

## NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

### CASTLE MORPETH LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At the meeting of the **Castle Morpeth Local Area Council** held at Council Chamber - County Hall on Monday, 10 October 2022 at 4.00 pm.

#### PRESENT

D Towns (Chair) (in the Chair)

#### MEMBERS

L Darwin  
R Dodd  
P Jackson  
G Sanderson

S Dickinson  
L Dunn  
V Jones  
R Wearmouth

#### OFFICERS

M Bulman  
R Campbell  
M King  
H Lancaster  
L Little  
P Lowes  
E Sinnamon  
R Soulsby

Solicitor  
Senior Planning Officer  
Highways Delivery Area Manager  
Legal Services Manager  
Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Neighbourhood Services Area Manager  
Development Service Manager  
Planning Officer

Around 14 members of the press and public were present.

#### 40 **PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED AT PLANNING MEETINGS**

Members were reminded of the procedure to be followed at the meeting. The Chair advised that the agenda would be reordered to allow those planning applications with public speaking to be heard first. Therefore the two applications for South Hall, Ingoe would be moved down the agenda and whilst there would only be one presentation from the Officer each application would be the subject of a separate vote.

#### 41 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bawn, Beynon, Foster and Murphy.

#### 42 **MINUTES**

Ch.'s Initials.....

**(a) 11 July 2022**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Castle Morpeth Local Area Council held on Monday 11 July 2022, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and be signed by the Chair.

**(b) 8 August 2022**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Castle Morpeth Local Area Council held on Monday 8 August 2022, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and be signed by the Chair.

**43 DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Members were reminded of the procedure to be followed at the meeting. The Chair advised that the agenda would be reordered to allow those planning applications with public speaking to be heard first. Therefore the two applications for South Hall, Ingoe would be moved down the agenda and whilst there would only be one presentation from the Officer each application would be the subject of a separate vote.

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

**44 21/01137/FUL**

**Construction of two residential properties, including new vehicular access, with associated drainage and infrastructure  
Land North West of Garden Cottage, Front Street, Ellington,  
Northumberland**

An introduction to the report was provided by R Soulsby, Planning Officer with the aid of a power point presentation. There were no updates provided.

Mr Pattison addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application on behalf of Mr Bramwell. His comments included the following:-

- The plan did not show the correct boundary.
- There was concern regarding the access into the field as it was too near the main roundabout and appeared to be very close to his property.
- The decibel check was invalid as it was carried out during the Covid pandemic when traffic was much lighter and with the proposed access right next to his window the noise levels would be much higher.
- It had been stated incorrectly in documentation that his property was a two storey dwelling and in fact it was a single storey dwelling.
- The septic tank which was used by Garden Cottage had not been mentioned and the reliance on the field drainage for his property had also not been mentioned.
- The well on the property had been filled in using the rubble from the demolition of an old blacksmiths tool shed.
- The two supporters of the proposal had a vested interest in the application.

Ch.'s Initials.....

- He questioned whether the traffic calming measures which had been installed would remain as there had been a significant rise in the amount of traffic.
- The application would be detrimental to many of the amenities in the village and he asked that careful consideration be given to the application.

M Hepburn, Agent on behalf of the applicant addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. His comments included the following:-

- The report fully assessed all the relevant issues and recommended that permission should be granted. The applicant's team had worked with officers to ensure the best scheme for the site and the proposals would create two new high quality homes within the village of Ellington.
- The comments from the Parish Council had been taken into account when they presented material considerations. The proposals were policy compliant and all technical matters had been addressed and there were no material considerations which outweighed the benefits of the proposal.
- Robust technical assessments had been undertaken which demonstrated that the proposed development was technically sound and deliverable. There were no outstanding objections from any of the Council's internal consultees and a number of conditions have been agreed between the applicant and Council officers.
- In response to comments received from Council consultees there had been a reduction in the scale and massing of the houses and there had been a revision to the access arrangements to the site with the new access arrangement following the exact specification requested by the Highways Department.
- The development had evolved over the course of the application in response to comments received and the result would be a sustainable high quality development which would be a great addition to Ellington.

