

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

NORTH NORTHUMBERLAND LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At a meeting of the **North Northumberland Local Area Council** held at Northern View (previously known as the Jubilee Club), Highcliffe, Spittal, Berwick-Upon-Tweed, TD15 2JL on Thursday, 21 March 2019 at 2.00pm

PRESENT

Councillor G. Castle
(Chair, in the Chair, items 170 - 172 and 183 - 192)

Councillor T. Thorne
(Planning Vice-chair, in the Chair, items 173 - 182)

MEMBERS

T. Clark (part)
G. Hill
R. Moore
A. Murray
W. Pattison

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

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

| | |
|----------------|---|
| S. Aviston | Head of School Organisation and Resources |
| M. Bird | Senior Democratic Services Officer |
| J. Blenkinsopp | Lawyer |
| G. Bucknall | Highways Delivery Area Manager |
| M. Bulman | Lawyer |
| V. Cartmell | Principal Planning Officer |
| G. Fairs | Highways Development Manager |
| G. Gavin | Head of Neighbourhood Services |
| B. Hodgson | Neighbourhood Services Area Manager |
| T. Kirsop | Community Regeneration Manager |
| T. Lowe | Senior Planning Officer |
| I. McCaffery | Building Conservation Officer |
| C. McDonagh | Planning Officer |
| C. McEvoy-Carr | Executive Director of Adult Social Care and Children's Services |
| R. McKenzie | Senior Programmes Officer (Highways Improvement) |
| R. Murfin | Director of Planning |
| J. Sharp | Planning Officer |
| E. Sinnamon | Senior Planning Manager |

Ch.'s Initials.....

D. Muscatelli, M. Stoneman - Highways England

30 members of the public and one member of the press were also in attendance at 2.00pm, and 55 members of the public and one member of the press were also in attendance at 6.00pm.

(Councillor Castle in the chair)

170. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bridgett and Lawrie. Councillor Roughead had advised Democratic Services that he would be arriving late.

171. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of North Northumberland Local Area Council held on Thursday, 21 February 2019, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair, subject to being amended to state that in minute 164, for application 18/03290/FUL the motion to have a site visit for application was moved by Councillor Pattison, not Councillor Moore.

173. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor Moore declared a personal and prejudicial interest in relation to application 18/02965/OUT and left the meeting whilst it was discussed.

(Councillor Thorne in the chair.)

174. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

175. 18/03290/FUL

Change of Use of land to accommodate the siting of 5no glamping pods (as amended 17/09/18)

Link End Caravan Park, Alnmouth, Northumberland

The application was introduced by Planning Officer Jon Sharp, who firstly provided a number of updates. The application had been deferred at the last meeting for the receipt of additional information and undertake a site visit; the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Partnership had written to confirm that they had no objection subject to the two additional conditions requiring the submission of a site management plan and ensuring that no additional paraphernalia was allowed on the

site; they were content that a satisfactory level of control existed over the site and the proposal marked an improvement as currently there was no such control. Alnmouth Parish Council had now also responded to confirm that they supported the application. The rights of way team had confirmed that there was a claim to rights of way over the track; three objections had been received, and additional evidence was required before the rights of way team would decide whether they supported the claim or not. Mr Sharp then continued introducing the application with the aid of a slides presentation.

Councillor Shuan Whyte then spoke on behalf of Alnmouth Parish Council, of which his key points were:

- the parish council had met with Alnmouth Golf Club and the applicant to discuss and agreed at their parish meeting on 12 March to support the application; they recognised the concerns of the golf club, but noted that the landowner welcomed the use and vehicles were limited to buggies and green keepers
- any additional risk was negligible; it was illogical and unreasonable to stop the business from continuing what it had been provided during the summer; it was not necessary to limit to a 12 month approval
- one issue for clarification regarded whether keys for an access gate could be retained by the golf club and applicant?

Dale Maloney then spoke in support of the application, of which his key points were:

- thanks were expressed for the site visit undertaken members who knew the location would have been able to how it would improve the site
- he had spoken to the golf club and would meet to further discuss the need for site users to be respectful to golfing activities
- they had worked closely with the AONB Partnership and the proposal was supported by Leader funding.
- the proposal would have a low impact, help support their local gallery and bring greater diversity in tourism.

Members then asked questions to which officers clarified that the need for any risk assessment was not a material planning reason. It was a civil matter for public liability cover for owners of the site and other users. The site had an existing lawful use and a public right of way. It was further explained that the query regarding a gate and padlock was not a planning issue but one for the applicant and golf club to confirm, but no public right of way should be blocked.

