

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

NORTH NORTHUMBERLAND LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At a meeting of the **North Northumberland Local Area Council** held in St. James' Church Centre, Pottergate, Alnwick, Northumberland, NE66 1JW on Thursday, 20 September 2018 at 3.00pm

PRESENT

Councillor G. Castle
(Chair, in the Chair, items 67 - 69, and 78 - 87)

Councillor T. Thorne
(Planning Vice-chair, in the Chair, items 70 - 77)

MEMBERS

S. Bridgett
T. Clark
G. Hill
R. Moore
A. Murray

W. Pattison
G. Renner-Thompson
G. Roughead
C. Seymour
J. Watson (part)

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

J. Bellis
M. Bird
G. Bucknall
B. Hodgson

N. Masson
H. Parkin

E. Sinnamon
R. Sittambalam
I. Stanners
C. Thompson

Senior Planning Officer
Senior Democratic Services Officer
Area Manager, Technical Services
Area Manager, Neighbourhood
Services
Principal Solicitor, Regulation
Highways Development Manager
Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk
Management Officer
Interim Head of Planning Services
Senior Planning Officer
Housing Enabling Officer
Principal Highways Officer

51 members of the public and one member of the press were in attendance at 3pm, and five members of the public were in attendance at 6pm.

Inspector L Hall - Northumbria Police

(Councillor Castle in the Chair)

Ch.'s Initials.....

67. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lawrie.

68. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of North Northumberland Local Area Council held on Thursday, 23 August 2018, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

(Councillor Thorne in the Chair)

69. DISCLOSURES OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor Hill declared a personal interest in relation to application 17/03961/FUL as a Berwick business owner had approached her about his interest in the site, but Councillor Hill had then directed the resident directly to the County Council for further assistance.

70. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The report explained how the Local Area Council was asked to decide the planning applications attached to the agenda using the powers delegated to it. (Report and applications enclosed with official minutes as Appendix A.)

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

71. APPEALS UPDATE

Members received a report on recent appeals lodged and decisions made.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

72. 18/02348/FELTPO

Tree Preservation Order application: Species are mixed broad leaves and conifers including Beech, Ash, Sycamore, Elm, Whitebeam, Field Maple, Scots pine and Larch. Works are to prune back from boundaries to prevent obstructions and encroachment of roads, paths, properties and street lights. Occasional removal of trees that are suppressed or poor form or condition. Land East Of Kirks Yard, Dock Road, Tweedmouth, Northumberland

Members were advised that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda.

73. 18/01070/VARYCO

**Removal of condition 29 (height restriction) of approved planning application 16/02824/OUT owing to the topography restrictions enabling exclusion of a height restriction to the site
Alnwick Golf Club, Swansfield Park Road, Alnwick, Northumberland, NE66 2AB**

James Bellis, Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with the aid of a slides presentation.

Peter Green then spoke in the objectors' public speaking slot, of which his key points were:

- he was speaking in objection also on behalf of Mr Steve Montgomery of Hope House Farm, who was not able to attend this meeting
- the main objection was on topographical grounds; the applicant had owned the land for 200 years and there were no need to build either three storey housing or a two storey with undercroft in this location; it would not blend in with the landscape. The ruling on the original plans was there was no reason for a three storey properties there, so allowing the application would be a breach of the Council's own standards and have an effect on subsequent residents and other properties next
- there was no history of outlying local housing being higher than three storeys locally; at Greenfield Farm the cottages were single storey and designed to blend in with the landscape
- building new roads and LED lighting would produce permanent light pollution in a dark and natural area
- there had been other occasions when applications had been agreed in contradiction to the Conservation Officer's views, so would her views carry any weight here?

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

- members needed to consider what this application proposed; a blanket removal of the conditions was not recommended here
- this application was indicative and outline only. The height restriction condition could be removed without determining the form of the final development for the site, which would be presented at the reserved matters stage
- the reserved matters application for the next stage of the proposal had been received but was not ready yet for determination; this was an amendment to the outline scheme. The reserved matters application could not be considered until the height restriction condition had been varied
- comments received from consultees and residents would also be fully taken into consideration at the next application. Members had to decide at this point whether it was reasonable to remove the height restriction
- officers were satisfied that they had sufficient control over the development and that it was reasonable as further details could be controlled at the reserved matters stage, including any proposals to include either loft conversions or cellars if such details were to be proposed then.