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

- The road safety audit had advised that the application was acceptable subject to the relocation of the traffic calming measures. Highways had sought a S278 agreement so that the applicant would relocate the traffic calming measures under this. Precise details would only become available after the S278 Agreement was drafted. The Chair requested that Councillor Dunn as Ward Councillor be consulted as part of any proposals to move the traffic calming measures.
- The Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) had been satisfied with the drainage arrangements and had raised no objections as it had been demonstrated that an appropriate sustainable drainage system would be provided on site. Condition 4 requested details to be submitted and agreed by the LLFA.
- It was clarified that the septic tank referred to by the Objector would be a civil issue between the applicant and owner of Garden Cottage should it be required to be relocated.

Councillor Wearmouth proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Dodd.

Ch.'s Initials.....

Members expressed their concern regarding the creation of a new access on the road which had been the subject of a petition for a 20 mph zone and had been why traffic calming measures had been put in place, for these to be moved to accommodate new properties. Members were reminded that traffic assessments had been carried out and applications could only be refused on highways grounds if there would be a severe impact. The Highways Development Management Team had assessed the additional impact that the two properties would have on movements on the network and had concluded that the roundabout could cope and with the relocation of the traffic calming measures it would not be a severe impact. Any proposal to move the traffic calming measures would be consulted upon, including the local Ward Councillor and the applicant would be expected to pay for any changes required. It was also clarified that the issue of the possible relocation of the septic tank would be a private civil matter and whilst this would need to be resolved, it did not preclude the Committee from making a decision.

A vote was taken on the proposal to approve the application as outlined in the report as follows:- FOR 6; AGAINST 2; ABSTAIN 1.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** subject to a legal agreement securing coastal mitigation, for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report

45 **22/01923/FUL**

**Installation of a 30m x 3.65m fully carpeted single bay practice facility and fully enclosed single bay cricket cage with heavy duty galvanized tubular uprights and netting. Single pedestrian gate. White netting added behind bowler to act as a sight screen and install three protective sheets around each side of the batting end.**

**Ulgham Playing Field, Ulgham Lane, Ulgham, Northumberland  
NE61 3BG**

An introduction to the report was provided by R Soulsby, Planning Officer with the aid of a power point presentation. There were no updates provided.

S Miles of 3 Manor Court, Ulgham addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of her husband and herself in objection to the application. Her comments included the following:-

- It was not shown on the plan how close the structure would be to their home as whilst it showed the whole boundary of number 6 Manor Court it did not identify their property which was closest. The proposed facility would only a matter of feet away from their boundary and approximately 48' from their conservatory and would infringe on their quality of life and privacy.
- A garden seating area, which was used on a regular basis, was only feet from where the structure would be sited.
- There would be a constant noise of "bat on ball" during practice sessions.
- The size of the structure would be approximately 6'6" higher than their hedge and 12' wide only a matter of feet from their boundary and would be visible from anywhere in their garden and all rear windows of their home

Ch.'s Initials.....

and would greatly impact on their outlook 365 days per year.

- The cricket club had been there when they had bought their property 27 years ago and up until now they had not had any cause to complain about the normal matches or any of the other activities and functions held on the play field area.
- The structure could affect the resale value of their property.
- They appreciated that the cricket club was trying to involve younger players to get involved in the sport, but the majority of supporters of the scheme did not live in the Village let alone have the prospect of a structure this size almost in their back garden. They did not object to the installation of a practice net but asked that it be relocated somewhere else, possibly where the old practice net had been stored. If the structure was erected in that location then the existing band of trees would muffle the noise and it would not have any visual effect from their home.
- The report gave the impression that there were existing trees that would shield the structure from their view, however currently there were no trees that would shield the view. The applicant had previously stated to them that some of the trees on the boundary would be removed to facilitate the structure and therefore the outlook from their garden would be of a steel netted structure not trees and greenery. He had also advised that some conifers around the tennis courts would be removed and this would also impact on them as these muffled the sounds from the tennis court.
- It had also been stated that the current mobile net facility was close to the proposed facility and therefore noise levels would not dramatically increase, however that had not been used for some considerable time and was not in the same location.
- The nets would only be used and be of benefit to the cricket club from April to September but the eyesore for them would be there 365 days a year and would be permanently detrimental to themselves and other occupants of Manor Court.