Councillor Moore moved that the application be granted in accordance with the officer's recommendation in the report; he added that the visit had assisted address the concerns raised, the AONB Partnership were satisfied and the access issue had been clarified. This was seconded by Councillor Watson.

Discussion followed during which the key points from members were:

- there had been a very good turnout at the visit, which helped members understand the site
- the good neighbourliness between the applicant and golf club was welcomed
- hopefully the business would succeed; it was important for Alnmouth's economy, and tourism was one of the biggest jobs in the county
- it was better to have a 12 rather than a six month operation each year.

The motion was put to the vote and was agreed by eight votes in support to two abstentions, so it was thus:

RESOLVED that the application be GRANTED subject to the conditions in the report and subject to a S106 agreement securing a contribution towards the Council's Coastal Mitigation Service.

176. 18/01164/OUT

Hybrid Application - Demolition of Reservoir, Full application for Conversion of Pumping Station for up to 6 Apartments and Outline application with Access, Layout and Scale for the Erection of 4 Dwellings - Amended 16/07/18 _ 28/11/18 Former Water Works, Dock Road, Tweedmouth, Northumberland

The application was introduced by Senior Planning Officer Tony Lowe, who firstly provided a number of updates: there was a typographical error on condition 23, number 4 - the first word should read 'The'. Also, an objector had submitted additional comments - copies of this email were circulated at the meeting. (Members then read the email at the meeting. Copy attached to the official minutes of the meeting.)

Mr Lowe then continued introducing the application with details to the background to the application including the original outline application considered in July 2018 and the update due to November's meeting as a result of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which had to be withdrawn due to legal issues. The proposal was then amended to become a hybrid application and deferred for a site visit at the Local Area Council's meeting on 24 January. Mr Lowe also continued introducing further details the aid of a slides presentation.

Margaret Thomas then spoke in objection to the application, of which her key points were:

- There should have been separate applications for the two elements of the scheme so each could be dealt with separately on their own merits
- the reservoir site part lacked information, which meant that the impact on the Conservation Area could not be assessed
- the proposal was incongruous with the local area; most local buildings were shops or two storey terraces, not any semi detached properties as proposed by this application. Terraced housing instead would have better complimented the pump house and enhanced the streetscape
- any proposal would impact on the Conservation Area; the waterworks site made a positive contribution to the area. Any new buildings should sustain and enhance such a heritage asset
- St. Boisil's Residents Association objected about its scale, form and materials.

Kathryn Simpson then spoke in support of the application, of which her key points were:

- the application had been voted for both times it had been presented to the Local Area Council. Work had taken place with local groups and councillors to scope the project and address any issues
- Northumbrian Water Limited was subject to regulatory duties under the Water Industry Act including achieving best value for their assets

- more detail including the designs for the housing would follow at the reserved matters stage
- it was a sustainable development that would bring a disused site back into use after 25 years.

Members then asked questions to which officers responded, of which the key details were:

- sufficient information had been submitted regarding preserving and enhancing the Conservation Area. There were several detached and semi-detached properties on Dock Road; some were set back from the road. The application would preserve the architectural interests of the pump house and bring it back into use, which would help maintain the Conservation Area
- ideally there should have been two parking places per property. The applicant had submitted one for each so the Highways Authority had to consider if this would cause a negative impact. The site visit demonstrated that on street car parking already took place; the development would increase the numbers but there was no evidence that this would cause actual harm. Two way traffic could pass and there was no accident history in the area. There was no evidence of possible harm from the proposal that would justify refusing the application on highways grounds
- there would be space for four vehicles on the street outside the properties, but spaces were not allocated as there was no right to a space on the highway
- access, layout and scale were all within this outline application. Further details including external appearance and landscaping would follow at the reserved matters stage
- if consideration was to be given to putting yellow lines on the seaward side to address parking concerns, it would not be within the scope of this application to do so. There were currently no proposals for any such restrictions at the location
- there was no planning law basis to refuse the application on the basis that it was outline; sufficient information was considered to have been received to determine the application
- such hybrid applications were unusual; the Building Conservation Officer had agreed that the principle of the development was acceptable and would give their views on the additional detail when it was received at the next stage. Condition 23 was important as it stipulated the scale and massing. All aspects would be presented at the reserved matters stage.

Councillor Moore moved that the application be granted in accordance with the officer's recommendation in the report, which was seconded by Councillor Castle.

Discussion followed during which the key points from members were:

- the look of the streetscape was spoilt by setting the housing back from the road
- the area had other types of buildings including the neighbouring fish factory
- setting back the semi detached properties actually helped emphasise the architectural attractions of the pump house
- the neighbouring Goody Patch was protected by a number of tree preservation orders
- there were no reasons to refuse at this stage without seeing the detail; members would assess details of the proposed buildings at the next stage.

