

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL
NORTH NORTHUMBERLAND LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At the meeting of the **North Northumberland Local Area Council** held at Meeting Space
- Block 2, Floor 2 - County Hall on Thursday, 22 July 2021 at 2pm.

PRESENT

G Castle (Chair) (in the Chair)

MEMBERS

S Bridgett
T Clark
W Pattison
C Seymour
C Hardy
M Mather

T Thorne
G Hill
G Renner-Thompson
J Watson
I Hunter
M Swinbank

OFFICERS

V Cartmell

D Hadden
B Hodgson
L Little
R Little
E Sinnamon
G Bucknall

Planning Area Manager - Development
Management
Solicitor
Neighbourhood Services Area Manager
Senior Democratic Services Officer
Assistant Democratic Services Officer
Development Service Manager
Highways Delivery Area Manager

12 DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED that this report was noted.

13 PROCEDURE AT PLANNING MEETINGS

The chair confirmed that members had watched the site videos before this meeting.

Planning application 20/01155S106 had been withdrawn from the agenda and would not be considered.

RESOLVED that this report was noted.

14 DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Ch.'s Initials.....

Councillor Hunter disclosed a personal interest in item 9 and 10 on the agenda as she was the Town Clerk at Beadnell Parish Council but had taken no part in any debate and therefore would take part in the application. Councillor Pattison advised that she would be speaking as the Ward Member on applications 5 and 6 during the public speaking slot then leaving for the debate and vote of those two items.

15 **20/03446/VARYCO**

Members were advised that items 5 & 6 on the agenda were going to be a merged presentation but separate voting.

V. Cartmell - Planning Area Manager, introduced the application with the aid of a power point presentation.

An update was provided from Rennington Parish Council clarifying their comments on this application as follows:

- The parish council strongly objected to the VARYCO orders of building materials at North Farm, Rennington and believed the materials they were planning to use should be refused.
- The developer had continued with construction despite earlier comments having been drawn to the attention of the planning officer
- The slate used appeared to be a blue Spanish slate of uniform colour which was not consistent with the character of the buildings in the surrounding area, contrary to the planning conditions.
- The stone being used was of a yellow colour and was being laid in a single layer course, this was not consistent with other buildings in the village.

V. Cartmell also provided an update from paragraph 7.2 in the report, to confirm that the proposal also included an amendment to the materials condition as this was missing from paragraph 7.2.

S. Baggot addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the two applications. His comments included the following information:

- The colour of the stone being used was a bright yellow, which would take decades to tone down. The colour and coursing of the stone were not sympathetic to the vernacular and were within the curtilage of a grade II listed building.
- The reduction of the number of car parking spaces within the development, specifically the and the small size of these garages. The size of the garages would not be able to fit a family-sized car inside, which meant that residents would use street parking, reducing the number of spaces down to 15, 1.5 spaces per property.
- The development was on the edge of a small village, which has no public transport, no local shops or services, residents would be reliant on their cars, likely resulting in two cars per household.
- Developer has not tried to reach the sustainable objective set out in the NPPF with the lack of electric car charging point, and requesting

Ch.'s Initials.....

that if the applications were granted, that there be an additional condition of a 16AMP charging point.

Councillor Dixon of Rennington Parish Council addressed the committee speaking in objection to the two applications. His comments for objection included the following information:

- The inappropriate use of tiling and stone on the almost complete new build.
- The objection in the relation to the stonework related to the bright colour and irregular shape and laying of the stone.
- The tiling was blue, as against the original speciation of grey slate.
- The materials and styling detail used has a negative visual impact on the appearance and character of the village and an adverse effect on the setting of the Grade II listed buildings that form the remainder of the site as well as the listed building opposite the site, also was adjacent to a row of old traditional agricultural worker cottages.
- The C73 road going through Rennington from south to north, the mix of converted farmstead and school properties, old estate agricultural cottages, newer build cottages and houses, the village pub and village hall all fronting onto the C73, ending at North Farm. They shared a common vernacular, presented a visual harmony and a strong sense of place. The loud and overbearing effect of the application now different from the original plans approved for this site was contrary to that sense of place.
- There was concern around the relationship with the Grade II listed buildings, there had been a loss of the roof trusses, a new roof had been laid including modern roof lights which were contrary to previous planning approval, as well as use of inappropriate yellow stone from replacing the unsalvable stone from the listed building.
- Water drainage scheme that had been put in place had changed considerably from original plans, which could cause problems such as flooding as surface water was being drained already into a short watercourse. There was a history of flooding on the roadway and in the field opposite the entrance to the site.
- The method of working, the village had to cope with the C73 roadway being used as part of this site, the way the developer had organised the site meant they could only access the site yard to the build site by using the C73, this has caused problems with residents, motorists, and pedestrians due to blockages from road works and lorries transporting materials.
- The site was loud and overbearing in its effect of the village, it was seen as a mini estate instead of a traditional farmstead conversion.
- Rennington Parish Council asked the committee to refuse these applications.

