, who could not attend due to illness
- Article 8 of the European Human Rights Act included stipulations for the respect of people's private and family lives; no fly zones were needed for people to enjoy their properties
- the current 9am - 7pm hours affected residents, and the proposed time extension was not acceptable
- the applicant was unclear regarding Condition 9, regarding the 44DBA limit for off road course; why should that apply to other activities on the site?

Councillor Hazel Lindley then spoke on behalf of Thirston Parish Council, of which her key points were:

- Thirston Parish Council strongly opposed the application; the airfield had been developed for the RAF during World War Two. When it reopened in 1984 for part recreational flying, aircraft were limited to being single engine propellor generated, with a 9am - 7pm restriction so nearby residents were not affected
- the application in 2006 to extend the times by two hours per day was refused by Castle Morpeth Borough Council; this decision was then upheld on appeal
- there were problems with an increasing number of complaints about increased noise and overflying by aircraft not abiding by the no-fly zones; some aircraft flew so low, residents could see the pilots' faces
- if approved, residents in the villages of Bockenfield, Burgham, Eshott and Felton were concerned about the adverse impact
- since 2006 many more properties had been built locally including in excess of 150 holiday lodges. The local zoo employed many staff and was proposing employment for a further 44

- Thirston Parish Council supported the growth of sustainable local businesses, but such plans should acknowledge the impact on local residents and businesses. No other local business would be granted approval for this amount of additional hours each week. The 44 DBA level only applied to machinery on the airfield.

The supporters' speaking slot was then shared between Andrew Buck, Ian Parkinson and Richard Pike. Mr Buck's key points were:

- aircraft taking off had to get up to 500 feet and back down to land; houses built near or under the airfield approaches would see aircraft at all heights. The airfield nationally published its recommended guideline operating procedures and asked and encouraged pilots to follow them
- Eshott Airfield was not for the privileged few; it provided the opportunity for younger pilots and those with limited funds to fly, and for some the chance to follow their dream of becoming a commercial pilot. It offered some of the cheapest training and flying, had created skilled job opportunities and introduced younger people to aviation
- Eshott Airfield had become a key part of Northumberland's transport and tourism infrastructure and should be encouraged to develop by the County Council.

Mr Parkinson's key points were:

- he was a pilot who had flown from Eshott for over 25 years. There was an established use for members to access, drive into and use the airfield at all hours of the day. An attraction of flying in Northumberland was there were few restrictions; Eshott was an unlicensed airfield and operated in unregulated airspace. He could fly when and where he wanted and land at any time of the day or night without interference from airfield operators or radar control
- for as long as there had been an airfield there there had been complaints from a very small minority of serial complainants; Eshott was no different from all airfields, which had these issues
- the airfield was long established, neighbours moved there and in some cases to within the original airfield boundary in the full knowledge they were moving near an active airfield, where pilot training took place throughout the day.

Mr Pike's key points were:

- Eshott Airfield was the only all weather tarmac airstrip left in Northumberland. Pilots had been witnessed making dangerous decisions by not landing at Eshott after 7pm when in difficulty. Pilots were aware of the restrictions and problems that late landing caused the airfield with neighbours. This could lead to a fatality one day if this old and voluntary restriction was not removed, which was requested by a very different Eshott site over 20 years ago. Aircraft were quieter and more efficient than in the 1990s. They could only issue recommendations, but not instructions to pilots. As an airfield operator they were promoting best practice
- they had made approaches to Thirston Parish Council but they would not communicate and misunderstood the largest piece of infrastructure within the parish; helicopters were already allowed to land there
- the operators had been threatened with deliberate acts and obstacles designed to interrupt operations, suffered personal abuse, and putting pilot and public lives at risk was a criminal act and prisonable offence
- the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognised the importance of and contribution of GA Airfields within the UK economy, which should be recognised.

Neighbours would be surprised just how little activity there was outside of the core hours and how little difference it would make to their lives. Thousands of visitors came to Eshott every year. Airfields around the UK were closing at an alarming rate and they were passionate about keeping Eshott airfield open and viable. There had not been any need for either the fire service or police to attend the airfield.