Councillor Castle then moved that the application be granted as per the officer recommendation. He added that it was a brownfield site and had this been the final application for the site he would not have supported it, but he would as there was the chance at the forthcoming reserved matters application to consider the detailed proposal and any impact on this very sensitive location. This was seconded by Councillor Watson.

Members then made the following key points:

- a member indicated that she could not support it as the owner knew the site well and it was another case of 'permission creep'
- Alnwick Town Council's response summarised the position well; they didn't object currently but awaited the chance to see the detail at the next stage
- it was concerning that the removal of conditions would allow for further housing types to then be presented at the reserved matters stage
- points raised by objectors could be further considered when the reserved matters detail was received; agreeing this application did not commit members to any final decision
- there were no planning reasons to refuse this application.

The motion to grant was then put to the vote, and agreed by eight votes in favour to four against, so it was thus:

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

**74. 17/03961/FUL
Demolition of Existing School Building and Development of 30 dwellings -
Amended 02/07/18
Former Milfield County First School, Wheatriggs, Milfield, Wooler,
Northumberland, NE71 6HZ**

Ragu Sittambalam, Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with the aid of a slides presentation. He explained that the recommendation was:

That Members authorise the Head of Service to GRANT permission subject to a Legal Agreement pursuant to s106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following obligations:

- £52,800 Education contribution;
- £17,400 Health contribution;
- Sale Values for First Disposal as set out in the report

And the recommended conditions as set out in the report.

Councillor David Clark then spoke on behalf of Milfield Parish Council, of which his key points were:

- Milfield Parish Council broadly agreed with developing the site but could not support this application
- there had been a lack of consultation; many objections could have been avoided, and the developer had refused to meet with residents
- the scheme had been amended but the loss of the well used playing field and school had badly affected the village
- there should be a condition for a MUGA (multi use games area) included if the application was agreed to offset the loss of the sports field, for the benefit of both current and future residents. There were few local facilities for young people and a 20% increase in the village's population did not help either
- off street parking in Milfield was already poor. It was incorrect to say there would be no increase in traffic compared to its previous use, as then only three staff had driven to the school, all pupils had walked there. A

crossroads facility would assist; Milfield Parish Council should be consulted on any traffic impact

- if the number of houses was reduced to 29, the parking issue would be resolved, no health contribution would be needed, and the profit margins would be the same for the developer.

Chris Dodds then spoke in the supporters' slot, of which his key points were:

- close working had taken place with the County Council and its relevant consultee departments
- consultation had taken place with local residents
- it was a good scheme which had been amended, met all policy requirements and was acceptable on all planning terms
- the strategic traffic and highways regulations were all in place, as was a Construction Management Statement.

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

- it was a council owned site, viability issues had been independently verified, so the contributions were now limited to education and health and the requirement for affordable housing was dispensed of
- it did not qualify as affordable housing within the definition of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) despite it not being a high end specification
- Sport England had been consulted and raised a serious objection but were not considered a statutory consultee. Much time had elapsed since the school had closed in 2009. The site had not been accessible nor had any sporting capability since and was closed off and in disrepair, but the loss of the school and field was still a material planning consideration
- the cost of the first sale price could not be secured in perpetuity and was not considered necessary
- a housing needs assessment had not specifically been undertaken for Milfield, but research had been undertaken. The site had been considered but then discounted as an affordable housing site
- consideration had been given to the best outcome for the site within what was available. Education and health contributions were required as there would be a direct impact on infrastructure offerings. These obligations were based on what was considered necessary for the development
- discussions had taken place directly with the developer, and the estates team, the planning department were not party to those discussions; land value was not a material planning issue
- the material type differed from some local housing but this was acceptable. Milfield Parish Council had requested Northumbrian Stone, but it was proposed to use brick as opposed to render/pebble dash more commonly seen within the area. There was no Conservation Area nor any listed buildings nearby
- land ownership was not a planning reason; the application had to be considered in terms of whether it was acceptable or not in planning terms
- it would not be a reasonable condition to secure leisure provision on site; it could not be provided either without evidenced need and would be in the absence of policy.

Councillor Moore then moved that the application be refused on the loss of green space, as the application did not offer sufficient benefit to outweigh this loss.

