<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Officers present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 members of the public</td>
<td>K Bartlett, I Billham, M Bird, L Hayward, M Robinson, J Seaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Cooper, T Wyatt – Arch Digital, T Wyatt - BT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda Items and Resolutions**

- **Membership and Terms of Reference**
- **Apologies for absence** – received from Councillors Dickinson, Hunter, G Jones, Murray, Taylor and Tebbutt. Get well wishes were expressed for Councillor Taylor.
- **Minutes of last meeting** – agreed. It was also clarified that an agenda item about Aln Valley Railway would instead be included on the committee’s next agenda, as steering group developing the application had only met twice to date. A request was also made about either having an agenda item at the next meeting or a steering group established to look at traffic calming concerns for the A697, which would be raised at the Policy Board/Area Chairs Working Group meeting on 21 May.
- **Declarations of interest** – none.

**Actions**

- Noted
- Noted
- Cllr Bridgett to raise at Policy Board/Area Chairs Working Group

**Public Question Time**

**Councillor David Parker, Morpeth Town Council, NE61 2DG** referred to the recent increase in the use of Morpeth’s railway station and number of trains stopping there which he hoped would continue. However the proposed new Northern Rail franchise did not include the same level of service for Morpeth station as was currently provided and Morpeth Town Council was anxious that the service continued to be offered to the public. He asked if the County Council had also written to express concern about the proposed reduction in service. Members were advised that a response to the franchise consultation had been given through the Regional Rail Officers’ Group. It was hoped to protect the level of service as a minimum, and preferably an improved level of service. A member stressed how everybody present would agree about the importance of the rail link to the county and its stations and hoped that the current arrangements could be left in place as new contracts should not be to the cost of services to rural Northumberland and its stations. A political response could be arranged to the franchise, and an update given to the Policy Board/Area Chairs Working Group.

**Billy McKnight, NE66 3PZ** referred to the consultation about the proposed permit for resident parking at Alnmouth, as the letter sent included inaccuracies including the house numbers and how most people on South Road had private drives. He raised further concerns about the situation including possible consultation with residents about cutting back a hedge that was 2.5 feet across a footpath, why was Lesbury Road not included in the consultation when it was affected; would people then park as a result of the proposed measures further down on the A1068,
were the current measures effective or not. He also requested a further letter be sent and include Lesbury Road residents and for a public meeting be arranged in Lesbury Village Hall to discuss this further. Further concern was expressed by the local member about the hedge at Bilton Hill, which needed cutting back, and the inadequacy of the footpath. The Transport Policy and Programme Manager thanked Mr McKnight for raising the issue, apologised for any inaccuracies in the letters and explained how the consultation was ongoing and there was no done deal. All the comments would be fed back including the request for a public meeting. Officers would investigate whether there were any inaccuracies, send out a revised letter to make any necessary corrections, and investigate the reasons why Lesbury Road had not been included in the consultation and respond to Mr McKnight.

Local resident, NE65 7AL referred to the number of planning enforcement breaches in the county and how only 48 had enforcement action taken in response, and at what stage would Development Services take more enforcement action. Members were advised by the Rural Development Manager that a number of enforcement complaints were received and investigated, and the enforcement team followed guidance for dealing with them. The responses and any enforcement action taken depended on what quantifiable harm was caused by each breach, and resources had to focus on the most significant cases. If there were specific cases of concern, residents should provide her with details. Examples of action taken included unauthorised work to listed buildings, damage to protected trees, and cases which caused an impact on residential amenity.

### Petitions

**a) To receive any new petitions:** A petition opposing the introduction of the proposed parking scheme at Alnmouth was submitted.

**b) To consider reports on petitions previously considered:** A report had been produced and was presented in response to a petition received requesting speed humps at Longhirst Colliery. The local member spoke about the issue, with reference to the section of the road adopted by the County Council and which part wasn’t. There was a tight corner on the adopted section at which vehicles were negotiating at speed and there was only space for one vehicle at a time. It was hoped to install speed humps, using members’ local improvement scheme funding, at the point prior to the County Council’s diminished part of the road. Councillor Sambrook was happy for this option to be explored further.

**c) To consider updates on petitions previously received:** Reference was made to the petition handed in at the previous meeting requesting that no more wind turbines be erected in the Tweed Valley area. A member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition to be submitted into the consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) A copy of the Leader’s letter be circulated to all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
expressed concern about a note that the lead petitioner and he had received about the issue not being referred to the Petitions Committee but submitted into the Core Strategy consultation. He referred to the provisions in the constitution for dealing with petitions by area committees if they were local issues and corporate/countywide issues by the Petitions Committee. Concern was expressed about the proposed way forward given the importance of the issue, the efforts of people to raise the petition, not stifling any debate, and a request was made to refer the issue again to the Petitions Committee and raise the committee’s concerns with the Leader of the Council, which was supported by a number of other members.

