

## **NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL**

### **CRAMLINGTON, BEDLINGTON AND SEATON VALLEY LOCAL AREA COUNCIL**

At the meeting of the **Cramlington, Bedlington and Seaton Valley Local Area Council** held at Meeting Space - Block 1, Floor 2 - County Hall on Wednesday, 21 July 2021 at Time Not Specified.

#### **PRESENT**

Councillor M Swinburn (Chair in the Chair)  
For agenda items 1 – 5 and 10 – 16

(Planning Vice-Chair Councillor R Wilczek in the chair for items 6 - 9)

#### **MEMBERS**

L Bowman  
C Dunbar  
B Flux  
M Robinson  
R Wilczek

W Daley  
P Ezhilchelvan  
S Lee  
C Taylor

#### **OFFICERS**

H Bowers  
T Gribbin  
G Horsman  
J Murphy  
M Payne

Democratic Services Officer  
Neighbourhood Services Manager  
Principal Planning Officer  
South East DM Area Manager  
Consultant Engineer

#### **1 CHAIR'S OPENING COMMENTS**

As this was the first meeting of the Cramlington, Bedlington & Seaton Valley Local Area Council since the Election in May, the Chair requested introductions from members and officers.

#### **2 MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Chair explained the Terms of Reference for the local area committee. In response to a query, it was advised that any comments could be forwarded to Councillor Castle or Councillor Flux for consideration into the review of the local area committees.

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

Ch.'s Initials.....

### 3 **PROCEDURE AT PLANNING MEETINGS**

The Chair advised members of the procedure which would be followed at the meeting.

### 4 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Ferguson.

### 5 **MINUTES**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Local Area Council held on Wednesday, 17 March 2021, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

### 6 **DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The committee was requested to decide the planning applications attached to the report using the powers delegated to it. Members were reminded of the principles which should govern their consideration of the applications, the procedure for handling representations, the requirement of conditions and the need for justifiable reasons for the granting of permission or refusal of planning applications.

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

### 7 **20/03225/COU**

**Retrospective permission for partial change of use of downstairs of property to childcare in a domestic setting with proposed front driveway (amended 07.06.21)**

**41A Southward, Seaton Sluice, Whitley Bay, Northumberland, NE26 4DQ**

It was confirmed that Members had no questions on the site visit videos which had been circulated. G Horsman, Principal Planning officer introduced the application to the Committee with the aid of a power point presentation.

Members were provided with an update that since the report had been issued, a further 7 letters of support had been received, including a letter from the Head Teacher of Seaton Sluice First School. In addition to the reasons for supporting the applications, the further 6 letters of support referred to the business providing employment locally, and the Head Teacher of the first school had stated that the business complemented the school by providing local childcare outside of school hours for working parents, a service the school could not provide at present and care being provided by the nursery including children with special educational needs.

A further letter of objection had been received in relation to loss of privacy and inadequate refuse storage.

Further representations had also been received by the applicant and a planning consultant acting on behalf of the applicant in support.

Ch.'s Initials.....

Elaine Burt, applicant, was in attendance and spoke in support of the application:

- Despite being informed on 2 July that her application would be recommended for approval, and the subsequent change in the recommendation to refuse the application, she had registered to speak in support of the application
- She had been providing childcare for the past 14 years to local children and children with special educational needs with no issue until a recent dispute with her neighbour who was her husband's mother and father
- Four letters of objection had been received to the application and three of those had been from acquaintances of her parents-in-law, none who lived close by
- At time of writing there had been 51 letters of support and a petition in support
- In addition, Seaton Sluice First School had written in support
- There had been overwhelming support not reflected in the report and a serious material consideration had been overlooked
- The request to withdraw the application from the agenda was rejected and the report presented to members was not a full presentation of the facts of the case
- She was one of only three childcare providers with wrap around care and had continued an open door policy during the pandemic for key workers
- There had been no complaints relating to noise in the 14 years she had been providing childcare
- Recent complaints had been vexatious
- Paragraph 2.4 of the report indicated that the proposal would result in an increased level of noise generated by the high volume of children and parents, there were over 50 letters of support from neighbours with no mention of noise and even the planning officer who had visited the site commented on how quiet the property was
- Paragraph 109 of the NPPF was clear that development should only be prevented if there was an impact on highway safety. Nothing had been raised in the officer's report
- There was one allocated parking space and two public parking spaces at the rear of the property, legal consent had been given by NCC for the two public parking spaces
- There had been no complaints regarding parking as the majority of children attended local schools which was within walking distance and most visits were on foot
- Parking standards, failed to take into account site specification and there were two entrances to the street
- Officers decisions were based on perceptions rather than fact
- She summarised that there had been no complaints over the last 14 years; the house first and foremost was their family home which provided childcare to key workers who they had been able to support during the pandemic; to refuse the application would affect the livelihood of many people in Seaton Sluice