This was seconded by Councillor Hill.

Members then made the following key points:

- the loss of green space had occurred in 2009, not now; there had been no green space available since then
- a leisure provision should be included, as otherwise young people would be growing up without any provision locally
- any decision should be based on sound planning policy; the green space referred to had been lost in 2009. Planning training had been provided recently; decisions had to be made after listening to arguments and debate then taking sound planning policy into account. If people wanted green space within the village, a group should be organised to look at this
- a point of order was raised about comments regarding training and members' consideration of applications; it was clarified that this was not intended as a criticism of any members but that the crux of the matters being considered concerned planning policy
- concern that no affordable housing was included in the application
- development would be good for Milfield but there was also a need for more social housing.

In summing up, Councillor Moore referred to paragraphs 8 & 9 of the NPPF regarding social, environmental and economic benefits required from developments; the loss of the playing fields would had a significant loss of space and impact on the character of the development without anything going back in, and also result in an 18.3% increase in the size of the village.

The motion to refuse was then put to the vote, and agreed by eight votes in support, three against and one abstention, so it was thus:

RESOLVED that the application be REFUSED due to the social and environmental impacts of the proposal not being outweighed by the benefits of the development.

**74. 18/02583/FUL
16 Principal Residence Dwellings (25% Affordable) & Landscape Buffer with SuDS Basin - Amended 07/09/18
Land North Of Woodsteads, U3010 Station Road To Embleton Moor Junction, Alnwick, Northumberland**

Mr Sittambalam introduced the application with the aid of a slides presentation. He updated the committee initially by explaining that a site visit took place on 17 September 2018. Four further letter of objection had been received since the agenda had been published, however no new issues had been raised aside those already recorded within section 5 of the officer report. A Phase II Ground Investigation report and Site Visuals were submitted on 14 September 2018. The Ground investigation was being assessed by the Council's Public Protection team.

Within conditions 6 and 7 the landscape plan should have referred to revision D not B. The applicant had agreed in writing for the construction access to be taken from Station Road. As a result there was an amendment to Condition 11 (a) to read:

Details of temporary traffic management measures, temporary access to be from Station Road (unless otherwise agreed in writing), routes and vehicles;

The revised recommendation was now:

That Members authorise the Head of Service to GRANT permission subject to the expiry of consultation period with no significant issues raised, resolution of outstanding matters and the imposition of additional conditions deemed necessary and relating to;

- *Public Health Protection - Contaminated Land Issues;*

A Legal Agreement pursuant to s106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following obligations:

- *Principal Occupancy Restriction;*
- *10-year Management Plan for the Landscape Buffer;*
- *4 Units of Affordable housing (25%);*
- *£48,000 Education contribution;*
- *£9,600 Coastal Mitigation contribution; and*

The recommended conditions as set out in the report.

(Councillor Bridgett left the meeting during consideration of this application and took no part in it, and returned to the meeting for the following item.)

Paul Ashdown spoke in objection, of which his key points were:

- he represented the Creighton Place Residents' Group including 50 individuals who'd objected to the application. The application represented further extension into a greenfield site; residents did not want to see urban sprawl nor an extension to the boundary unless absolutely necessary
- Embleton did not need further housing, including affordable or social types; the village's share of proposed housing numbers was 65, and this application would take it far higher than that
- there was no fundamental justification to enter the greenfield land, upsetting vulnerable wildlife. This application might soften the impact of the first phase, but the tree and hedge planting was less than 12 months old so would provide the required screening yet
- it was good that access would not go through Creighton Place, but the alternative, from Station Road, was narrow with no passing places, and equally inappropriate
- drainage on site was not remedial. This was the wrong sort of unsustainable, speculative development.

Councillor David Cooper then spoke on behalf of Embleton Parish Council, of which his key points were:

- although the site lay outside of the settlement boundary prepared, the higher than required affordable housing and ecological enhancements mitigated against that factor
- highways access was however a concern; Creighton Place to Station Road was accessed from the B1339. This was only possible if all new traffic went

through Creighton Place, but the only alternative, access from Station Road, was previously seen as unacceptable

- the original development had less than 50% permanent occupancy, and Embleton Parish Council were concerned that this would be replicated on this site. Permanent occupancy requirements should be included.