The motion was put to the vote and agreed by eight votes in support to two abstentions, so it was thus:

RESOLVED that the Interim Director of Planning Services be authorised to GRANT permission subject to the listed conditions and: a legal agreement pursuant to s106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following contributions: Coastal mitigation contribution of £600 per dwelling (£6,000 total).

177. 18/03961/FUL

Erection of 3 dwellings with vehicular access and boundary treatments (amended 28th February 2019).

Signal Cottage, Island View, Amble, Morpeth, Northumberland, NE65 0SF

The application was introduced by Planning Officer Chris McDonagh, who firstly provided three updates. A response regarding coastal erosion had been submitted by the Lead Local Flood Authority, who did not object. A new condition required service lines to the properties be underground; members were asked to incorporate it into the recommendation; the final wording of the condition needed to be delegated to officers. A further letter of objection had been received, which raised concerns already raised in previous objections. Mr McDonagh then continued introducing the application with the aid of a slide presentation.

Louise Little then spoke in objection to the application, of which her key points were:

- the application appeared to a disguised business venture; would they actually remain as residential dwellings? It was easy to blur the use from C3 to C1 - they were likely to become holiday lets
- it was located in a site of special scientific interest. The area had a number of old mines and sinkholes were common; one had opened up 200m from the site in 2018
- the numbers of second homes were now restricted in other areas on the Northumberland coast. The Amble area could soon be impacted by high levels of second homes
- the only police reports about antisocial behaviour locally concerned fly tipping on public land
- the local GP Practice was struggling to keep up with the demand on their services due to increasing population of Amble
- the 1.5m lowering of the structure should not happen. The previous structure had been a prefabricated building. The proposal was totally out of keeping with the area. There was no provision for footpaths. The proposal was twice the footprint of the original building and could impact on the coastline for future generations.

Nicola Allen then spoke in support of the application, of which her key points were:

- this was a new scheme and should not be confused with previous ones. It was not in the area of outstanding natural beauty and not set any precedent. The applicant was not a property developer nor proposed holiday lets; they were a family from Newcastle who had spent time on the coast all their lives and planned to make it their home. They had tried to engage with Amble Town Council. It was a 1.5 story building of three cottages

- over three years, nine planning officers had been involved with the site and each one had supported development there. No technical objections had been received. It was previously developed land. There was no policy basis for Amble Town Council's objection about development on the coastal strip
- objectors had repeated points from the previous application which included many inaccuracies. Most objected to the previous proposal for a tower, which was not included in this application. It was not within the AONB nor would it set any precedent for Low Hauxley
- it had a good, modern design and took reference from coastal architecture, using local stone, weatherboarding, shallow broken roofs and white render
- the dunes had suffered significant antisocial behaviour problems. For security reasons, the applicant did not want only one house; having more than one house would help dispel antisocial behaviour. The CCTV on site would be made available to the police; such monitoring would improve the area
- there was no policy basis for resisting having one house on the site. It had a bespoke design and worked for the site.

Members then asked questions to which officers responded, of which the key details were:

- from an ecological point of view, the extra 0.5m depth was not expected to have any effect on safeguarding the dunes
- the telephone pylon to the properties had been reduced in height compared to previous applications
- the presence of sink holes was not a material planning reason; the applicant had to be satisfied that there was sufficient stability to build on the site
- condition 10 required planting to soften the boundary
- the previous building on the site had been demolished without permission, permission was requested by the Local Planning Authority but not essential in every case
- the dog proof fence was included as the local area had special protection for birds and other wildlife.

Councillor Clark moved that the application be granted in accordance with the officer's recommendation in the report with an additional condition to be included regarding service lines to the properties to be underground, with wording of the same delegated to officers; he considered that the design and structure would blend locally; the development would safeguard the dunes and the height reduction was welcomed. This was seconded by Councillor Castle.

Discussion followed during which the key points from members were:

- the proposal would embrace rather than compete with the local setting
- 2,000 houses were coming to Amble but there was nothing in the NPPF to stop this proposal
- this application was an improvement on the previous one and the applicant had worked so it fit in with the local area
- Amble Town Council was happy that the tower proposed in the last application was not included in this development
- local residents' concerns were acknowledged, but Amble had a very low level of second homes, unlike villages like Beadnell; a member would reluctantly support it for these reasons

- a member did not support the design and considered it an overdevelopment of the site
- the applicant had worked hard to accommodate the proposal and the 1.5m height would assist; it was in a very prominent site, and design was a subjective judgement
- as a seaside home, the benefits and attractions of the proposal were clear.