Councillor W. Pattison addressed the committee speaking as the Ward Councillor. Her comments included the following:

- The development was filled with retrospective applications.

Ch.'s Initials.....

- The developer has changed plans on the application without consulting the residents of the village or the Parish Council.
- The residents voiced their concerns over the “garish” yellow of the stone being used.
- During the building work at North Farm, the developer chose to remove the roof of a Grade II listed cart shed, as written in unit 9. The roof should be put back and restored exactly as it was, and she asked Members to reject this application.

Councillor Pattison left the room.

In response to questions from members, the following information was provided:

- The bright stone would weather in time, the building conservation officer had visited the site and stated that any stone used must be a natural colour.
The planning officers did feel the stone was appropriate and would weather over time.
- L. Sinnamon, Development Service Manager, advised the Committee that the applicants were entitled at any point in the building process to submit an application to vary what they were building, and the Committee had to consider it. The Building Conservation Officer had deemed that the building materials were appropriate. If this application was refused and it went to appeal it was likely that the Inspector would give weight to the comments from the building conservation officer and overturn members decision. In November the Building Conservation officer had given verbal confirmation that they were happy with the stone, however there was no formal approval.
- The Highway Authority had been consulted regarding the parking and had raised no objections, subject to conditions.
- If members considered they would like to add a condition to the application regarding charging points for electric vehicles, it could be added as a condition.
- The material used on the listed building was different to the original, the Conservation Officer had stated that they accepted the re-roofing has been completed in a manner consistent with the cycling of traditional slate as discussed in the application.
- 1.5 car parking spaces per house was not a policy but a judgement by the Highways Officer.
- The garages would be large enough to fit a family sized car in addition to any bicycle storage.

A proposal was set out by Councillor Thorne to approve the application 20/03446/VARYCO as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Watson.

Councillor Hunter expressed her disappointment that the developer had started work before they had been granted planning permission and that they had taken the risk. Parish Councils see retrospective applications as automatic planning

Ch.'s Initials.....

approval.

Councillor Swinbank explained to the committee that he was going to vote against it due to the developer not seeking planning permission before commencing work, and he considered that the application should be refused, and the units be stripped and put back the way they were.

L. Sinnamon explained to the committee that enforcement action was discretionary and the aim of the Council Enforcement Strategy was to resolve planning breaches informally first before taking further enforcement action. On this occasion the officers had worked with the applicant and the Building Conservation Team to agree an acceptable way forward, notwithstanding that it was not what was originally applied for. It may be the case that if the developer had used brick for instance, it may have been unacceptable in which case there would be a different outcome.

Councillor Mather expressed his concern in relation to the parking issue, as there was a lack of public transport. It was clarified that the garage would be 3m x 6m and was appropriate for accommodating a family car and cycle storage.

Councillor Thorne requested an amendment to his proposal to accept the recommendation to also include a condition for electric vehicle charging points to be provided and the size of the garages to be confirmed.

It was clarified that the proposal was now to accept the recommendation to approve the application subject to the conditions in the report and delegated authority be provided to the Director of Planning and the Vice-Chair Planning to agree the dimensions of the garages to be no less than 3m x 6m and an additional condition to be added to provide one electric vehicle charging point per property at a suitable wattage to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority.

This was agreed by both Councillor Thorne as the proposer and Councillor Watson as the seconder.

A vote was taken on the proposal as outlined above as follows: - FOR 5; AGAINST 5; ABSTENTIONS 0.

There was one Councillor who did not vote.

The Vice Chair - Planning used his casting vote and voted to approve the application.