Mark Bridgman then spoke in support, of which his key points were:

- Creighton Place had been developed in conjunction with a local builder. There was demand for affordable and market housing locally. Embleton was a key service centre in between Alnwick and Seahouses. The development would soften the entrance to the village from the north. Currently the boundary was made up of banks of two storey houses, but these new houses would be lower height including dormers and bungalows
- a 10-12m woodland buffer would be included and planting at the bottom of existing gardens; the development would provide an environmental net gain
- all properties would be for permanent occupancy only, and the 25% share of affordable housing was higher than the Council's 15% requirement
- the settlement boundary of the emerging local Neighbourhood Plan included the application site. 74% of local people had agreed to this boundary, and 19% had disagreed
- work had taken place with the Local Lead Flood Authority; the application included a substantial expansion of the existing suds pond.

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

- the applicant had agreed a construction access through Station Road, which included both a Section 59 agreement to allow for extraordinary traffic along the highway to establish the condition of the road; the applicant was also expected to put right any damage caused to the road during construction afterwards. A Section 278 agreement was also included for works on the highway
- the Alnwick Local Plan had a boundary as had the Embleton Neighbourhood Plan, although weight was not put on this yet; the application site was within the boundary
- the proposed passing places could be left in situ after the development, but they would need to be formal places and not just have a gravel surface. The passing places would be constructed mainly within existing highway limits with some works being required on Mr Bridgman's own land
- a condition about flooding had been included after the Lead Local Flood Authority had reviewed the application, which provided enough information to consider the proposal suitable
- the permanent occupancy of all houses on the site would be enforced by a S106 legal agreement. The previous Creighton Place development did not have such a restriction included
- officers considered that the benefits from the application, including affordable housing, permanent occupancy and safeguarding against future development outweighed landscape impact. Bungalows were also needed in north Northumberland
- the planning history listed in the report all referred to the existing Creighton Place development
- the S106 contribution towards education had to be specifically used for infrastructure improvements. Such capital project money was retained in a holding pot until the money was required by the school in question.

Councillor Pattison then moved that the application be refused on the grounds of visual impact, as it was on a greenfield site in the open countryside. This was seconded by Councillor Hill.

Members then made the following key points:

- a member was impressed by the responsible presentation given by the landowner who had included permanent occupancy, improved screening and construction arrangements for traffic, and could not see a planning reason to refuse the application. Another member supported this and also added that highways concerns had been addressed and it was an example of an application where the concerns raised had been acknowledged and addressed
- in the overall percentages, 25% of 30 as compared to 15% of 30 did not mean much difference in the actual amount of affordable houses proposed
- the quality of build at Creighton Place was fantastic, with green spaces and wide roads. Any harm to the village was already done when Creighton Place was constructed. This new development would soften the boundary and it was within the Neighbourhood Plan boundary.

The motion to refuse was then put to the vote; it received three votes in support, seven against, with one abstention. The motion to refuse thus fell.

Councillor Moore then moved the officer recommendation to grant the application. This was seconded by Councillor Thorne.

The motion to grant the application was then put to the vote; it received seven votes in support, three against, with one abstention, so it was thus:

RESOLVED that members authorise the Head of Service to GRANT permission subject to the expiry of consultation period with no significant issues raised, resolution of outstanding matters and the imposition of additional conditions deemed necessary and relating to;

- Public Health Protection - Contaminated Land Issues;

A Legal Agreement pursuant to s106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following obligations:

- Principal Occupancy Restriction;
- 10-year Management Plan for the Landscape Buffer;
- 4 Units of Affordable housing (25%);
- £48,000 Education contribution;
- £9,600 Coastal Mitigation contribution; and

The recommended conditions as set out in the report.

75. 18/02244/OUT
Outline Application (All Matters Reserved); 18 Dwellings
Land West Of Thropton Demesne, Thropton, Northumberland

Mr Sittambalam introduced the application with the aid of a slides presentation.