The motion was put to the vote and was agreed by eight votes in support to two abstentions, so it was thus:

RESOLVED that the application be GRANTED subject to the conditions in the report and delegation to officers for the additional agreed condition for the underground service lines and completion of a s106 agreement to secure a contribution of £1800 to the Coastal Mitigation Service.

(3.30pm: Councillor Moore left the meeting in advance of application 18/02965/OUT being considered.)

178. 18/02965/OUT

**Outline application with all matters reserved for the demolition of an existing building and redevelopment with up to 5 no. residential properties
Christon Bank Farm, Christon Bank, Alnwick, Northumberland, NE66 3EZ**

The application was introduced by Principal Planning Officer Vivienne Cartmell with the aid of a slides presentation.

Craig Ross then spoke in support of the application, of which his key points were:

- all the proposed refusal reasons regarded the receipt of technical information; there were no reasons to refuse the application in principle. Details would be provided for all the requirements that currently were listed for refusing the application: these included land contamination, noise, impact on the listed building and surface water. Details for the landscape impact would be addressed at the reserved matters stage
- there was no settlement boundaries in the Alnwick area and sustainability was not only judged on the location of a proposal - the recent successful appeal at Rock was a case in point
- the principle of establishing a hierarchy of development needs was out of date. There was no longer a need to establish a need for a development and the new NPPF did not require sequential tests
- the site had previously been developed, and redevelopment would be beneficial; further details would follow at the reserved matters stage anyway. Members should visit the site to consider it in the absence of settlement boundaries plus in the context of the out of date policies referred to.

Councillor Pattison moved that the application be deferred for a site visit; it was being recommended for refusal due to a lack of information yet to be provided, and members would benefit by seeing the site for themselves. This was seconded by Councillor Watson.

The motion was put to the vote and it was agreed unanimously that it be:

RESOLVED that the application be DEFERRED for a site visit.

(3.37pm: Councillor Moore then returned to the meeting.)

179. 18/04313/REM

**Reserved matters application for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for approved planning application 16/01871/OUT
Land East Of Dovecrag, Plot 4, Hillside, Rothbury, Northumberland**

The application was introduced by Mr Lowe, who firstly updated that a further letter of support had been received; it had been uploaded to the planning portal and copies had been circulated at the meeting, which members read (copy of email attached to the official minutes of the meeting). Mr Lowe then continued introducing the application with the aid of a slides presentation; he explained that the application had been called to the Local Area Council for consideration by the local member, who had since withdrawn his request but as this was late the application remained on the agenda to be determined. Mr Lowe also provided a sample of the pre-weathered timber proposed to be used.

Jane Davis then spoke in support of the application, of which her key points were:

- the house was for she and her husband to retire to. The proposal would have a minimal impact on the environment and surrounding landscape
- the pre-weathered timber to be used was subtle and would blend better locally than stone. There were a variety of styles locally, so there would not be issues with the design blending with other properties amongst the nine self build plots. Houses opposite included a mock Tudor design and also four three-storey stone clad town houses
- the house would follow the contours of the slope and use recycled stone. There would be limited visibility from the road as the building would be well set back. The timber frame and cladding were acceptable future looking materials
- the process had taken three years' work to get to this point
- plots 2, 3 and 5 all had similar designs.

Members then asked questions to which officers responded, of which the key details were:

- the local member had withdrawn his objection to the application as clarification had since been provided that other similar nearby properties were to use such materials
- it was not the determination of the application that had taken three years; an outline application had been agreed in 2016 and there had been a pause in progress whilst the road was stabilised
- only one objection had been received and Rothbury Parish Council had not commented
- it was the first of nine self build plots at the location to be developed.

Councillor Moore moved that the application be granted subject to the conditions in the report; he commented that it had a very good design and commended the applicant. This motion was seconded by Councillor Renner-Thompson.

The Chair referred to queries he had received from residents about how to ensure minimal disruption to local residents during the construction of self build plots, as this different to how larger scale sites developed. He clarified that the Building Control service had a role to ensure that developments were built to requirements with little interference to local residents, but that was not a planning matter.

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

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

180. 18/04397/FUL

Change of use of part of existing dwelling house into a self contained three bed holiday letting unit; retention of 3 no garden pods for use as garden storage purposes only (Retrospective).

1 Thornbrae, Alnmouth Road, Alnwick, Northumberland, NE66 2PS

The application was introduced by Mr McDonagh. He firstly updated members that the description of the application needed to be amended to remove reference to the three garden pods, which did not need planning permission as they were used for storage. Furthermore, permission for a change of use was needed because this application concerned the subdivision of a house for different uses. Mr McDonagh then continued with the aid of a slides presentation, with reference also to the site visit undertaken on 18 March 2019.