In response to questions from Members the following information was provided:-

Ch.'s Initials.....

- The planning officer's understanding was that the nursery operated 52 weeks of the year and not just during school term
- The County Council had car parking standards; car parking was asked for on new developments. The report related to car parking for staff and the council's current standards required 3 – 4 as laid down in the Blyth Valley DPD documents and the emerging Northumberland Local Plan. The new car parking standards in the Council's new plan could not be afforded significant weight at present. The new plan sought 1 car parking space per 1 member of staff
- The refusal reason to the extension was not a matter for this application but related to the next application. The two refusal reasons were set out in the report
- Mr Horsman explained that he did not have any details of the size of the Residents Association which had objected
- The current car parking standards were maximum standards. It could be permitted in certain circumstances to allow for less.
- The application had been assessed on its own merits against the above-mentioned car parking standards and it was the view of officers that 3 off-street staff car parking spaces were required. In the submission from the Estates Team whilst the parking area at the rear could be used, there was no guarantee there would always be space for nursery staff/users as this was a car park for use by the general public. A number of dwellings did not have off street parking.
- It was only relatively recently that the premises had accommodated the numbers of children that were there at present. The business initially started off as a small child minders business and had intensified more recently. The level of use was relatively recent and the applicant had advised that she had not received any complaints but officers had concerns about the size of the property and its close proximity to neighbouring properties with which it shared boundaries
- Members were reminded that the application was for retrospective consent and that the application had to be considered on its planning merits with no weight being given to the fact that the use had already commenced
- The off-street staff parking could be less than 3 spaces but the advice from highways officers, was that the number off street staff car parking spaces should be 3 for this property.
- Mr Horsman was unaware whether staff walked to the property but advised that if planning permission was granted that would run with the land not the occupier so if the occupier were to change, staff travel plans could change also.
- A temporary permission was considered by officers but after considering the representations and assessing the application, the view of the officers was that the application went against policy. A temporary permission was one option that could be pursued, if members felt there was a need to allow for further time for the impact of the business to be assessed. Officers did not feel the property was suitable for the number of children (22). The temporary permission would allow the business to look for alternative property but officers did not feel it was the best way forward.
- In terms of the numbers of children, there were limits placed by Ofsted on the numbers of children that could be accommodated on the premises at any one time (i.e. 22 children). In terms of the planning process, a condition could also be attached if planning permission was granted to limit

Ch.'s Initials.....

the number of children on the premises at any one time to 22.

- Mr Horsman was unsure regarding the proximity address-wise of those who had made representations in support of the application as he was standing in for an officer who was self-isolating, however, having read some of the late representations, a number of parents with children in the nursery had written in to support the proposal
- Mrs Murphy referred to an appeal for a childminding business for 10 children referred to in the report which had been dismissed as the Inspector had considered the impact would lead to noise and disturbance to occupants. Two of the main issues of the case were set out in paragraphs 7.22 and 7.23 of the report in relation to the garden area and the harmful living conditions to nearby occupiers which officers had taken into account whilst coming to a decision
- The business made use of the existing refuse collection arrangements
- It was understood that the property had been extended over the last 2 years which allowed for the accommodation of 22 children
- Ofsted would have looked at different matters than planning officers, eg internal space and staffing ratios which may dictate numbers accommodated