Parish councillor Ian Webb had been in attendance to speak on behalf of Thropton Parish Council but had needed to leave the meeting, so a copy of his address to the Local Area Council was treated as a late representation and read out to the meeting, of which the key details were:

- Thropton was an ageing community, and each new development brought new retirees; the village was losing young families and not attracting new ones. Thropton also had an increase in high end housing which attracted an increase in retirees from urban areas far and wide. In the not too distant past, it was welcoming with small developments of mid-range houses
- the application was more sympathetic than that proposed on the Northern 4x4 site and would have gained support if it was not for this previous proposal
- if the other 60 houses were approved, this further 18 would add a significant increase in the size of the village, and alter the character of the village and put substantial pressure on all support services and infrastructure
- under the “Indicative Distribution of Housing Requirements 2016-36”, 140 dwellings would be due in Coquetdale, meaning an average of seven per year; however Thropton might potentially get 87 new dwellings in less than 12 months
- transparency in the provision of affordable housing was needed, as was a need to know what the correct balance between affordable housing market value housing and high end housing. It was important to know what was a balanced population, and establish it. Affordable housing was needed to attract young people, but there had been an incremental increase in high end dwellings which was continuing. It needed serious joined up thinking before any approvals were given.

Laura Dixon then spoke in supporter, of which her key points were:

- the application had received two objections, from Thropton Parish Council and the County Archeologist, for whom further information would be provided following the decision. All other statutory consultees were happy with the proposal
- the site was in a sustainable location next to the local school and a bus stop and formed a logical extension to the village
- the site had a willing landowner with a proven track record. It would provide high quality homes, with details following at the reserved matters stage
- it provided affordable housing, a highways upgrade and an education contribution
- the application should be granted subject to the S106 agreement and the further archeological information required being received.

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

- alternative sites had been considered for the affordable housing allocation, but the three proposed onsite were considered to be a better option
- the 4x4 site’s permission, with 13 affordable housing units, had to be agreed by December 2018, otherwise planning permission would lapse
- it was not possible to clarify how many local residents had moved into the discounted market value of the Rothbury application and how many of the three major applications had delivered affordable housing within the past six years. A member added that the answer to both was zero

- a desktop archeological survey had been undertaken, and the recommendation was subject to further information being received. The decision notice would only be issued once this information was received and it was still minded to approve the application.

Councillor Bridgett then moved that the application be granted. This was seconded by Councillor Thorne. In moving the application, Councillor Bridgett expressed concern that the application was however one of the worst applications for the delivery of affordable housing in his area. This was not the fault of the applicant, as applications were subject to a small number of large landowners and developers. Hopefully an offer of land could be made in due course which could be used for provided affordable housing. This application was however potentially the only route and there were no policy reasons to refuse the application. He hoped that more details would be provided at the reserved matters stage so the application would provide more benefit to local communities than currently proposed.

Members then made the following key points:

- social housing was important and kept young people in local areas
- it was important that affordable housing was not kept separate in sites. Although it was unreasonable to ask for all affordable housing to be built first, the S106 agreement could include a clause so that there was a joint build out of both the affordable and market housing shares
- concern was expressed about determining the application before the further awaited information awaited from the County Archeologist was received
- it was welcomed that the application would definitely come back for consideration at the reserved matters stage.

The motion to refuse was then put to the vote, and agreed by 11 votes in support with one abstention, so it was thus:

RESOLVED that members authorise the Head of Service to GRANT permission subject to resolution of outstanding matters and the imposition of additional conditions deemed necessary and relating to;

- County Archaeologist - Submission of archaeological evaluation;

A Legal Agreement pursuant to s106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following obligations:

- 5-year Management Plan for the Landscape Buffer;
- 3 Units of Affordable housing (15%);
- £24,000 Education contribution;

And the recommended conditions as set out in the report.

(5.20pm: Councillor Watson then exited the meeting.)

**76. 17/00931/FULES
32 Principal Occupancy Dwellings (100% Affordable) - Amended 16/08/18
Land East Of Kingsfield, King Street, Seahouses, Northumberland**

Mr Sittambalam introduced the application with the aid of a slides presentation.

Malcolm Cresswell then spoke in objection, of which his key points were:

- there was no demand locally for affordable housing, more for social housing. The site was outside of the settlement boundary
- as affordable housing was defined as being 30% below market value as the level in Seahouses was 50 - 70% above the average level, it was not affordable for local low/medium level earners
- the sewage system also served Bamburgh and Beadnell, and already regularly caused bad odours
- a financial sum had been committed during the first phase for the S106 back in 2001, and legal action was now being taken for the applicant to comply.