M O'Brien addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. He advised that he had lived next to the ground for over 30 years and whilst balls were regularly hit into his garden he still supported the application. He drew attention to and read out the recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the report.

S Land also addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. His comments included the following:-

- The application had been made with the sustainability of the cricket club in mind, as currently of 60 players, only 15% of them were junior members.
- The club had played a pivotal role in the community since its founding in 1977, providing bar facilities and use of the pavilion for wider community events and the club also having responsibility for the maintenance of the grassed areas on the recreation ground.
- The cricket club currently had no practice facility which was a major part of any local cricket club and which was a major attraction to players as it enabled them to practice and most importantly allowed junior players to develop their game. Ulgham was trying to retain junior players to secure its future after having previously lost players to competing clubs with practice facilities. It was also hoped that the installation of the new net

Ch.'s Initials.....

- facility would help to attract new players into the club.
- The application had gained support from the Planning Officer who believed that the application should be approved and Public Protection had no objections. There had also been support from within the Village.
  - The objectors wished for the net to be situated at the far end of the field parallel to the football pitch however this was not possible. After consultation with Ulgham Parish Council they had rejected that proposal for several reasons such as that the installation of the permanent facility away from the cricket pavilion would take land away from other sports areas that were often used by families in the village; and to have the facility away from the proposed area would have a significant environmental impact as there were several mature trees which would need to be removed or significantly pruned.
  - Concerns raised by the objectors around noise had been noted and there were plans in place to limit the usage of the facility and two lockable gates would be incorporated to limit access. The facility would be used on Thursday evenings 17:30 until 20:00 and Saturdays and Sundays 11:00 until 12:45 with it being locked at all other times.
  - There was already a shipping container on the site of the proposed facility which was more visually intrusive with no complaints received.
  - In respect of foul language as had been noted by one objector it was clarified that this had not been raised with the club and that Ulgham Cricket Club had a behaviour policy in place which mirrored other cricket establishments and they did not tolerate offence language. The club was trying to create an inclusive environment where all were welcome and the use of foul or offensive language did not encourage that.
  - The objectors failed to mention the close proximity of the tennis courts which was open to the public all year around with unrestricted access which would be equally, if not more disruptive to the neighbouring properties than a time restricted cricket facility.
  - Regarding the issue of children congregating around the net facility as had been mentioned by some objectors, it was the club's belief that the installation of this facility would not increase the number of children using the recreation ground and usage of the net itself would be restricted as it would be locked.

Members were reminded that the application had been assessed on its current proposed location and that the application for decision was that before them.

Councillor Wearmouth proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve as outlined in the report, which was seconded by Councillor Dodd.

In response to objections it was suggested that conditions be included in relation to the times the facility could be used, and also that the structure should be removed if it was unused for 12 months or had fallen into disrepair. It was not felt that a condition was necessary in relation to the times of use as any noise nuisance would be addressed by Public Protection. In relation to the structure being removed if not used or had fallen into disrepair, it was not felt appropriate to condition the removal if it had not been used within 12 months but Councillors Wearmouth and Dodd were agreeable to an amendment to the proposal to include an additional condition with wording delegated to the Director of Planning regarding removal of the structure if it was unused within a timescale to be

Ch.'s Initials.....

determined or had fallen into disrepair.