Members then asked questions to officers, of which the key points and responses were:

- regarding whether the recommendation should have been different in order to reflect the need for more compromise following the concerns expressed by residents, members were advised that legal issues regarding proportionality had been considered. The number of representations received was not a factor in determining the proposal. After carefully considering all the issues, the proposals were considered proportionate and in accordance with human rights legislation. The highways, ecology and public protection statutory consultees did not object to the proposal subject to conditions
- the flying hours had not been discussed with Thirston Parish Council and residents but with the applicant and Public Protection service. The 11pm extension was considered acceptable for the reasons listed in the report
- full consultation had been undertaken and the views of Thirston Parish Council and neighbouring residents had been listened to. Public Protection confirmed that 7am - 11pm were considered daytime hours, and the proposal could only be refused if more issues had been raised by Public Protection, but not many had
- although the 7am - 11pm hours requested would apply throughout the year, the runway did not have external lighting, so aircraft could only land in the summer months within such hours. The applicant had no intention to apply for runway lighting. There could be no take off nor landing during months with darker evenings
- the weight restriction for aircraft of 5,700 kilos was based on the Civil Aviation Authority's definition of light aircraft
- if agreed, the County Council would be required to monitor the planning conditions but not other matters; the Civil Aviation Authority had control over pilot activity
- the Council could not impose a condition requiring a no fly zone. The airfield was subject to standing orders and procedures. The presentation included details of the boundaries of suggested circuits for pilots. The airfield could recommend pilots to follow the proposed boundaries but had no ability to insist on them
- flight training hours would continue to be limited to 9am - 7pm

Councillor Towns then moved the officer recommendation, as updated by the officer during his presentation, to grant the application. This was seconded by Councillor Jones.

Councillor Sanderson then moved an amendment to the motion, firstly to restrict flying hours to 8am - 8pm seven days a week, for a period of one year, which he said was a reasonable compromise. Secondly, he also moved an additional condition to prohibit any overflying of the area marked in red on the presentation, which included Eshott Zoo, to avoid impacting on their operation.

Members were advised that reasons would be needed to support the first amendment, and the second proposed condition was unenforceable and would also be appealable. The County Council would not have the expertise to enforce it.

Councillor Towns indicated that from the information provided, he could not support the amendment but would be happy for Councillor Sanderson to have the opportunity to move a revised amendment. Councillor Jones did not consider the amendment necessary as it had already been established that the activity up until 11pm would only be during the summer months.

Councillor Sanderson spoke in support of his amendment and did not wish for it to be revised as it was only for a year; the change in hours was considered too big a step and a compromise was needed.

Councillor Towns indicated that he would consider a 11pm period just for the summer period, but Councillor Jones indicated she would not support an amendment.

Members were advised that they could vote on the original motion, or withdraw it.

Following this, Councillor Towns and Jones agreed to withdraw their original motion to allow for another to be put.

A new motion was required. Councillor Wearmouth then moved the recommendation to grant the application as updated by the officer during his presentation. This was seconded by Councillor Dodd.

Councillor Dickinson then moved an amendment; this was to include an additional condition, as a lot of information had been submitted by the local parish councils and members, so there should be monitoring of compliance with the suggested conditions to be jointly undertaken by the applicant in partnership with the Public Protection service to give robustness, over a period of 12 months.

It was clarified that the planning reason for the joint monitoring was in the interests of the amenity of neighbouring properties. Councillors Wearmouth and Dodd agreed to incorporate Councillor Dickinson's amendment into their motion.

Debate then followed of which the key points from members were:

- sympathy was expressed for local residents, given new roads and businesses had also been built/located there, but people had moved into the area knowing that air traffic had increased
- the 11pm limit was late but there was little air traffic then
- the situation would be reviewed in 12 months' time, when there would be a better understanding of the effect of the changes on local residents
- when attending the site visit, the sound of traffic from the A1 nearby drowned out much of what noise the attendees could hear from the airfield
- there had been a previous example of much officer time being taken up by having to monitor a voluntary restriction
- there were varying types and frequencies of noise generated by different types of aircraft; sympathy was expressed for local residents.

Members were also reassured that if there was any breach of the conditions during the following 12 months, enforcement action would be considered; information gathered would be independently verified by the Public Protection service.

On then being put to the vote, the motion to grant the application, with the amendment, was agreed unanimously and it was thus:

RESOLVED that the application be GRANTED subject to the conditions in the report, the revised conditions given at the meeting and an additional condition requiring monitoring to be undertaken in partnership with the Public Protection service, in the interests of the amenity of neighbouring residents.

(Councillor Beynon then arrived at the meeting.)

48. 17/02012/OUT

Outline Planning Permission with all matters reserved for the erection of two dwellings

Land West Of 62 Station Road, Station Road, Stannington, Northumberland, NE61 6NN

It was noted that this application had been withdrawn from the agenda and would instead be considered by the Cramlington/Bedlington/Seaton Valley Local Area Council.

49. 18/02453/CCD

Installation of Modular Classroom to provide 2 classrooms - Ponteland Primary School, Thornhill Road, Ponteland, Newcastle Upon Tyne, Northumberland, NE20 9QB

Ryan Soulsby, Planning Officer, introduced the application by firstly providing an update; since the agenda was published, the Highways Authority had confirmed that they had no objection to the scheme. Mr Soulsby continued introducing the application with the assistance of a slides presentation.