Jill Hall, then spoke on behalf of North Sunderland Parish Council, of which she was the clerk, of which her key points were:

- the parish council and residents fully supported their new Neighborhood Plan, which was considered an accurate representation of local views. As it was now a legal document, it deserved serious consideration
- the application site was outside of the settlement boundary, which had been put in to prevent urban sprawl
- its location on the coastal strip was a sensitive environmental location; development could impact on local wildlife. The development's size was out of scale with Seahouses, which was not a main town, and did not count as a rural exception site
- Seahouses was suitable for some affordable housing, but the application recently agreed at North Sunderland would meet the level of need. Bernicia had also provided nine affordable houses for rent at Stone Close. Affordable housing was needed, especially for young families in perpetuity so local people could remain living there
- there was also an issue for local residents with access to the play park through the King's Field Estate. It was also located at a very busy road, impacted by a large increase in visitor numbers.

Katie Wood then spoke in support, of which her key points were:

- the requests within the legal agreement referred to had only been requested within the past 12 months
- Seahouses was a service centre, which was a location that it would be expected to see new housing
- regarding the site not being accessible through the existing route, under the Berwick Local Plan it had to be adopted
- an independent consultant had concluded that there would be no significant adverse impact from the proposed screening
- the current case officer was thanked for limiting the number of refusal reasons, however the application had been handled by at least four different case officers prior to that, with different advice often being provided to the applicant. The scheme had been amended constantly and advice provided at times that it would be recommended for approval. It had also taken six months to get Environmental Health involved in the development
- there were no other local sites that could provide other meaningful housing in the future.

In response to a question, it was confirmed that the site was located in a high risk coal area as previously there had been mining activity carried out. It was reasonable to presume that any such issues could be overcome, as other developments had taken place nearby, but the information provided had not provided conclusive.

Councillor Renner-Thompson then moved that the application be refused for the reasons listed in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Seymour.

A member indicated that in other circumstances he would support such an application given its affordable housing provision, however there was a defined settlement boundary which had been agreed at referendum. There was no need for the application; the nearby application agreed in June 2018 would meet any affordable housing need. There were no grounds to agree it and it would not win at appeal.

The Vice-chair (Planning) acknowledged and apologised to the agent for the complications experienced in processing the application.

In summing up the motion, Councillor Renner-Thompson added how developers encountered the risk in policies and markets changing. The Neighbourhood Plan was in place and provided the strongest indication that local people did not want this type of development. It was important to have housing for rent rather than purchase and many local people could not afford such houses. If the application was granted, more such sites might then come forward. This was also the last live application that straddled the time period before and after the adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The motion to refuse was then put to the vote and agreed unanimously, so it was thus:

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

77. 18/02409/VARYCO

Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of approved planning application 16/03770/FUL. Substitution of house type on plot 16 from HT3 to HTA. Re-positioning and substitution of house types as follows: Plot 18 from house type HT2 to HT1A, Plot 19 from house type HT3 to HT1A and removal of double garage, Plot 20 from house type HT1 to HT1A - Amended 30/08/18 Allerburn House, Denwick Lane, Alnwick, NE66 1YY

Mr Sittambalam introduced the application with the aid of a slides presentation.

Councillor Castle then moved that the application be granted; in doing so he explained that it was a different application to the one for Allerburn House that was refused earlier in 2018, and there were no grounds for refusing this one. This was seconded by Councillor Moore.

The motion to grant was then put to the vote, and agreed unanimously, so it was thus:

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

(The meeting then adjourned at 5.45pm for a short break, and recommenced at 6.08pm.)

OTHER LOCAL AREA COUNCIL BUSINESS

78. SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

The Chair proposed the suspension of standing orders in order to continue the meeting beyond the three hour limit. This was duly seconded, agreed and thus:

RESOLVED that the meeting continue beyond three hours in length as per the Council's constitution.

79. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

This item was for replying to any questions received from members of the public, which could be received in writing in advance or asked at the meeting.

The Chair explained that two written questions had been received in advance of the meeting, both about the proposed integrated Hospital and Leisure Facility at Berwick. Neither questioner was in attendance, so it was agreed that a written response to each question would be produced and a copy of both sent to all members of this Local Area Council.