Councillor Daley moved a motion to approve the permission for the following reasons:

1. The application was aligned to policy DC1 that it was within settlement boundaries - the application site was located within settlement boundaries as set out in the report
2. The application was in accordance with Policy SS3 - helping to build communities, which was listed in the report
3. The application accorded with Policy C1 of the Blyth Valley Core Strategy which highlighted the dual use for community benefits
4. The application aligned to the NPPF to provide employment opportunities
5. The application was also in accordance with DC12 of the Blyth Valley Development Control Policies which stated that development that enhanced the network of community facilities would be permitted within settlements, provided that the development was well located to the community which it would serve

This motion was seconded by Councillor Flux.

Councillor Robinson proposed a further motion for the temporary aspect of the permission to give the applicant time to find a suitable alternative site.

It was advised that as there was already a motion on the table, the first motion had to be considered. Councillor Daley asked if the temporary aspect could be added as a condition on approval of the application. It was advised that could be added as a condition as well as other mitigations, eg drop off and pick up times and hours of business.

Councillor Daley suggested that if members were minded to support the application with the conditions, that authority to draft necessary conditions could be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

Ch.'s Initials.....

In response to Councillor Robinson's proposal the Solicitor clarified that Councillor Daley had proposed that if members were minded to support the application with conditions, delegated authority could be given to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning and specific conditions to be applied for, eg, a temporary period of 2 years, the hours of the business and drop off and pick up schedules.

Councillor Robinson then withdrew his motion.

Councillor Flux stated the reason he came to the conclusion was that there had only been only 4 objections to the application with no objections from the Parish Council or The Resident's Association. In addition the applicant had originally been told the application would be approved.

In response to queries regarding the motion put forward, the Solicitor clarified the motion put forward with added conditions to be delegated to the Director of Planning and the Chair.

Upon being put to the vote the results were as follows:-

**FOR: 8; AGAINST: 2; ABSTENTION: 1.**

It was therefore:-

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** permission with conditions to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of Planning committee with additional specific conditions for temporary period of 2 years, the hours of the business and drop off and pick up schedules.

## 8      **20/03863/VARYCO**

**Variation of conditions 2 (materials) and 3 (approved plans) pursuant to planning permission 18/00515/FUL in order to install flat roof rather than a pitched roof.**

**41A Southward, Seaton Sluice, Whitley Bay, Northumberland, NE26 4DQ**

It was confirmed that Members had no questions on the site visit videos which had been circulated. G Horsman, Principal Planning officer introduced the application to the Committee with the aid of a power point presentation.

Late representations had been received from the applicant stating that approval had been granted for the extension. In terms of the building regulations, the Building Regulation Officer had not any concerns about the proposal. Mr Horsman advised that Building Regulations and planning permission were two separate matters.

Photos had been supplied of seven other two storey extensions with flat roofs in the Seaton Sluice area, however, addresses of these properties had not been supplied and officers had been unable to check the planning history as the extensions appeared to have been erected a number of years ago when certain 2

Ch.'s Initials.....

storey extensions did not require planning permission from the Local Authority and policy requirements were different.

The applicant also referred to a proposal to site regarding carbon capture plants on the roof of the extension. However, that did not form part of the proposal. There were other ways in which Co2 reduction could be achieved.

Mr Horsman advised that the officer recommendation was as per the report for refusal, however amended wording was now proposed in respect of the refusal reasons. The refusal reasons should read:

### **Condition 1**

*“The two-storey rear extension and proposed external staircase, by virtue of their siting, scale, mass and design do not respect or complement the style and character of the existing dwelling and constitute incongruous additions to the street scene, resulting in significant harm to the visual amenities of the locality. This would be contrary to Policies DC1 and DC28 of the Blyth Valley District Local Development Framework: Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2007), Policy ENV 2 of the Blyth Valley Core Strategy and the NPPF”.*