Members then asked questions to which officers explained that if the applicant had let out the whole house as a bed and breakfast facility, they would not have needed permission for change of use. However as they had walled off part of the house to separately use it as a bed and breakfast it needed planning so that the additional unit could be controlled. The pods were now not within the scope of this application so should not be debated.

Councillor Castle moved that the application be granted subject to the conditions in the report as he saw no reason to refuse and did not agree with Alnwick Town Council's view. This was seconded by Councillor Moore.

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

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

181. 18/04312/FUL

Construction of a new 3 bedroom dwelling

Land East Of Knocklaw Cottage, Rothbury, Northumberland, NE65 7XQ

It was noted that this application had been withdrawn from the agenda.

182. 18/04432/LBC

Listed building consent for essential conservation and structural repairs (Amended Site Location Plan 24.01.2019)

Union Chain Bridge, Horncliffe, Northumberland

The application was introduced by Mrs Cartmell with the aid of a slides presentation.

Members then asked questions to which officers responded, of which the key details were:

- it was within members' remit to consider County Council applications. Members would only be prejudiced if they had an individual interest debarring them from participating
- such applications could be considered by either the Local Area Council or the Strategic Planning Committee. In the interests of timely determination the application was being presented to this meeting. The highways service needed permission sooner in order to apply for lottery funding
- one objection had been received about the proposed relocation of the sign; however this proposal had been withdrawn and the sign would be remaining now in its original position.

Councillor Watson moved that the application be granted in accordance with the officer's recommendation in the report, which was seconded by Councillor Pattison.

Members welcomed the development, the importance of the bridge and keeping it open to traffic. The motion was put to the vote and agreed unanimously, so it was thus:

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

183. Planning Appeals

Members received information on the progress of planning appeals.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

(The meeting then adjourned at 4.20pm. Councillor Clark exited the meeting. Councillor Castle then returned to the chair from 6.00pm for the remainder of the meeting.)

OTHER LOCAL AREA COUNCIL BUSINESS

184. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Members could ask questions of the Local Area Council, which could be received in writing in advance of the meeting or raised at the meeting. Questions could be asked about issues for which the Council had a responsibility.

Carole Murrayson, local resident, on behalf of A Better Hospital for Berwick Campaign, asked if the Health and Wellbeing Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) had ever either stopped an issue from being further investigated, called in or stopped a development?

Councillor Watson, as chair of the Health and Wellbeing OSC responded. All items on the OSC's agendas were items called that the committee either was required to look at or issues that they decided to investigate. The committee then scrutinised whether they agreed or not with what NHS organisations proposed. The committee could not stop NHS developments, but they could refer some matters to the

Secretary of State for Health. For example, the committee was concerned about the suspension of dental services in the Rothbury and Hadston areas, and asked NHS England to provide updates regularly to the committee so members could keep track of the resolution of the issue. Northumbria NHS Foundation Trust would need to present an update to the committee when proposals were developed for the new Berwick Hospital. Democratic Services had contacted the Trust that day asking when the update could be provided. The committee would support receiving the update and members had to impartially assess what was proposed so could not make any judgement yet about what was proposed for the hospital.

Councillor Hill, as local member added that the previous proposal for a joint leisure and hospital development in Berwick had been agreed but then dropped due to the strength of public opinion. No update had since been provided about plans for the hospital, and it was also news that the current site was now to be reconsidered. There was a high level of local concern about what was happening and an update was needed.

Democratic Services would further follow up the request for an update with Northumbria NHS Foundation Trust.

Jen McClean, local resident asked about bidding arrangements for the site of the hospital. The Chair responded that there might be commercial sensitivities about this but clarity would be sought about the next steps to get an update as soon as possible. This would be raised with both the Council's chief executive and Northumbria Healthcare.

Kirsty Jamieson, local resident asked if the Health and Wellbeing OSC were all lay members or whether they had any medical training/background. She asked if members were able to take decisions if they were not health professionals and whether they just accepted reports on the presumption they were presented by health experts. She felt that local health services were being stripped away.

The Chair explained that elected members were all lay people who made judgements on the issues presented to them. Councillor Watson explained that members were elected and then appointed to council committees which then met to judge whether reports/proposals were in the interests of their communities and listen to the evidence of experts. The same principle applied when members considered planning applications like earlier in this meeting; members received presentations from planning professionals and made their own judgments on proposals. Councillor Hill added that scrutiny skills were very important, so that members challenged experts and the basis of their proposals.