Heather Cairns, NE67 referred to how the job evaluation process for staff at the Willowburn Leisure Centre had been completed and their pay per hour amended. She asked if there would be any meetings arranged with employees about staff morale?

A written response would be provided for Mrs Cairns.

Councillor Jeff Watson, Alnwick Town Council asked about the justification for introducing car parking charges on the north side of Alnmouth Station. He referred to how train fares had increased substantially and considered this additional cost erroneous, nor would it solve car parking problems at Alnmouth Station.

The Chair firstly referred to problems with buses not being able to get through routes due to drivers parking inconsiderately. Public consultation had taken place, with strong views expressed at an event, but there was no appetite amongst Hipsburn residents for a residents' parking scheme, so one couldn't be imposed. A number of other means were considered instead; consultation took place with Lesbury Parish Council, who expressed a number of views, and members then make a judgment on behalf of residents. A trial period of one year had been agreed and would be reviewed to see if it managed unnecessary use of parking at the station. Evidence existed of abuse of the car park; some cars had parked there for weeks.

The maximum time was limited to 72 hours. The proposed charge had been £3.00 per day, but this was reduced to £1.50, which would not damage incomes to an unacceptable level. Yellow lines would also be painted around Curley Lane, and parking was also proposed to be limited down South Road also. Long term, consideration was being given to how to extend the car park. The change was not about income generation, but stopping unnecessary use of the car park.

Councillor Moore added that the proposal was a short term measure, and the single yellow lines would be in force between 9am - 4pm each day, so residents could use after 4pm. A proportion of the proceeds from the proceeds raised would be ring fenced for use by Lesbury Parish Council towards the costs of developing their Neighbourhood Plan.

Councillor Watson of Alnwick Town Council agreed with the 72 hour limit and the yellow lines proposal, but sought assurance that if the parking charges had no impact on the problem, they would be reconsidered. Councillor Moore responded that the result of the trial couldn't be predicted, but consideration would be given to it and discussions would then follow with Lesbury Parish Council; the Chair added that all options would be available to discuss.

RESOLVED that written responses be organised where agreed.

80. PETITIONS

No new petitions were presented at the meeting.

Members received a report responding to a petition received in July 2018 requesting the resurfacing of Prince Edward Road, Tweedmouth for consideration. (Report enclosed with the official minutes as Appendix B.)

A member added that there were proven safety issues at the site, as the lead petitioner's wife had fallen and continued to receive support for her injury, the road surface was an eyesore, and the local area in question had not received its fair share of funding and the work deserved to be done. She hoped that the work to fix it would be supported as a priority in Local Transport Plan for 2019/20.

The Chair added that members would be discussing proposals for the LTP for the next year shortly and it could be discussed further then also.

RESOLVED that the following recommendations be supported:

- (1) the Council will continue to rectify any safety defects that are recorded;
- (2) in recognition of the safety concerns raised within the petition the County Council will consider the integrity of the existing construction and whether it is fit for purpose. This will include identifying the need for future long term maintenance or improvement works.
- (3) depending on the outcome of point 2, the County Council will consider the appropriate options for improvement in consultation with the local ward member and the Town Council; and
- (4) consider funding any identified improvements from future Local Transport

Plan programme proposals.

81. 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.

Neighbourhood Services:

- the eleventh and twelfth grass cut was being undertaken across all areas, with the target of 13 to be done by the end of the year
- the second round of weed control had been completed
- verge cutting work had been completed
- some waste services routes were being amended but changes were minimal in the north area. The new vehicles acquired had assisted in improving reliability
- consideration was also being given to demand for garden waste services, with some ring fencing for areas where there was the biggest uptake.

Discussion followed in which the key points from members included:

- a request was raised for treating weeds at Weldon Bridge on the A697, as it was the gateway to Longframlington. Members were advised that it had been treated but must not have had the required effect. It would be looked at again the next day
- a request for weeding around Berwick library
- it was not viable to collect and dispose of all grass cuttings
- the Council was not responsible for weed killing along unadopted roads. A list was available of streets, properties and estates treated
- details of the changes to refuse collection routes would be published shortly, and details would be included on the sides of vehicles
- a request was made for putting up the reminder sign for people to use the dog waste bin at Hauxley
- a request was made for North Sunderland's cemetery to be trimmed and made tidy in time for 11 November
- a letter had been received from Northumberland Estates about their views on local priorities. Councillors Castle and Moore were arranging a meeting with Northumberland Estates to discuss this.