A vote was taken on the proposal to grant permission as outlined in the report with an additional condition with the wording delegated to the Director of Planning regarding the removal of the structure if unused within a timescale to be determined or had fallen into disrepair as follows: FOR 8; AGAINST 0; ABSTAIN 1.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report and additional condition with the wording delegated to the Director of Planning regarding the removal of the structure if unused within a timescale to be determined or had fallen into disrepair.

46 **22/02252/FUL**

**Proposed construction of detached standalone garden room to rear garden area.**

**Hepscott Hall, Side Lane, Hepscott, Morpeth Northumberland  
NE61 6LT**

R Campbell, Senior Planning Officer provided an introduction to the report with the aid of a power point presentation. There were no updates.

A Elliott-Robertson addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application. Her comments included the following:-

- She lived at Hepscott Hall Cottage and had been devastated by the notification that her neighbour was to build a garden room on the site which was only 26 inches away from her dining room and small patio.
- The development would be the size of a double garage and was the entire width of the patio and would be 848mm above the boundary wall with a window which would overlook her property.
- The close proximity and nature of the development would have a profound detrimental impact and invade her privacy.
- Friends and family of the applicant would congregate at the garden room which would be on the site where a shed now stood and as it would be in such close proximity to her property she would be able to hear every conversation word for word and it would become a real noise issue day and night.
- The proposed development would be modern and ugly and would not be in keeping with the Grade II listed building.
- If the proposal had been for the garden room to have been erected on the large grass area then she would have had no objection, but the location was only 26 inches from her boundary wall.

Councillor D Cowens addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of Hepscott Parish Council. It was accepted that the proposed building design and appearance agreed with the Listed Monuments National Planning Guidance for the Grade II listed monument and the applicant's huge improvement to the south side of the listed building was acknowledged. However the Parish Council supported the very near neighbour's objection to the unfortunate siting of the development so near to their property and the intrusive height which would spoil

Ch.'s Initials.....

the vista and be detrimental to their amenity. It would be of benefit if the proposed development could be moved behind another, very nearby existing screening wall, or if the base could be lowered Italian sunken garden style, so that it would be hidden by the party wall.

S McNicoll, applicant, addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. His comments included the following:-

- Despite the objections that had been raised, the building did not overlook the garden next door from the side window it would in fact look into the fence.
- The building would be set two metres away from the boundary.
- The objections from the neighbour and Parish Council were not based on what had been submitted and were not based on what would actually be done on the site.
- The building would be part of a domestic garden, which already had a pool area, and objections on the grounds of noise had no merit as the use of the area would not be changing in any way.
- The application was supported by the planning and conservation officers and it was very frustrating that the application was only at Committee as the reasons given for objections by the Parish Council were based on an objection from a neighbour and not on what had been submitted for approval, and following a great deal of work undertaken on the listed building to improve it.
- The measurements stated in the objections were not in the documentation and there had been no agreement to re-site the building as it was a pool room and was to be used as such and therefore would not be moved to another part of the garden.

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

- The distance between the proposed garden room and the boundary ranged from 2m – 4m due to the angle and the distance from Hepscoth Hall Cottage to the garden room would be 6m.
- The window was at a high level and not at eye level height. There had been no concerns regarding privacy from the window and therefore it had not been considered necessary for frosted glass to be provided. The area was heavily screened and a condition could be added regarding boundary maintenance to prevent any overlooking if Members so wished.
- It could not be confirmed how high the existing hedge was.

Councillor Wearmouth proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the report and with an additional condition, the wording of which to be delegated to the Director of Planning, to ensure the height of the boundary screening to be retained no less than 1.8m to protect amenity between Hepscoth Hall and Hepscoth Hall Cottage, which was seconded by Councillor Sanderson. A vote was taken and it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report with the additional condition, the wording of which to be delegated to the Director of Planning, to ensure the height of the

Ch.'s Initials.....



boundary screening to be retained no less than 1.8m to protect amenity between Hepscott Hall and Hepscott Hall Cottage.

Councillor Jackson left the meeting at this point.