It was **RESOLVED** that the application be GRANTED subject to the conditions as outlined in the report and delegated authority be provided to the Director of Planning and the Vice-Chair Planning to agree the dimensions of the garages to be no less than 3m x 6m and an additional condition to be added to provide one electric vehicle charging point per property at a suitable wattage to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority.

16 **20/03447/VARYCO**

Councillor Thorne proposed to approve the application as outlined in the report

Ch.'s Initials.....

which was seconded by Councillor Watson.

A vote was taken on the proposal to approve the application with the conditions as outlined in the report as follows: - FOR 6; AGAINST 5; ABSTENTIONS 0.

It was **RESOLVED** that this application be GRANTED subject to the conditions as outlined in the report.

Councillor Pattison returned to the meeting.

17 **20/04349/FUL**

J. Sharp – Planning Officer, introduced the application with the aid of a power-point presentation.

W. Byatt addressed the committee speaking in objection to this application. His comments for objection included the following:

- The Environment and Design Team had concluded that this proposal would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, but their conclusion was flawed because their basic premise is wrong.
- Guyzance had its own distinctive and special atmosphere, not mirrored elsewhere in South Northumberland. The residents believed that sandwiching six new dwellings in between the hamlet and the hall would destroy it
- Six houses with 18 bedrooms created a 21st century Hamlet, and there could be no thought that this would enhance the vitality of the local community, as commended in the NPPF, because this was a second hamlet, was along a drive and behind an electronically controlled gate.
- On 26 January 2021 the applicant told the residents that the new dwellings would be used as holiday lets, this would be unsustainable in a hamlet with no services, surrounded by narrow lanes.
- The objector asked for a condition be included if approval was given for the new dwellings to be for residential use only and not to be used as holiday cottages.
- The hamlet's main access route was a long lane in a poor state of repair, and in places single track.
- The applicant's agent said that "the applicant intends that the hamlet and estate will be safeguarded through residential development" however there was another application to build new cottages on the small pasture in the hamlet.

Councillor S. Ingleby of Acklington Parish Council spoke in objection to this application. His comments included the following:

- The conservation officer report was incorrect in stating that Guyzance hall was the fundamental reason for the conservation area. The conservation area put the village street and the hamlet as the core settlement.

Ch.'s Initials.....

- The houses would be on private land, behind electric gates and would have little scope for interaction within the existing community.
- There was concern for the proposed development of the long barn, it would not enhance the character of the barn but change it detrimentally.
- Severe humanistic impact and a reason for refusal under the NPPF, due to lack of suitable paths for those with mobility issues.

P. Elder addressed the committee speaking in support of this application. His comments included the following:

- He agreed with the Officer's recommendation for the Committee.
- He emphasised the importance of the estate as a whole which was a challenge to run and had previously been supported by agriculture and a new way of creating a sustainable was needed to be found.
- Their clients long-term aim was to create an estate including a "green" hydro-power station which was currently under construction.
- The existing building was a traditional u-shaped barn and hay barn, it was proposed to convert these existing buildings into dwellings, repairing and bringing these back into use and he quoted the comments from the Building Conservation Officer
- The proposed housing had been specifically designed for older people and people with mobility issues, with parking areas suitable for wheelchair users and accessible internal layouts.
- There was a significant lack of suitable housing within the areas and the proposed development went some way to fulfilling this need.
- The currently population of the village was around 19. However, this should be seen in historical context – based on the census data of 1811, the population of the area was 186.

In response to questions from members, the following information was provided:

- The reuse of redundant buildings in sustainable locations was acceptable in policy terms in regards to NPPF
- There was no policy in place to enforce certain types of housing, therefore the applicant was free to allow holiday lets in these buildings.
- The horseshoe barn was reasonably solid, did have slates missing from the roof however was capable of conversion. There was a condition in the report that the applicant must reclaim and reuse slates. If the applicant was not able to convert the barns, then a new application would have to be submitted.
- The condition of the roads would be a separate highways management issue and not part of the planning application of conversion of the buildings.

Councillor Hill arrived at the meeting at 3.35pm as questions from the members took place, therefore did not take part in the discussion, or vote on this

Ch.'s Initials.....

application.

Councillor Watson discussed the lack of support from the surrounding areas and the highways report. Councillor Watson proposed to refuse this application on the grounds that it was in an unsustainable location, it would have an effect on highways and the effect on the conservation area. For clarification the reasons for refusal were provided as:

- Unsustainable location as travel does not prioritise walkways or cycleways
- Harm on the conservation area
- Unacceptable impact on the local highway

This was seconded by Councillor Pattison.