Gordon McClean, local resident stressed the campaign group's aim to get the best hospital for Berwick, in light of concerns about services, and asked elected representatives to commit to keeping asking questions and pursuing their concerns. The two local Berwick county councillors said they would and added that they were meeting the Council's chief executive to discuss this further on 22 March.

Mr McClean also asked how an integrated health/leisure services facility would work, as residents preferred a standalone hospital? Councillor Watson confirmed that the current position was to develop a standalone hospital; the joint proposal had since

been discontinued. Local councillors would continue to represent residents' views during this process.

Jannette Beresford, local resident expressed concern that no further information was available about the hospital and asked what the timescale was for developing it. The Chair explained that it was still early in the process for this but progress would be made.

Geoff Thomas, local resident stressed the importance of involving the staff who delivered health services in the planning about how their future delivery. It was essential that everybody involved in planning such services understood how important the leisure centre, school and hospital were to the Berwick community.

A local resident asked about what health service partnerships/arrangements existed with the Scottish Borders Council. Further points were also made about how Berwick was equidistant between the Borders Hospital and Northumbria Specialist Emergency Care Hospital and the issues this raised for treatment and access to maternity services.

Members considered that more could be done to coordinate between the two and there had been more joint working previously. Members also acknowledged that the Scottish NHS was a different organisation and expressed concern about their level of engagement, but this was due to national policy/arrangements. It was agreed that a written response would be requested, to include Northumbria Healthcare's input.

Mike Maud, local resident asked about the latest position on the future of Berwick Academy. The Chair indicated that a verbal update was later on the agenda and Mr Maud would be able to ask questions.

The Chair referred to a written answer provided for Lynne Roxburgh in response to a question Ms Roxburgh had submitted about parking fines in Alnwick. Ms Roxburgh was not in attendance at the meeting. Copies were circulated at the meeting (copy attached to official minutes).

At this point, as the meeting was approaching three hours in length it was RESOLVED to suspend standing orders to allow the meeting to continue beyond three hours in duration.

185. URGENT BUSINESS (IF ANY)

With the agreement of the Chair, by reason of special circumstances, the following item was brought forward on the agenda and considered as a matter of urgency as consultation on the matter was due to conclude before the Local Area Council's next meeting.

A1 Dualling in North Northumberland

Dino Muscatelli and Mark Stoneman of Highways England provided a detailed presentation about A1 dualling in north Northumberland. (Copy of presentation attached to the official minutes of the meeting.)

The key details/headlines of the presentation were:

- the roads investment strategy from 2014 included a £290m fund to improve the A1 in Northumberland, to be delivered by Highways England
- the dualling of Morpeth to Felton and Alnwick to Ellingham, and highways improvement works north of Ellingham
- the objectives of the scheme: provide safer, more reliable journeys for local people, visitors, hauliers and agricultural users; improved times and journey reliability; provide safe access and egress points for vehicles; promote economic development within the region; and improve access to and from the wider region for local people and businesses
- the preferred route analysis announcement in September 2017 and work undertaken since
- Alnwick to Ellingham currently and proposals to develop it: details of proposals north of Denwick junction, Broxfield overbridge, Heckley Fence south of Charlton Mires junction; Charlton Mires junction; Eastlink Hall Access Road
- the process to follow: consultation from February 2019, a development consent order at the end of 2019, the beginning of construction from mid 2021 and the scheme opening to traffic from 2023.

In response to a question Mr Stoneham provided details of the proposed 11 junction improvements north of Ellingham, which were currently at the feasibility stage. Work would be due to begin on them by the end of March 2020.

A member expressed concern about safety at the Guyzance crossing; accidents there had claimed 12 lives in recent years. Members were advised that this was not within the scope of the proposed work, but this request would be fed back to Highways England.

(6.58pm: Councillor Roughead arrived at the meeting.)

Responses to other queries from members and the public included:

- the proposed development would deliver an additional 15 miles of dual carriageway
- it was difficult to estimate how much quicker journeys would be after the improvements were made, as that might depend on traffic volume/conditions, but the reliability of journeys was expected to increase too
- it was not Highways England's decision not to dual the A1 between Ellingham and Berwick in this project. The government stipulated how money should be spent, and Highways England then developed designs to implement the proposals
- Highways England were currently working on preliminary designs. Details of proposed road closures were expected by the end of December 2019. Two way traffic had to continue to be provided and road closures should be kept to a minimum plus be at night time. Highways England would ensure that local communities and parish councils were aware of any arrangements.