### **Condition 2**

*“The two-storey rear extension by virtue of its siting, scale, mass and height results in a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the adjoining property at 39a Southward in terms of an unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight, visual outlook, structural proximity and overbearing presence and the proposed external staircase would result in significant harms to the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at 41 Southward by virtue of increased overlooking of their rear elevation and rear garden. This would be contrary to Policies DC1 and DC28 of the Blyth Valley District Local Development Framework: Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2007) and the NPPF”.*

Mr Alan Burt, applicant, was in attendance and spoke in support of the application:

- He explained that when the design of the extension was changed, he had asked the Building Inspector if it was acceptable. The Building Inspector advised Mr Burt that he would be happy to sign off the work as long as the neighbour did not complain
- Mr Burt spoke to the neighbour at 39a who had no objections
- Mr Burt carried out the extension unaware that new plans had to be submitted
- Throughout that build there had been no mention of a deviation from the plan, however Government Regulations required that a responsible person be informed if there was a deviation and if necessary, a stop work order would be issued. To date, he had not received such an order, even though the flat roof was clearly documented in the report and no objection to the extension
- They had paid for guidance from NCC's Building Inspector and expected the right guidance and advice

Ch.'s Initials.....

- The Planning Officer referred to DC28 in relation to planning extensions. There were already two in village and Mr Burt was happy to supply the addresses
- He understood the concerns of the Planning Officer and he was prepared to reduce the size of the extension to the side elevation back to 2 metres, not seek permission for the fire escape as long as they could keep the door on the side; replace with a Juliette balcony and retain the flat roof on the extension, as there were other examples in the village
- The advice they had received, had caused immense stress and financial burden over the last year. He asked the Committee if they would consider a compromise on the extension to reduce the impact on the neighbouring property and to install obscure glazing to avoid any overlooking of 41
- He hoped the changes were acceptable to the Committee.

(Councillor P Scott left the meeting at 5.48 pm)

In response to questions from Members the following information was provided:-

- If planning permission was refused, planning enforcement process would have to take place. This would include consideration being given as to how to remedy the situation, which could include demolition in whole or part , or an option to modify as per the approved plans from 2018. However, all the matters would need to be looked at
- The suggestions that were made by the applicant, could be progressed as a separate new application, however, Mr Horsman was not supportive of the suggestions made by the applicant, as the property was not in a suitable location for a flat roof and even if the projection was reduced it would still be harmful at two storey level and there would still be concern with regard to the external staircase and the visual impact on 39a
- In response to the advice given by the Building Inspector, it was advised that there was a distinction between the planning process and building regulations. The Building Control Officer would be concerned only about construction detail not whether the extension was acceptable in terms of its appearance and impact on neighbours. There was often confusion between planning issues and building regulations
- The most appropriate solution would be to build as to what was approved in 2018.
- The 45 degree rule related to daylight and sunlight and the visual impact
- The drawings for the external staircase had not been submitted originally. The balcony feature was a Juliette balcony which could not be accessed
- The actual extension projection to the rear was 3.56 which was not a major issue given that the 2018 approval allowed for a 3.5 metre rear projection
- In response to a query regarding possible changes to the application, it was stated that the application could be deferred to allow for further discussion but the changes did not support the concerns raised about the flat roof
- Mr Horsman had tried to make contact with the Building Control Officer and fully understood the issues raised in relation to co-ordination between the teams
- One objection had been received after the planning application was received and the extension had been built. However, the objection related to a side extension which did not require planning permission

Ch.'s Initials.....



- Only number 41 had objected to the application
- The Committee was advised that they could consider what had been said by the applicant
- Mr Horsman confirmed that the concerns were the design of the roof; the roof extended above the eaves of the property and the impact on numbers 39a and 41
- As a local authority, there was a view on acceptability and this would not normally be approved, in addition it was a careful approach was required so that undesirable precedents were not set
- The Committee were advised that if the application was deferred, a timescale would need to be discussed with a new set of plans which would be brought back to committee; there was also the option of refusal and the applicant had the option to appeal
- In response to the suggestion of removing the roof and deferring the rest of the application, this was not acceptable in Mr Horsman's view, it was not an acceptable scheme and not what had been approved originally. The way forward was to modify the extension so that it was as per the previously approved scheme
- The Solicitor clarified that if a deferment was agreed, there would be no decision

Councillor Flux proposed the motion for a deferral of the application which was seconded by Councillor Daley. The Solicitor clarified that the motion on the table was for a deferment for further discussion with the applicant to be had by November of this year. Councillor Flux and Daley confirmed this to be correct.