Councillor Bawn then moved the officer recommendation to grant the application. This was seconded by Councillor Dodd.

On being put to the vote, the motion to grant the application was agreed unanimously, and it was thus:

RESOLVED that the application be GRANTED subject to the conditions in the report.

50. 18/01508/FUL

Construction of two dwellings

Land north of Lynebank, Ulgham, Northumberland

Richard Laughton, Planning Officer, introduced the application using a slides presentation.

Councillor Jim Brown then spoke on behalf of Ulgham Parish Council, of which his key points were:

- the site was in the Green Belt, outside of the village boundary
- a 10 year housing supply existed in Northumberland so there were no exceptional reasons for building on the plot

- the refusal for another application nearby in June 2017 had been upheld on appeal
- it was not an infill development as there were only two small sheds and a paddock nearby
- it was a non-essential development in the open countryside.

Fraser McKenna then spoke in support of the application, of which his key points were:

- there were inconsistencies in the application of Green Belt policy in the county
- the committee report lacked the details of further supporting information provided and the map on the first page was inaccurate
- two nearby identical properties had been approved in 2015. Why was there allowance for a windfall site?
- the curtilage had been reduced by 25m, and the designs amended from a two story house and bungalow to two 1.5 storey bungalows
- substantial buildings were located to the west of the site; it was bordered on three sides by built form
- the settlement boundary would be defunct within the emerging Local Plan.

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

- the application plot had never had planning permission; the permission referred to by the agent concerned a plot to the east of the site
- regarding a member's concern about consistency in the application of Green Belt policy, and why other recent applications in Medburn had been approved despite being in the Green Belt and qualifying as infill and why they were different to this application, members were advised that in Medburn the applications were within the settlement boundary, whereas this application wasn't. Furthermore, this application was not considered infill as a reasonable expectation would be that they have a roadside frontage, unlike this application. Looking at a recent Court of Appeal judgement the judge took the view that that if such examples were viewed as infill, there would be permissions given too often, which would be to the detriment of the countryside.

Councillor Bawn then moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application. This was seconded by Councillor Sanderson.

Debate then followed of which the key points from members were:

- the local member had referred the application to be considered by this Local Area Council to be aired in public for an explanation of the policy position and transparency. The officer explanation had been helpful
- the property could be seen as a natural extension to the village, but the views of officers were supported.

On being put to the vote, the motion to refuse the application was agreed unanimously and it was thus:

RESOLVED that the application be REFUSED for the reasons shown in the report.

51. APPEAL UPDATE

Members receives information on the progress of planning appeals. (Report enclosed with the official minutes as Appendix D.)

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

52. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

The Northumberland County Council (Land at St Mary Park, Morpeth) Tree Preservation Order 2017 (No. 03of 2018)

The report was introduced by Planning Technician Connor Willis, with the aid of a slides presentation.

Councillor Towns then moved the officer recommendation to grant the application. This was seconded by Councillor Dodd.

On being put to the vote, the motion was supported by 10 votes in support to one abstention and it was thus:

RESOLVED that the application be CONFIRMED for the reasons shown in the report.

(The meeting then adjourned at 5.47pm and Councillor Dickinson vacated the Chair. The meeting restarted at 6pm, with Councillor Armstrong in the Chair. Councillor Jackson then arrived at the meeting.)

53. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No questions were asked by any members of the public.

54. PETITIONS

No new petitions were received. Members were reminded that an update on the Riversdale House petition considered at the last meeting would be presented to the January 2019 meeting of this Local Area Council.

55. LOCAL SERVICES ISSUES

Members received a verbal update from the Area Managers from Technical Services and Neighbourhood Services in attendance about any key recent, ongoing and/or future planned Local Services work for the attention of members of the Local Area Council, with the opportunity for members to ask questions afterwards.

Neighbourhood Services update:

- the Council now had three new refuse vehicles, and there would be two more for the Morpeth area by the end of the year. They improved reliability

- operatives had provided nine rounds of grass cutting for most areas, and were on target to deliver 12 by the end of the year
- the first round of weed control had provided a blanket coverage and the second would be more focused. Members should let officers know if any areas particularly needed such treatment
- some small changes were due to take effect for waste collection in the area, mostly affecting Broomhill and Red Row. The changes would mostly affect the south east area of the county. Publicity would be issued about the changes

The Cabinet member for Local Services added that there would be changes in waste collection but consultation and explanations would be organised; it was particularly due to new housing and about making the service more efficient.