47 **21/04413/FUL**

**Conversion of outbuildings to two holiday lets, repair/reconfiguring of third outbuilding for storage ancillary to Hall and landscaping including new car park and main entrance to south elevation of Hall  
South Hall, Ingoe, Newcastle Upon Tyne, Northumberland, NE20 0SR**

R Campbell, Senior Planning Officer provided a joint introduction to this application and application 21/0441/LBC with the aid of a power point presentation. The applications would be subject to a separate vote and no updates were provided.

Councillor Wearmouth proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Darwin. Councillor Jones, Ward Councillor advised that she would not be voting on the proposal. A vote was taken as follows: FOR 6; AGAINST 0; ABSTAIN 1.

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

48 **21/04414/LBC**

**Listed building consent for conversion of outbuildings to two holiday lets, repair/reconfiguring of third outbuilding for storage ancillary to Hall and landscaping including new car park and main entrance to south elevation of Hall  
Hall  
South Hall, Ingoe, Newcastle Upon Tyne, Northumberland, NE20 0SR**

An introduction to the report had been provided by R Campbell, Senior Planning Officer as part of the previous agenda item.

It was clarified that Listed Building Consent was not dealt with retrospectively and was classified as unauthorised works. The works which had already been undertaken were mainly re-roofing works to the outbuildings and work on the boundary walls, however the boundary walls were not listed.

Councillor Wearmouth proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Darwin. A vote was taken as follows:- FOR 7; AGAINST 0; ABSTAIN 1.

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

49 **APPEALS UPDATE**

Ch.'s Initials.....

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

A short recess was held at this point to allow officers to join the meeting.  
Councillors Sanderson and Dickson left the meeting at this point.

50 **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No questions had been submitted.

51 **PETITIONS**

**(a) Receive New Petitions** – no new petitions had been received.

**(b) Petitions Previously Received – Report provided on the petition against on-going planning issues and environmental destruction on land to the south of St Mary’s Park, Stannington.**

The report acknowledged the petition received from residents of St Mary’s Park in respect of on-going planning issues and requested Members to agree the Council’s response. An introduction to the report was provided by R Campbell, Senior Planning Officer who advised that since the planning permission had been granted in 2007 there had been a series of subsequent planning applications had been received and determined in response to alterations of house-types, layout and other material changes. Slides were also shown as part of the introduction.

She stated in response to the petition, that the Council fully accepted the residents’ upset and dissatisfaction at Bellway’s lack of compliance with these conditions and advised that the planning department had been working with Bellway for around 3 years now to resolve all of the outstanding matters. This had been a very complex and lengthy process due to the number of applications and variations of plans to consider. Paragraph 11 of the report detailed a change in circumstances since planning permission was granted with regards to the pavilion, which had resulted in Bellway being unable to meet the requirements of condition no. 10. This had impacted on the future development of the landscape and recreational areas of the site.

With regards to the SuDS area, the Lead Local Flood Authority had looked closely at the submitted plans and what was on site. They were satisfied that the expected requirements had been met with a small number of changes around some overgrown earth/grass being removed, which has been relayed to Bellway.

To address the matters of landscaping and the pavilion, planning officers and enforcement officers had continued discussions with Bellway and it had been agreed that they would submit two further applications, one to vary the wording of condition no. 10 to allow for a restoration scheme and/or the provision of playing fields; and two, a new application for the provision of a playing field, including pitch drainage and landscaping viewing mounds. Since compiling the report, those two applications had been received and validated and were open to public consultation. The planning department were working closely with the Council’s Ecologist to ensure the residents’ views were considered and the right outcome of

Ch.’s Initials.....

these proposals by Bellway would be achieved. Both applications would be brought before Members in due course.