It was suggested in future that when developments were being inspected, Building Control Officers should report back to planning officers, to prevent issues such as this.

Councillor Ezhilchevian stated that the position had arisen as a result of the Building Control Officer not having plans when inspecting the property, therefore the Committee was concerned about the Building Inspector's response and he would therefore be supporting the deferment. Councillor Bowman stated that it was up to the applicants to ensure they showed the correct plans to the Building Control Inspector, which did not appear to have been the case.

Upon being put to the vote the results were as follows:-

**FOR: 9; AGAINST: 1.**

It was therefore:-

**RESOLVED** that the application be **DEFERRED** until November 2021 to allow further discussion with the applicant.

## 9 **APPEALS UPDATE**

The report provided information on the progress of planning appeals.

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

Ch.'s Initials.....

**(Councillor Swinburn in the Chair).**

**10 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No questions had been received.

**11 PETITIONS**

This item was to:

a) Receive any new petitions:

No new petitions had been received.

b) Consider reports on petitions previously received: Petition for additional parking at Mayfield Dale, Cramlington

Councillor Lee reported that a petition containing 128 signatures had been received requesting additional parking spaces in the Mayfield Dale area of Cramlington. Families were concerned about the safety of children and the elderly. There was only one route into the estate which contained cul de sacs. It was not clear on the petition that the estate contained a lot of green open space to the front and pockets of open space at the back where the parking was requested.

The report suggested that as the estate had private housing, it was not a social housing scheme, which Councillor Lee disputed. The suggestion of money being used from County Councillor small schemes would be more expensive than £15,000 and he suggested that another scheme taking place in Cramlington to create 14 spaces should be looked at and that the report be deferred to look at that scheme.

Neil Snowdon, Principal Programme Officer was in attendance to respond.

Mr Snowdon stated that these types of schemes were not usually considered through the Council's LTP scheme. A lot of the houses were built when car ownership was so low and it was difficult to prioritise one area over another. He suggested the option to spread the money from members' local improvement schemes which could be the best way forward.

Mr Snowdon was unaware of the scheme referred to and Councillor Lee clarified that the scheme was for the excavation of grass verges at Hall Close Glade to provide 14 spaces; the funding had not come from the small schemes money.

Mr Snowdon stated that he would look into the scheme and was happy to discuss a scheme with Councillor Lee outside of the meeting and would request Reuben Morgan who was responsible for members schemes to email Councillor Lee information.

Members discussed the issues regarding costing of schemes. The Chair referred to the scheme at Hall Close and stated that residents in the area had asked for many years for improvement to parking.

Ch.'s Initials.....

It was suggested that Councillor Lee have a discussion with Homes for Northumberland as a practical way forward and contact Housing Services and use the example of Hall Close.

Some discussion took place regarding the Road Traffic 1984 Act; the review of policy and scoring mechanism and off street EV work that was being carried out and those that did not have the ability to charge.

It was suggested that an officer report on the issue could be taken to a Scrutiny Committee and possibly Cabinet.

Councillor Lee was advised to contact officers from housing if he wished a site visit to the area.

**RESOLVED** that the report be deferred to allow for further information.

c) To consider updates on petitions previously considered:

There were none to consider.

## 12 **LOCAL SERVICES ISSUES**

Members received the following updates and explanation of the impact of Covid-19 on front line services from Tony Gribbin, Neighbourhood Services Area Manager:

### **Waste Service:**

- Following lockdown, there had been an increase of domestic waste. This had reduced slightly but had not returned to pre lockdown levels.
- Residual and recycling waste collection continued to perform well but the increase of new builds was a concern. This was currently under review.
- Garden waste had seen an increase in subscriptions and housing developments continued to place additional demands on the waste service
- Perfect growing conditions also increased the weight of grass cuttings in the bins collected
- As usual a garden waste service review would be undertaken at the end of the season to look for efficiencies.
- There were 569 new customers so far this year and a total of 9918 customers up to date.