Technical Services update:

- traditional resurfacing of potholes included a total of 127,000 square metres (Sq m)
- 29 of the 56 Local Transport Plan activities for 2018/19 were on target
- surface dressing was being undertaken for 89,000 Sq m on principal roads across Northumberland, and 435,000 Sq m of non-principal roads
- 80 miles of road network had received surface dressing
- Technical Services were providing testing of their equipment in Gateshead
- 112,000 Sq m of microsurfacing had been completed across Northumberland
- a large rivers protection scheme continued to be developed at Lady's Walk in Morpeth
- for reactive work, a peak of potholes reported had reached up to 11,500 in April, of which an estimated 4,600 remained. Work would continue and be input into the LTP process.

Discussion followed during which the key points raised by members and responses from officers were:

- the key consideration for repairs was the quality of materials used. External contractors had been required to provide remedial measures to some work which had not met the required standard
- thanks were expressed to the dedicated team undertaking surface dressing work, who were very professional
- Mr King would check with the team based at Stakeford and reply to Councillor Dunn about her query regarding whether litter picking at the Woodhorn crossing now had to be undertaken at night. Much work continued to raise awareness about the problems caused by littering
- a further update could be provided at a later meeting about the work being undertaken in Gateshead
- thanks were expressed for repair work undertaken at Church Road in Prestwick; the parish council and residents appreciated the work
- thanks were expressed to Mr Wardle for his speed and efficiency in answering queries and getting tasks done.

RESOLVED that the updates be noted.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Ch.'s Initials.....

56. ANNUAL POLICING UPDATE

Inspector Liz Hall was in attendance to give an overview and answer questions about policing in the Castle Morpeth area. The key details of the update included:

- **Burglaries of dwellings:** there had been a general reduction in the wider Morpeth area, but a small increase in rural Morpeth including the Mitford locality
- **Vehicle crime:** awareness raising activities were ongoing, including assistance by cadets. People were reminded to ensure their cars were locked and not leave valuables on display
- **Antisocial behaviour:** a CCTV system had been installed at the Hadston Co-op store to tackle some antisocial behaviour. Work took place between local partners to identify who was best placed to address particular issues. Preparations were in place to deal with the expected increase in incidents around Bonfire Night. Work was also taking place to look at re-establishing neighbourhood watch groups, and if a community wanted to set one up, they could receive assistance
- **Vulnerability:** the Village Hall Scheme provided an opportunity for people to receive support for a number of problems, including hate crime, domestic violence and others. Operation Signature had helped identify some very vulnerable people who might be vulnerable to fraud or other dangers
- **Town centre:** discussions had taken place with the clerk of Morpeth Town Council about the introduction of CCTV in the town and identifying locations where it might be most needed based on previous incidents. A walkaround with officers was planned.

A member welcomed the proposal for CCTV in Morpeth and expressed concern about incidents of drugs and drug related crime in the Hadston area. Around 10 burglaries had taken place in Broomhill, and it was important for the police to work with the County Council and others to identify and use local knowledge and make it clear that drugs and their impact were not welcome. Members were advised that the officer in charge of the team at Morpeth was Sergeant 2591 Ian Forster who would link in with local intelligence as required. It was also essential that residents provided detail of examples in order for the police to act, for example car number plates, suspicious visits to properties etc as hearsay was insufficient as evidence.

In response to a member's concerns about the impact of a large number of bicycle races and motorbike usage around Kirkley Hall and Morpeth, the police indicated that they would not support such events, and the race organisers would need to get their own insurance to operate such events.

Replying to a member's welcoming of recent action taken against poaching, members were advised that Operation Checkpoint helped gather evidence. A proforma document was used to record details, and the evidence could then be presented to any cases that went to the Magistrates courts. All members of Farmwatch had been advised about the operation. An increased focus on rural crime was being developed which was assisted by training. People should report any concerns, such as suspicious vehicles, to help the police gather more evidence.

Ms Hall was thanked for her update and it was:

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

57. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF PLACE: PAUL JOHNSON

The Green Dog Walkers Scheme and Dog Fouling Enforcement

The purpose of the report (enclosed with the official minutes at Appendix H) was to update members on the progress of the Green Dog Walker Scheme and also on dog control enforcement in 2017/18. The report was considered by the Communities and Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 25 July 2018 and was attached for the Local Area Council's information.

The Cabinet member for Local Services explained how the scheme operated in a voluntary way but sanctions for fouling were also tough. Staff had attended schools to promote the Green Dog Walkers' Scheme, and he was very grateful to them for this.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

58. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF LOCAL SERVICES AND HOUSING DELIVERY

Members Local Improvement Schemes - Progress Report

To receive a progress report (enclosed with the official minutes as Appendix I).

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

59. LOCAL AREA COUNCIL WORK PROGRAMME

Members noted the latest version of agreed items for future Local Area Council meetings (any suggestions for new agenda items will require confirmation by the Business Chair after the meeting). (Enclosed with the official minutes as Appendix J.)

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

60. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting would be held on Monday, 8 October 2018 in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Morpeth.

CHAIR _____.

DATE _____.