D Flounders, the lead petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Committee. His comments included the following:-

- He clarified that he lived in the village and did not live in a Bellway home.
- The playing field area had been superseded by planning application 22/02923/FUL about which some residents had received letters. The new application negated the requirement for Bellway to reconstruct the pavilion it demolished, as well as install sports-grade drainage. It also removed the requirement to dispose of the construction spoil surrounding the perimeter which they refer to as viewing mounds, which were in fact just piles of rubble, plastic and clay soil, and as such should be subject to the relevant rules and regulations concerning construction waste. The area also formed part of a Grade II listed park and garden.
- In relation to the Suds scheme, and his main area of concern, this was supposed to alleviate the environmental disturbance from across the development and provide an area of open access to residents, however it had been closed off and used to illegally dump thousands of tonnes of construction waste both from this site and others and allowed to grow over. A discharge had now been submitted to effectively remove the proper footpaths and gated access available to the public. This had first been reported to the Environment Agency in 2019 and Bellway had subsequently received a S59 Enforcement Notice and were due to be prosecuted on 8 December 2022 related to waste imported from Five Mile Park.
- The issue had first been reported to NCC in May 2019 and had escalated through complaint stages 1 and 2 due to poor and conflicting information being received and had escalated to the Local Government Ombudsman and had been upheld due to poor communication, and nothing had changed.
- Multiple overlapping planning applications, confusion at NCC and the sheer timescale had led to a significant loss of amenity to the wider community and destruction to local environment.
- Construction waste as high as neighbouring properties rooflines remained across the area, which was not detailed on any plans and was not managed in line with any Waste Management Plan. The area was barren, inaccessible and unsuitable for walking, wildlife and plants and trees. This was an environmental crime and was clearly defined as waste in all industry guidance.
- Emails from NCC detailed the removal of this waste benefitting from permitted development when the development was finished and this had not happened. It was another complete breakdown of the planning system, planning enforcement process and waste management enforcement at both NCC and the Environment Agency letting down local residents and paving the way for developers to do what they wanted.
- The area needed to be landscaped properly, including top soil and levelling, and if the waste remained then it should be subject to proper planning consent and landfill tax.

Councillor Darwin, as the local Ward Councillor thanked Mr Flounders for raising

Ch.'s Initials.....

the residents' concerns stating that Bellway had dumped a lot of waste on the land and questioned what mitigation had been taken to get back to what was there previously. He advised that plans had been downgraded to those previously agreed and that play facilities should be accessible to all and also questioned what officers were going to do about the Suds issue.

L Sinnamon, Development Services Manager advised that as this was an open enforcement action case then many details could not be provided in open session. There was a long history and complicated web of applications and lots of changing iterations of applications, however the applicant was entitled to make applications to change consents and the current applications, one for the variation of conditions in relation to the provision of the pavilion and drainage and the other to provide funds rather than the pavilion need to go through the process and be brought to Committee for Members to debate and make a decision on. In relation to the Suds feature, the applicant had the opportunity to discharge conditions and was now aware of what these should look like and how they would work and planning officers were currently tracking this. The landscaping continued to fall short and work was ongoing with the applicant to see if it would be delivered. The Ecology Officer had inspected the site and did not want anything to be done to the detriment of the area and wished to be able to ensure the best environmental benefit for the area. It was preferred to try to resolve the issue rather than take enforcement action and deliver the type of landscaping the residents envisaged.

Members were mindful of the procedures which needed to be undertaken but developers needed to deliver on the promises they made and not to continuously submit requests for changes to conditions which eroded their original promises. Officers and the local Ward Councillor needed to ensure that the current applications came to Committee in order to see that developers could be held to account. Pressure must be put on the developer to expedite proceedings and to that end a further update report be provided to this Committee in March, after the planting season, on the progress made. The Ecologist would also be asked to attend this meeting.

**RESOLVED** that a further update report be provided to this Committee in March 2023.

**(c) Updates on Petitions previously received** – no updates were provided.

## 52 LOCAL SERVICES ISSUES

### Neighbourhood Services

P. Lowes, Neighbourhood Services Area Manager advised that the residual, recycling and garden waste collections continued to operate well with income from garden waste exceeding targets. Income from commercial waste and bulk collection had also exceeded targets. Bottle recycling facilities continued to receive extra collections due to increased use. There had been increased demand for bulky collections and domestic waste tonnages remained higher than normal and whilst operational adjustments had been made the situation remained

Ch.'s Initials.....

challenging.