Reference was made to a letter sent from the Leader of the Councillor to the lead petitioner, and a member explained how the issue would have more impact if put into the Core Strategy and acknowledged the strength of feeling expressed in the petition. The Chair then read out the Leader’s letter, which explained the next steps and the petition’s classification as a consultation petition (copy of letter attached to the official minutes). Members appreciated the explanation in the letter but recommended that the petition should both be submitted into the Core Strategy consultation process and also discussed at the Petitions Committee.

LOCAL ISSUES

Updates on Issues Discussed at the Last Meeting

a) Alnmouth Railway Station - Parking
Members were advised of a recent meeting with Network Rail and acknowledged that the process was taking some time. Network Rail had given a preliminary and in principle response about getting 29 extra car spaces, although it was hoped for more if possible to encourage more use of the station. Discussion the followed with an opinion expressed about the needs of other railway users from other local areas, the need for the additional station parking should be introduced first before a residents’ scheme, and how it was the responsibility of the County Council and Network Rail to resolve it.

(b) Alnwick public toilets

members of the committee;
2) the Chair write to the Leader about the committee’s views and the issue be discussed at the next meeting of the Policy Board/Area Chairs Working Group; and
3) an update be provided at the committee’s next meeting.

An update on the consultation be provided to the committee’s meeting on 7 July
Members were updated that the specifications for the work had been confirmed. In addition to the funding from the two local county councillors and Alnwick Town Council, the County Council had now contributed, creating a total budget of £12,000 for the work.

(c) Parking at Alnwick marketplace
Members were advised that the proposal was for a restricted parking zone at the marketplace operating a disc system. It would limit parking between 9am – 6pm in designated bays to 30 minute stays and no returning within the hour. The restrictions would be enforced and come into effect from 2 June. In response to another query it was confirmed that a cycle rack would be erected at the marketplace; the design was to be consulted on. Further reference was made to funding available for town centre improvements for sustainable travel including more bus stops, dropped kerbs, buses linking with trains, bike hire and other proposals. Work was taking place with Sustrans to secure additional funding.

CORPORATE ISSUES

Superfast Broadband Update
An update was provided for the committee about progress on introducing Superfast Broadband in Northumberland (copy of presentation attached to the official minutes).

Detailed discussion followed in which the key detail of points made by members and the public and responses provided by Arch Digital and BT included:
- how Alnwick now had five cabinets
- concern about not having a map of the final 9% areas
- the three month forecast and large postcode areas
- how there had not been a cut in the capital budget, the operational budget for Arch to undertake commercial opportunities had, as the strategy had been removed and the post in question made redundant
- it was not possible to confirm the availability of Superfast Broadband for areas that access would not be cost effective for until there was information on the amount of funding and discussions taken place with suppliers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns of Residents</th>
<th>Discuss at Policy Board/Area Chairs Working Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - concern that if an area was designated as “under consideration” it limited opportunities to seek alternative ways to connect local properties  
- the concerns of residents in areas with weaker Broadband access and concern about the Rothbury scheme, as the bid had included the Building Benefit scheme and communities had worked to assist getting more remote properties included, but was not included in the contract, which was not publicly available, the reduction in match funding from the rural communities fund and percentage of properties eligible had decreased  
- work had not taken place yet to check manholes in areas under consideration to see if they would be accessible to input cable  
- concern about other opportunities for applications disappearing whilst areas were under consideration  
- the non-availability of being able to provide details of the locations of the resources  
- details of clawback arrangements  
- the ability to provide details of the locations of the resources due to concerns about possible misuse of  
- possible benefits from mobile 4G and more mobile masts and to ask the County Council to lobby DCMS in support of getting more access and the role of Northumberland National Parks Authority  
- disappointment about how the Rothbury programme had been rolled out  
- the impact on local households and businesses; would young people stay and work in the area if there was insufficient access?  
- examples of households which were exchange only lines, and not connected to cabinets 20 metres away as they would not benefit from 20 megabits per second. | Further update to be provided to the committee at its July or September meeting |

**Update on Section 106 (S106) Contributions and the Implementation of Community Infrastructure Levy**

Julie Seaton, Rural Development Manager, Development Services, provided a presentation about Section 106 (S106) Agreements and the Community Infrastructure Levy (copy attached to the official minutes). Issues then raised by members included:

- an issue about consultation once not taking place with the local parish/town council  
- whether all allocations should be allocated to affordable housing projects if there were already sufficient levels of affordable housing locally
- welcoming the availability of records providing details of previously agreed S106 agreements and the importance of parish/town councils having access
- the importance of knowing the levels of local acceptance for applications
- the importance of joined up working between the Development Service and Highways departments to discuss any damage to local roads at the right time.

### Safer Northumberland Partnership Local Multi Agency Problems Solving (LMAPS)
The updated members of LMAPS activities and priorities, details of statistics and the funding situation for 2014/15. Ian Billham, Strategic Community Safety and Licensing Manager presented the report.

### Information Items

#### Community Chest Annual Report
The report provided members with information on Community Chest funds distributed during 2013/14.

### Members’ Local Improvement Schemes – Progress Report as at 31 March 2014

### Future Meetings
It was noted that the next meeting would take place on 12 May at Thropton, 9 June’s meeting at Longhorsley, and the 7 July meeting at Amble.