Councillor Seymour supported the application and mentioned that it was good for Northumberland's "green" innovative, due to the reuse of the barn.

Councillor Swinbank spoke around the concern to refuse under the unsustainable location in relation to carbon emissions through car traffic, as the housing units were being targeted at older people who would not be walking or cycling to facilities.

A vote was taken on the proposal to refuse the application for the reasons above as follows: - FOR 6; AGAINST 6; ABSTENTIONS 0.

The chair had the casting vote and voted against the proposal to refuse as set out by Councillor Watson.

The proposal failed and it was opened up to the floor for another proposal.

Councillor Castle proposed to accept the officer recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Seymore.

A vote was taken on the proposal to approve the application with the conditions as outlined in the report and additional conditions and the lateral undertaking to secure the Coastal Mitigation Service as outlined in the officer's report as follows: - FOR 6; AGAINST 6; ABSTENTIONS 0.

The Chair of Planning had the casting vote and voted in favour of the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED that this application be GRANTED subject to planning conditions and the applicant entering into a Unilateral Undertaking to secure a financial contribution towards the Council's Coastal Mitigation Service (£3,690)

The Chair proposed a comfort break for members at this point and the meeting recommenced at 4.20 pm

18 **21/01108/COU**

Ch.'s Initials.....

J. Sharp – Planning Officer, introduced the application with the aid of a power-point presentation.

T. Carter addressed the committee speaking in support of the application. His comments included the following:

- The site was a brownfield site and has accommodated various buildings in the past, however taking into account of the committee's comments on the last application the applicant had amended the scheme to address those concerns.
- The site would only be open between 6am and 10pm in order to protect residential amenity. These hours were similar to the operation of trains on the adjacent East Coast Mainline.
- The containers would be of a single height and would be painted in a forest green colour to blend in with the landscape.
- The applicant proposed a 2m high timber perimeter fence with additional landscape planting to further screen the site and enhance the setting.
- The number of storage units had been reduced from 10 to 8 with the originally proposed compounds removed. This would reduce the visual impact and the impact on the setting of the historic assets.
- The reuse of brownfield land was encouraged by the NPPF and the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact upon the designated assets.

In response to questions from members, the following information was provided:

- The proposed changes to the hours had been something offered by the applicant rather than something that had been imposed by Public Protection.
- The applicant had indicated that he had a number of interested parties to take up the storage facilities as the nearest at the current time was at Belford.
- The impact on the listed building had been taken into account with hedging proposed around the boundary and the drawing back of the built from the road would help lessen the impact.
- The expectation was that the site would be used as a storage facility and could include a boat or a caravan. There would be some level of noise but not enough to disturb the surrounding areas, it would be an enforcement matter if somebody was running a business out of the site.

Councillor Pattison proposed to refuse this application on the grounds of:

- Visual Impact
- Residential Amenity
- Impact upon Heritage Assets

This was seconded by Councillor Hill.

Councillor Thorne expressed his opinion on the opening hours of the application, stating that while the train station did make some level of noise, the level of noise

Ch.'s Initials.....

from the site when complete would be constant.

Councillor Watson advised that he supported the officer's recommendation in that the facility would be well shielded and it will not have an adverse effect on the village. Councillor Castle also advised he could not see that there was much wrong with the application.

A vote was taken on the proposal to refuse the application for the reasons as outlined above as follows: - FOR 6; AGAINST 7; ABSTENTIONS 0.

The proposal failed, and it was opened up to the floor for another proposal.

Councillor Watson proposed to accept the officer's recommendation and grant the application, this was seconded by Councillor Castle.

Following further debate, a suggestion was made to change the times of operation and look at reducing the times to 8 am to 8 pm on Monday to Saturday which was agreed by Councillors Watson and Castle.

A vote was taken on the proposal to grant the application with the conditions set out in the report, with an amendment to condition 9 to limit the times of operation to 8am – 8pm, Monday – Saturday as follows: -

- FOR 7; AGAINST 6; ABSTENTIONS 0.

It was **RESOLVED** that this application was granted subject to planning conditions as outlined in the report and amended condition 9 as above.