There had been some staffing issues in relation to grass cutting but the core standard had been achieved. Work was now commencing on winter work schedules and early requests would be welcomed from Members. Normal schedules were continuing in relation to street sweeping however this would move to leaf hot spots shortly. Verge cutting had been completed county wide on target, however the kerbside food waste trial had been delayed due to supply chain issues in relation to vehicles, but was now scheduled to start in November.

In response to issues raised by Members, the following would be looked at:

Sun Inn/War Memorial

Road from Sun Inn to County Hall – debris in the middle of the road

Litter following verge cutting on Alcan Road

### **Highways**

M King, Highways Area Manager advised that all Covid restrictions had been removed however some rules remained to ensure good practice and protect frontline operatives. Reactive maintenance teams were continuing with Cat 1 works and were reported as up to date. Routine Inspections were ongoing and reported as on target by the end of October. Reactive third party requests were still running higher than any other areas and the backlog of works continued to be reduced.

Training had been completed for gully wagon drivers and productivity had seen an increase and should continue to rise. All drainage works identified and this year's programme should be ready to go by the end of October 2022.

The minor patching programme had been completed, with minor structural patching also completed across the Castle Morpeth Area. Details would be circulated to Members outside of the meeting.

A number of vacancies had become available, however as with other services within the County it was difficult to attract the level of skills set to ensure that a quality service could be delivered.

In relation to winter services grit bin were being filled and final preparations on going. Routes had been confirmed and teams fully trained and prepared to deliver the same quality service as previous years

Councillor Dodd raised the issue of road markings at the roundabout to join the A69 from Ponteland and also highlighted potential problems with Ash die back and how this could impact on the county's highways and would be requesting a plan on how this could be tackled at Council in November.

Councillor Towns advised that Ulgham Parish Council were continually reporting issues with road signs. He also reminded Officers of an issue at Colliery Row where a meeting had been held prior to Covid but had not progressed from that time.

Ch.'s Initials.....

Officers were thanked for their attendance.

### 53 **APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

Members were asked to confirm if they were happy to continue as the representatives of organisations as outlined on the agenda. H Lancaster, Senior Manager, Legal Services was also in attendance to present the report on the proposed appointments to the Stakeford and Bomarsund Sports and Social Welfare Centre. Councillor Wearmouth proposed acceptance of the recommendation as outlined in this report which was seconded by Councillor Dodd.

**RESOLVED** that:

1. County Councillors continued appointments on outside bodies as follows:

Choppington Education Foundation – M Murphy  
Druridge Bay Regeneration Partnership – S Dickinson  
Friends of Morpeth Museum – D Bawn  
Greater Morpeth Development Trust – R Wearmouth  
Linton Village Hall Management Committee – L Dunn  
Lynemouth Welfare Management committee – L Dunn  
Stakeford/Bomarsund Social Welfare Centre – J Foster and M Murphy

2. The following Parish Councillors be appointed to the Stakeford and Bomarsund Social Welfare Centre in addition to the two County Councillors above:

Councillor Paul S Vaughan  
Councillor Hillary Allsopp  
Councillor Arthur Iley  
Councillor Graham Huntley

### 54 **MEMBERS LOCAL IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES**

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

### 55 **CASTLE MORPETH LOCAL AREA COUNCIL WORK PROGRAMME**

The Chair advised that the work programme was for information and should Members wish to ask for any items to be added to the agenda, then they contact either himself or Democratic Services.

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

### 56 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next full meeting of the Local Area Council was scheduled for 4.00 pm on

Ch.'s Initials.....

Monday 14 November.

**CHAIR**.....

**DATE**.....

Ch.'s Initials.....