Technical Services:

- copies of a handout providing a highways update were circulated at the meeting (copy attached to the official minutes of the meeting)
- 50 miles of surface dressing had been completed
- the micro-surfacing programme had been completed with Colas, with a total of 112,000 square metres of network repaired
- the internal small surfacing team had delivered 14,000 square metres of additional surfacing works and patching; details were provided of areas covered
- a query from Councillor Seymour about surfacing of Northumberland Avenue, Berwick would be looked into.

Discussion followed in which the key points from members included:

- Longhoughton ward had benefited much, but clarification would be provided for Councillor Pattison about further road repairs requirements following a recent housing development
- concern was expressed about the condition of part of the Belford - Bamburgh Road past Budle Bay; officers would look into this
- clarification would also be given to when work would be undertaken on the Bilton to Shilbottle road
- remedial work to the road at Chatton Crossing was due in February 2019.

Officers were thanked for their work and it was:

RESOLVED that the updates be noted and issues identified followed up where required.

DISCUSSION ITEMS - CORPORATE

82. ANNUAL POLICING UPDATE

Inspector Liz Hall was in attendance to give a verbal overview and answer questions about policing in the north Northumberland area.

Key details included:

- there had been a reduction in the burglary of dwellings over the year
- the Darker Nights campaign was due to begin, with increased patrols, with a focus on protecting property and lighting
- there had been issues with vehicular crime in Berwick and Alnwick recently around a circuit of Hexham - A1 - Scottish Border - Cumbria. A joint police force initiative had addressed this
- Berwick town centre had had additional CCTV cameras put in; front office staff had attended training
- there had been a reduction in crime in rural car parks; notes were issued reminding people not to leave any valuables out on display
- CCTV was now in place in Amble, which was effective. Further possible improvements were being considered
- a village hall scheme was being rolled out which addressed rural isolation, which was a more traditional way of providing a hub for help; police officers attended the slots
- Operation Signature: small information leaflets were being circulated to areas to protect elderly vulnerable people from fraudulent activities. Police cadets and PCSOs had helped spread the message
- Operation Checkpoint: this had been successful in addressing rural crime
- it was important to get evidence of any drug dealing; people were able to call the police anonymously to report any problems. Magistrates convictions would not be possible without the required information being provided.

Members raised a number of issues, of which the key details and responses were as follows:

- the compatibility of Alnwick's CCTV with police mobile phones had been addressed and would now link in with the existing system

- police action against drug dealing depended on the quality of the intelligence received; for example how many sources had reported issues and what had they seen. If members wanted to report any particular situations, they could also contact Inspector Hall directly
- there had been cases of off road quad biking in areas, and the confiscation and crushing of some bikes in response to offences had been effective. Members were advised that there was a campaign to request people to report the locations of problems; for example if motorbikes entered fields at a particular point, the police could target the location. Community intelligence was also essential for this
- concern was expressed about the impact of jet skiing in estuaries and disturbance caused to local wildlife. Research had been undertaken into what action would be taken in response to such public order offences; details could be provided for members.

Inspector Hall was thanked for her attendance and it was:

RESOLVED that the information be noted and queries raised followed up.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

83. 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 as Appendix C) 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 Neighbourhood Services Area Manager provided a verbal overview of the report.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

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

Members Local Improvement Schemes - Progress Report

Members received a progress report (enclosed with the official minutes as Appendix D).

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

85. BERWICK REGENERATION COMMISSION

This was a standing item on the agenda for verbal updates. Councillor Hill reported that the Commission's work was progressing well.

86. LOCAL AREA COUNCIL WORK PROGRAMME

Members noted the latest version of agreed items for future Local Area Council meetings. (Enclosed with the official minutes as Appendix E.)

The Chair referred to the joint meetings with town/parish councils that would take place from 6pm on 18 October 2018, and items agreed for November's meeting including a report on winter services preparedness and presentations about the Empowering Communities Project and the Economic Strategy.

RESOLVED that the work programme be noted.

87. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the next meeting would take place on Thursday 18 October 2018, in St James' Church Centre, Alnwick. Councillor Pattison asked for her apologies to be recorded for that meeting.

CHAIR.....

DATE.....