Councillor Bridget and Councillor Hill left the meeting at this point

19 **SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

As the meeting approached the 3 hour limit the Solicitor asked Members if they wished to suspend standing orders in order to continue the meeting. Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED that in accordance with the Council's constitution, standing orders be suspended and the meeting continue over the 3 hour limit.

20 **21/00026/FUL**

V. Cartmell, Planning Area Manager introduced the application with the aid of a power point presentation.

Councillor C. Williamson from Beadnell Parish Council addressed the committee speaking in opposition to the application. His comments included:

- Swinhoe was a small hamlet, consisting of two working farms and twenty-two dwellings, nine of those dwellings were holiday homes.
- Beadnell Parish Council requested that this application and application 21/00368/FUL be deferred until drainage issues raised

Ch.'s Initials.....

- by the local farmer could be investigated by the local flood authority and the Environment Agency.
- Northumbria Water had confirmed there were no public sewers in the area.
- The farmer stated that the applicant intended to add surface water and treated effluent to his private field drain which discharged into the burn.
- The applicant had not attempted to discuss the necessary improvement to the drainage system with the farmer.
- The Parish Council requested a Grampian Condition for the applicant to remove all permitted development rights on the garage and prevent change of use to ensure that the building remained as a garage in perpetuity.

Following questions from members, the following information was received:

- The Local Lead Flood Authority had not been consulted as the application was only for an extension to a garage. Any impact on the drainage system would not be sufficient to warrant refusal of the application.
- The double garage would be used for storing a vehicle and storage condition 6 would ensure that it was not to be used for another reason.
- If the applicant wished to change the use of the garage in the future, then a change of use application would need to be made.

Councillor Thorne proposed to move the recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Watson.

A vote was taken on the proposal to grant the application with the conditions as outlined in the report as follows: - FOR 10; AGAINST 1; ABSTENTIONS 0.

It was **RESOLVED** that this application be GRANTED subject to planning conditions as outlined in the report.

21 **21/00368/FUL**

V. Cartmell introduced the application with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

Councillor C. Williamson of Beadnell Parish council addressed the committee speaking in opposition to the application. The reasons for opposition included:

- The Parish Council requested a deferment in this application for the local lead flood authority and the Environment Agency to investigate the drainage issue which had just been raised by the farmer and as stated in the previous application.
- The application was an overdevelopment of a small plot with little amenity space and would have an overbearing effect on a neighbouring property resulting in a loss of their light
- The application would also result in the loss of public amenity land which had been used for 20 years by the children from the holiday

Ch.'s Initials.....

park and as there was no footpath to Beadnell the loss of the land would increase the likelihood of pedestrians, especially children coming into contact with traffic.

- The Parish Council requested the following conditions:
 - (i) Grampian Condition, to prevent the start of the development until offsite works had been completed on land not controlled by the applicant to ensure that the applicant provided modern drainage to the development and should state that no work should be undertaken before the drainage situation was resolved. The farmer had indicated that he was willing to talk to the applicants in relation to this matter.
 - (ii) A S106 agreement that the self-build dwelling was used as a principal residency in accordance with policies 14 & 15 of the North Northumberland Coast Neighbourhood Plan.
 - (iii) A S106 agreement that the separate workspace building and garage to be used for business use only in perpetuity to prevent the Neighbourhood Plan being bypassed and the accommodation changed to provide holiday accommodation.
 - (vi) A condition preventing any roof lights in the building emit light spill during the hours of darkness to reduce the impact on the dark skies that the area enjoyed.

Following questions from members, the following information was provided:

- It was not felt that it would be proportionate to refuse the application on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site as whilst there may not be a lot of amenity space there was ample space for the dwellings.
- The green space amenity that the public had used was not publicly or council owned, it was owned by the applicant who was able to develop the land.
- The LLFA has stated that there has been no flooding recorded on the environment agency flood risk maps, nor has anything been reported. It has not been identified as an area at risk of flooding.
- The Environment Agency would not comment on the application as it was below their threshold.

Councillor Renner-Thompson advised of issues with the drainage in the area with one pipe which was at capacity and on occasions this did back up and was causing SUDs to fail. He proposed to approve the application with the conditions as outlined in the report and a Grampian condition regarding the drainage and an additional condition to limit the use of the workshop with the wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in conjunction with the Vice-Chair Planning and subject to the 106 agreement in the report to secure a coastal mitigation condition and to restrict the residency of the dwelling. This was seconded by Councillor Thorne.