Other points raised for Highways England to consider were:

- consideration needed to be given to roads to be used for diversions when work commenced; some routes might require repairs to potholes, which would

provide more risk and cost to drivers and the County Council - this would be raised with the County Council at the appropriate time

- Beale junction could be dangerous, especially as traffic increased on roads - this needed to be reported back to Highways England
- Lowick was a regular diversionary route when there were roadworks on the A1, which caused road wear/damage
- there had been a failure to communicate to residents in the Belford area about local road closures back in February 2018. It was essential that such changes were publicised so residents knew in advance what the likely impact would be
- rerouting as a result of road closures could also have a critical impact on staff and residents' access to hospitals, so it was essential that the necessary communications were organised.

The Chair thanked Mr Muscatelli and Mr Stoneman for their presentation and welcomed that proposals were developing.

RESOLVED that the information be noted and members' comments on the proposals be reported back to Highways England.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

186. BERWICK ACADEMY / EDUCATION UPDATE

This item was also brought forward on the agenda at the Chair's discretion.

The Executive Director of Adult Social Care and Children's Services and Head of School Organisation and Resources were in attendance to provide a verbal update about funding for Berwick Academy and other educational / children services matters relevant to North Northumberland.

The key points from the update were:

- £15 million funding for improvements to Berwick Academy had recently been announced. Much work was now needed to take this forward, and a visioning event would be held in April 2019 to consider possible options
- it would be financed differently to the Duchess' School, which had received central government Private Finance Initiative (PFI) funding
- the six month timescale identified for discussing and developing ideas for the work
- it was difficult to estimate how long the process would take to plan, procure and then build. Hopefully it would be completed in time for the 2022/23 academic year
- it was highlighted that the project, through the contract would encourage the use the local labour market as far as possible, to include both junior and higher level apprenticeships.

Discussion followed during which the following points were raised:

- regarding whether £15m was realistic for a new build or more likely to just modify the existing building, members were advised that a minimum of £15m had been committed; options would be scoped including feasibility factors

- the Alnwick proposal had been developed for a three tier system then but had to be extended to accommodate the two tier structure that was agreed afterwards
- the County Council could not become a sponsor of Berwick Academy, but was uniquely investing in the school this way. All involved were working together for the benefit of children regardless of the school structures involved. As the school was an academy, Berwick Academy had invited the Council in to help - the Council could only intervene by law when the school or sponsor asked. The Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC) could not subcontract school improvement to the local authority nor could the local authority legally bring the school back within their maintenance. Much work had taken place with the Regional Schools Commissioner about how to support Berwick Academy
- the Opportunity North East Programme enabled the targeting of specific schools for intervention
- if the education provision improved, fewer children would leave to go to other schools and the budget could be more easily balanced
- funding was also in place for James Calvert Spence College for modernisation work. An outline business case was being developed for this aim.

A member added that the situation also impacted on other schools which fed in to Berwick Academy. For example, some children left Glendale Middle School early at the end of year 7 to go to the Duchess' High School, but Glendale would benefit if students stayed there until the end of year 8.

Other points from residents included:

- thanks expressed for the time, money, resources and advice provided to support Berwick Academy going forward
- Berwick Academy's new headteacher was doing a great job and understood the challenges faced
- significant progress was being made but there were other challenges and difficulties to work through. By 2022/23, three cohorts of current students would have left the school, so it was important to ensure that those children who would not benefit from the result of the £15m investment were supported with other support/available measures
- concerns about problems with Berwick Academy going back to 2013, including a previous lack of open and honest approach nor engagement with the local community.

To conclude, the Chair thanked Ms McEvoy-Carr and Ms Aviston for their attendance and the assurance about the work taking place to address the issues. Officers were engaging with the public by attending this meeting and the school was trying very hard to improve and move forward.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

187. PETITIONS

(a) New Petitions:

No new petitions were received.

Ch.'s Initials.....

(b) Reports on petitions previously received:

Members considered a report regarding residents request to remove speed cushions from Allerburn Lea in Alnwick (attached to the official minutes as Appendix B).

It was noted that the lead petitioner was unable to attend the meeting and there was not anybody else representing the petitioners. The lead petitioner had been sent a copy of the report when the agenda for this meeting was published, and would also further a letter detailing the outcome of this meeting's consideration of the petition.

Reference was made to how Alnwick Town Council had also considered the petition but not supported the request. Members supported the conclusions of the report, so it was:

RESOLVED that

- (1) the contents of the report be noted; and
- (2) support be expressed for the decision that traffic calming measures should remain in place and the petitioners' request be declined.

(c) Updates on petitions previously considered:

An update had been due also about the Berwick evening bus service, following on from the Local Area Council's previous consideration of a petition to Border Buses; a written note would be circulated to members after the meeting.