### **Grass Cutting:**

- Now on cut between 7/8. Grass cutting proved to be a significant challenge in the early part of the year
- A long period of rain was experienced in May followed by very warm weather with the grass growing rapidly
- This presented two challenges, the first was to complete cutting rounds efficiently to avoid having long grass on view. The second was the inevitable grass arisings left following the cut of grass which was longer than usual.

Ch.'s Initials.....

- Both situations meant that standards weren't as high as usual for the month of June
- Standards had stabilized and grass was returning to normal standards

### **Weed Control:**

- The service was being delivered in house again this year
- This year had seen an unprecedented growth in the grass and weeds as a whole
- The in-house approach had worked well in previous years and was being adopted again for this round
- Weed control was slightly behind this year and weather conditions above had also affected weed growth which created another challenge
- All areas had received their first treatments on the first pass and weeds were already starting to show in the areas completed in May/June
- The commencement of the second treatment was being reviewed to start earlier and it was likely that a third treatment may be undertaken in more stubborn areas
- Teams had been using new weed rippers to remove more stubborn areas along with pedestrian sweepers.
- There were some issues with Japanese knotweed which were being addressed and more staff being trained in treating Japanese knotweed

### **Glyphosate alternative trial:**

- Trials of alternative products was underway county wide in those locations
- Results would be analysed and products would either be considered for use in future or, excluded on the grounds of poor performance or prohibitive costs
- The following alternative methods were being trialed:
  - Walk behind ripper brush
  - Nonanoic acid (Enclean) – a colourless oily liquid with an unpleasant smell
  - Pelargonic acid – which caused extremely rapid and non-selective burn down of green tissues and exhibit damage within 15-60 minutes of application
  - Burning with lance
  - Hot foam
  - Nomix Dual (glyphosate based)
- A formal report would be produced at the end of the trial with findings

### **Bereavement Services**

- The pandemic had also been a challenging time for teams across the area, working with the most challenging conditions
- The lockdown restrictions have meant huge professional and personal challenges for each team member, particularly working with bereaved families and reduced capacity in chapels and funeral directors
- There had been an increase in cremations in the months after lockdown

Ch.'s Initials.....

- and the whole team had risen to the challenge and performed magnificently. Thankfully, these had lowered to near normal figures
- Restrictions had been removed in the number attending funerals however, those poses challenges and facilities still required cleaning between services to ensure the health, welfare and safety of attendees and staff.

#### **Glass Trial:**

- This was ongoing in the Bedlington area and to date 58.7 tonne had been collected throughout the 4 month trial. The area total was 216.20 tonne.

Members asked a number of questions including:-

- Could a pack with 'Who's Who' on each service be circulated to members?
- Had the recent foliage growth meant that the Council had missed an opportunity from a carbon neutral aspect. Does this need to be reviewed and how often?
- A problem of Japanese knotweed in Bedlington on Bernicia land
- The rolling out of glass recycling
- Removal of the soil heap in Bedlington
- Why litter picking in Cramlington had ceased and also the refusal for the request of an additional litter bin
- Could the advertising boards at the roundabout at the top of the avenue in Seaton Delaval be removed
- The significant residue after grass cutting
- Incomplete grass cutting at Lamb Street, Cramlington
- Grass cutting in the nature reserve at the rear
- Weed treatment/trimming in Allendale

Mr Gribbin reported as follows:

- The 'Who's Who' pack would be requested from the relevant service
- The recent problem with foliage growth would be forwarded to the relevant person
- Contact information for Bernicia would be forwarded
- The information regarding the glass recycling would be forward to the relevant officer
- The removal of the soil heap would be forwarded to the relevant team
- A response to the query regarding litter picking would follow and Cramlington Town Council would also be contacted regarding the litter bin
- The question of the removal of advertising boards would be forwarded to Street Works
- The problem with residue grass cutting had been explained previously to the committee
- Councillor Lee would be contacted regarding the grass cutting in Lamb Street
- The Senior Countryside and Green Spaces Officer had previously responded to the query regarding the grass cutting at the nature reserve
- Mr Gribbin would inspect the weed treatment/trimming in Allendale and

Ch.'s Initials.....

action this

In the absence of the Highways Area Manager, Mr Gribbin provided an updated as follows:

The gully emptier was fully deployed dealing with reported issues and cyclic maintenance.

**Larger tarmac patching** had been carried out in the following locations:

- Broadlaw, Cramlington
- Oakley Drive, Cramlington
- Otley Drive, Cramlington
- Shields Road, Cramlington
- Mill Lane, Seghill
- Shotton Lane, Cramlington
- Park Road, Seaton Delaval
- Atley Way, Cramlington
- Ormston Street, Cramlington
- Western Avenue, Seaton Delaval
- East Cramlington

#### **Drainage Improvements**

- Chesterhill, Cramlington
- Astley Gardens, Seaton Sluice
- Bristol Street, New Hartley
- Park View, Seaton Delaval

#### **Tarmac Resurfacing Work**

- A1068 Aerodrome roundabout, Cramlington
- Nelson roundabout, Cramlington
- A192 East Hartford, Cramlington
- A 189 Spine Road from Moorfarm to Klondyke off slip
- Cumbrian Road, Cramlington
- Avenue roundabout, Seaton Delaval
- Atley Bank, Bedlington
- Station Road, Cramlington
- Beaconhill, Cramlington

#### **Microsurfacing Preparation Work**

- Crammond Way, Cramlington
- Blagdon Terrace, Cramlington
- CATERAN Way, Cramlington
- Mirlaw Road, Cramlington
- A1068 Choppington Road, Bedlington
- Cherry Tree Drive, Bedlington

#### **Bridge Refurbishment**

Ch.'s Initials.....

The A189 Klondyke Bridge will be undergoing concrete repairs and waterproofing during the school holidays week commencing 19 July. The works would be carried out under contraflow. Three weeks north bound and four weeks south bound. Advance signage and communications would be carried out in advance.

Any questions from members could be emailed to Democratic Services for onward transmission to the relevant department.

Thanks were conveyed to officers for all their hard work throughout the difficult challenges.

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted and issues set out in the bullet points above be followed up.

### 13 **APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

Members considered a list of appointments to outside bodies for 2021/22.

**RESOLVED** that the following list of appointments be confirmed:

- Astley Park Management Committee - Les Bowman
- Beaconhill Community Association – Barry Flux
- Cramlington Community Association - Mark Swinburn
- Cramlington Learning Village – Mark Swinburn
- Cramlington Voluntary Youth Project - Barry Flux and Wayne Daley
- East Hartford (and District) Community Association – Barry Flux
- New Hartley Community Association – David Ferguson

As some members were not present this could be reported back to a future meeting.

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

### 14 **MEMBERS' LOCAL IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES 2021-2022**

The Local Area Council received a progress update on Members' Local Improvement Schemes as at 1 July 2021. (A copy of the report is enclosed with the minutes.)

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

### 15 **LOCAL AREA COUNCIL WORK PROGRAMME**

A list of agreed items for future Local Area Council meetings was circulated. (A copy is enclosed with the minutes.)

Members were invited to email any requests to the Chair and / or Democratic Services Officer between meetings.

Items to be added to the work programme following the last meeting of the LAC Chairs Briefing included:

Ch.'s Initials.....

- Youth Service Provision
- Enhanced Services with Town and Parish Councils
- Off-street Electric Vehicle Charging Points
- Cycling and Walking Board
- Enforcement

**RESOLVED** that the work programme be noted.

16      **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting would be held on Wednesday 18 August 2021. (Planning only).

**CHAIR**.....

**DATE**.....

Ch.'s Initials.....