A vote was taken on the proposal to grant the application as outlined above as follows: - FOR 11; AGAINST 0; ABSTENTIONS 0.

It was **RESOLVED** that this application was granted subject to planning conditions as outlined in the report, a Grampian Condition regarding the drainage

Ch.'s Initials.....

and additional condition to limit the use of the workshop with the wording delegated to the Director of Planning in conjunction with the Vice-Chair Planning and subject to the applicant entering into a S106 agreement to secure the following obligations:

- A financial contribution towards the Council's Coastal Mitigation Service (£615) and
- Principle residency restrictions.

22 **APPEALS UPDATE**

RESOLVED that the information be noted

23 **SECTION 106 UPDATE**

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

The meeting was adjourned whilst planning officers left the meeting.

24 **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No questions had been received.

25 **PETITONS**

There had been no new petitions.

Councillor Renner-Thompson provided an update on a petition to resurface the bridleway from North Sunderland to Seahouses Primary School, that it had been successful, and the work would start in August 2021.

26 **LOCAL SERVICES ISSUES**

G. Bucknall - Lead Highways Delivery Manager provided a verbal update on north area highways. The update included information on the following

- Resurfacing works in the North Northumberland area
- Various traffic schemes such as 20mph zones
- Bridges and structures schemes
- Emergency situations
- Pothole fillings

In response to questions from members, the following information was provided:

- Bus shelter at Shilbottle would be in place in six weeks' time.
- A taskforce had been arranged for the upkeep of road signs and would be spending 4 weeks with an inspector to refresh road signs.
- Grit bin refilling to start in October.

Members thanked Mr Bucknall and the highways team for all the work completed in the area.

Ch.'s Initials.....

B. Hodgson - Neighbourhood Services Area Manager provided a verbal update on North area neighbourhood issues. The update including the following information:

- Mr Hodgson thanked the frontline staff for their continued hard work throughout last year during lockdown.
- The residual and recycling waste services were continuing to perform well, garden waste services have been stretched several times with new housing buildings.
- Growing conditions had increased the wait time between grass cuttings and the waste being collected due to extra journeys to the tip and composting facility during shifts.
- Slightly behind with grass cutting and weed control due to the weather conditions from May into June.

Following questions from members, the following information was provided:

- The Neighbourhoods Services aimed to empty litter bins and cleanse the areas at least twice a day on the coast. There was a nine-hour crew on a Saturday and Sunday with the aim of getting three rounds completed in a day.
- There were no current plans to reduce the cleaning of Seahouses public toilets.

The members thanked Mr Hodgson and his team for their continued hard work.

Councillor Clark and Councillor Pattison left during questions from members.

27 APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

Alnwick Playhouse Trust	Councillor Castle
Alnwick Sporting Club	
Alnwick Town AFC – Board/Management Committee	
Amble Development Trust	Councillor Clark Councillor Watson
Butler Ember Charity	Councillor Watson
Eastern Borders Development Association	Councillor Hunter Councillor Seymour
Glendale Gateway Trust	Councillor Mather
Holy Island of Lindisfarne Community Development Trust	Councillor Hardy

Ch.'s Initials.....

Lindisfarne Nature Reserve Joint Advisory Committee	Councillor Hardy
North Sunderland Harbour Commission	
Northumberland National Park Joint Local Access Forum	
River Tweed Commission	Councillor Hardy Councillor Hill Councillor Seymour
Seahouses Development Trust	Councillor Renner-Thompson
Tweed Forum	Councillor Seymour

28 BERWICK REGENERATION PROJECT

No update

29 MEMBERS LOCAL IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES 2021 - 2022

In response to issues raised by Members in relation to the bureaucratic nature of the scheme, the Chair advised that the process would be raised at the LAC Chairs' Briefing.

RESOLVED that this was noted.

30 LOCAL AREA COUNCIL WORK PROGRAMME

The Chair had requested Tony Kirsopp to attend the meeting to provide an update on Borderlands, however he had not been available for this meeting. He will be invited to attend the next meeting.

He had also requested that an item be included for the September on Youth Service Provision.

RESOLVED that the information was noted.

31 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting was scheduled planned for Thursday 19 August 2021.

CHAIR.....

DATE.....

Ch.'s Initials.....