188. LOCAL SERVICES ISSUES

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

Technical Services Update from Graham Bucknall:

- the Local Transport Plan (LTP) resurfacing work for 2018/19 had been completed since the last meeting: details were provided including work at Chathill Crossing Northumberland Avenue and North Road in Berwick, Bilton Barns, Shilbottle, Whittingham and Alnwick
- structural patching work had been undertaken - examples were provided of work at Lowick, Warkworth, Berwick, and current work between Newton on the Moor to Longframlington, plus Callaly Road
- the car parks at Craster and Seahouses had been completed.

Members then raised the following key points:

- the Newton on the Moor to Swarland work and investment was welcomed
- residents were pleased that the white lines from Hampeth to Shilbottle had been undertaken
- it was noted that local residents had rejected a proposal for Felton

- work would take place to check on issues reported about drains in Northumberland Avenue in Berwick
- it would be confirmed after the meeting when the repairs due for Ravensdowne in Berwick would be undertaken
- a request was made to check the condition of the U road to Shieldfield Farm near Shilbottle
- clarification was requested about when work for Cow Road and Prince Edward Road in Berwick would be undertaken
- discussion would take place with both Alnwick county councillors and Alnwick Town Council about the project work for The Cobbles
- a problem with water seeping into residents' gardens from Seahouses car park being floodwater was being addressed
- much positive feedback had been received about the Chathill Crossing repairs.

Neighbourhood Services Update from Bob Hodgson:

- winter maintenance work was completing and pre-season grass cuts were being organised
- community litter picks organised
- maintenance work continued on gateways to towns including bulb planting, plus much work on weed killing
- Another two new refuse vehicles had been delivered, which had rear steer and provide better access
- the refurbishment work to Bamburgh's toilets was expected to be completed by 26 April or sooner
- Seahouses' toilets were being painted and deep cleaned.

Members then raised the following key points:

- could footpaths be scrubbed in Magdalene Fields in Warkworth as moss was making them very slippery?
- litter cleaning on the A1 was very important; members were advised that a new badge system had been introduced which enabled workforce to be inducted and able to access the A1 to do the work. Much work had taken place recently in particular the junctions by Scremerston, Haggerston and Denwick. £50,000 government funding had been received for littering picking of which Alnwick was receiving £5,000. Equipment was paid for by the funding and available for accredited groups to use

A member also provided clarification about the River Tweed Commission's fishing and mineral rights and the Crown Estate's role.

Mr Bucknall and Mr Hodgson were thanked for their attendance and it was:

RESOLVED that the information be noted and issues raised by members be followed up by Local Services.

(a) Environmental Enforcement and Environmental Campaigns Update

The Local Area Council had received a report on dog control enforcement and the Green Dog Walkers Campaign in September 2018. The report provided an update on environmental enforcement and the Council's environmental campaigns.

(Report attached to the official minutes as Appendix C.) Regular updates would continue to be provided.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

INFORMATION ITEMS

189. MEMBERS' LOCAL IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES 2018/19

Members received a progress update on Members' Local Improvement Schemes during 2018/19 as at 1 March 2019. (Report attached to the official minutes as Appendix D.)

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

190. BERWICK REGENERATION COMMISSION

This was a standing item on the agenda for verbal updates. The Community Regeneration Manager explained that a public consultation about the new leisure centre had recently taken place at the Swan Leisure Centre, and another would be taking place at Berwick Workspace on 23 March. The Council had not been successful with its bid to the Future High Street Fund, but would be continuing with a bid for more funding. The heads of terms for the Borderland Deal was also expected in June or July 2019.

In response to a question it was clarified that the bid to a funding pot of £55m was a separate process being run by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. A decision was expected around June 2019.

RESOLVED that the update be noted.

191. LOCAL AREA COUNCIL WORK PROGRAMME

Members noted the latest version of agreed items for future Local Area Council meetings; any suggestions for new agenda items required confirmation by the Business Chair after the meeting. (List attached to the official minutes as Appendix E.)

RESOLVED that the work programme be noted.

192. FUTURE MEETINGS

Members noted dates of future meetings as agreed by the County Council on 20 February 2019; all would be on Thursdays scheduled to begin at 3.00pm, although the start times were subject to change. It was further noted that the next meeting on Thursday, 18 April 2019, at St. James' Church Centre, Alnwick, would begin at the earlier time of 1.00pm.

● 18 April 2019

● 21 November 2019

Ch.'s Initials.....

- 23 May 2019
- 20 June 2019
- 18 July 2019
- 22 August 2019
- 19 September 2019
- 17 October 2019

- 19 December 2019
- 23 January 2020
- 20 February 2020
- 19 March 2020
- 23 April 2020
- 21 May 2020.

CHAIR.....

DATE.....