

GLANTON PARISH COUNCIL

PARISH COUNCILLORS ARE SUMMONED TO THE MEETING OF GLANTON PARISH COUNCIL TO BE HELD ON **MONDAY 30 JULY 2018 at 7.00pm** IN THE MEMORIAL HALL, GLANTON.

Members of the Public are welcome to attend

1: Introduction

1.1 Welcome, apologies for absence and declarations of interest/grant of any dispensations/ co-option to the vacancy

1.2 Public Questions

1.3 Minutes of the previous meetings held on 21 May 2018

- To approve the minutes of the Annual Parish Council Meeting
- To note the draft minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting

1.4 An update on matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting

To update the Council on any issues discussed at the previous meeting if not on this agenda, including

- The request for a Green Salt Bin – please see appendix
- Drains on the Powburn Road – please see appendix
- Footpath to Whittingham
- The Show and Village Clean-up
- Recruitment of a volunteer to look after the two planters on West Turnpike
- The Causeway street sign

2: Items for discussion and potential decisions

2.1 Reports from the County Councillor and the Police

2.2 Planning

- Comments on any current planning applications (*none at the time of agenda preparation*)
- To consider any response to the draft Northumberland Local Plan, copies are available via <http://www.northumberland.gov.uk/Planning/Planning-policy/Plan.aspx> - please see appendix for note prepared by Cllr Radgick

- To consider any further information regarding a play area on the site of St Peter's Church – please see appendix

2.3 A Fingerpost Sign

To consider any further information regarding the potential cast iron sign at the Playwell Road Junction

2.4 Commemoration of the end of the First World War

To consider any further information on marking the Centenary

2.5 Safety Warning Signs on the A697

To consider whether to make a contribution towards the cost of safety warning signs on the A607

3: Items for Information

3.1 Forthcoming Village activities

3.2 Details of any meetings attended by Councillors or the clerk

3.3 Correspondence received

4: Administration

4.1 To authorise any payments and to approve the current accounts for 2018/2019

4.2 Final Accounts for 2017/2018

Subject to any issues raised during the period for public inspection of the accounts, to give final approval to the 2017/2018 accounts – *none raised by close of period for public inspection*

4.3 Details of items Councillors wish to raise at forthcoming meetings

4.4 Dates of Next Meetings

- Monday 24 September 2018
- Monday 26 November 2018
- Monday 28 January 2019
- Monday 25 March 2019
- Monday 20 May 2019 – preceded by the Annual Parish Meeting – and brought forward because of the Bank Holiday

(Sgnd) Stephen Rickitt - Clerk to Glanton Parish Council

Appendix

1: Email extract regarding waste bin and Powburn Road – From Paul Johnston – Interim Executive Director (Place)

I understand why Glanton PC may be perplexed at the response they have received to the request to swap the yellow grit bin for a green one in order to be more aesthetically in-keeping. The issue we have with this request is that all NCC funded and serviced grit bins across the whole county are yellow (which makes them easier for motorists to spot). If a parish requests additional grit bins in locations which do not meet NCC's criteria, then the request is declined but they then have the option of paying for the installation and restocking of a parish grit bin (which are green so there is a clear visual differentiation for staff). If we start making the NCC bins green then this has the potential to create confusion for staff in relation to the future responsibilities for replacement and restocking of such bins. Whilst I accept that robust record keeping would assist in overcoming such issues, it is our view that swapping the bin would inevitably increase the likelihood of mistakes being made in respect of responsibility for replacement/recharging, which would only grow due to the likelihood of other parishes then following suit. This seems like an unnecessary risk / complication given it relates purely to the aesthetics of the grit bin colour, so the view taken is that the parish should either live with the bin being yellow and have NCC maintain/restock it, or if they feel so strongly that it must be green, then we will replace it with a green one but this would be classified as a parish bin and incur the appropriate charges. Apologies if this rational was not clearly communicated first time around.

On the drainage issue, we are not clear what conversation this relates to, but we are aware of an issue we are pursuing. Water is coming down the bank into Glanton and this has been caused by BT damaging the highways drain. We have now exposed the damage and are arranging for a site meeting with BT's contractor to agree remedial work. This should hopefully be soon.

2: Email extract regarding the site of the former St Peter's Church – From Peter Steel

I think we are now ready to start the process of conveying the Site of St Peter's Church to Glanton Parish Council. I have three points which you may wish to take to your meeting next Monday:-

▶ *I gather that the pavement by the entrance to the Church site is considered to be too narrow for the safe exit of excited children, so you propose that we also provide a passageway along the south side of the north wall. eastward to the main building site entrance. There are two reasons why we cannot do this.*

* *Our property advisors say that we should not do this as plot 1 is already reduced/compromised enough by gifting the Church site to the Council, and the site is not yet sold.*

* *Secondly, the exact location and design of the main site entrance is not yet known. This matter has been left by the planners for resolution with the site's buyer/developer, and the site has yet to be sold.*

* *It is therefore suggested that, as an alternative solution, a length of the north Church site wall boundary wall is rebuilt to create a splay, thereby enabling the gate to be adequately set back with suitable sight lines.*

* *It may be that eventually, when we do have a buyer, the Parish Council could raise the passageway proposal directly with them, but we cannot convey the church site to you on that basis.*

▶ *Lawyers' fees. I am assuming that, as we are gifting the Church site to the Council, you are happy to pay both sides' fees (I may add that our solicitors are local to the North East. They have served us well over many decades; they do a thorough job, but they are not one of the big fee charging national firms!)*

▶ *Although to all intents and purposes our wish is to gift this site to the Council, I understand that there may be legal reasons for there to be a 'consideration'. I await further advice on this from our lawyers, but have indicated to them that, if this does prove to be the case, then the consideration should be nominal ~ say £1.*

Draft Northumberland Local Plan

The draft plan has been published for initial consultation with submissions needed by 15th August.

I have read through at least some of the 294 page document which replaces the old Core Strategy to which we contributed our views several years ago now.

The plan contains a description of the County, the current authority's vision for the future (which I found to be phrased in somewhat rose-tinted spectacle terms) and talks about how to deliver that vision with reference to the green agenda, economic development, housing, environment, natural resources and infrastructure.

From my point of view the most important aspect is how the plan would affect any decisions on future developments in Glanton.

Similarly to the Core Strategy the plan defines the Main Towns which in the North area are Alnwick and Berwick, Service Centres which are the next level such as Wooler and Rothbury. Then there are Service Villages which are defined as villages which have a reasonable level of services such as a school or shop and a population of a size considered to be likely to maintain the viability of those services in the future. Glanton does not fall into that category, so we are basically part of "the rest".

New development is generally encouraged to follow that hierarchy, so that major developments are likely to be in the main towns, and it follows that only minor developments would be likely to be appropriate in Glanton. The plan does though allow for the principle of small developments for micro businesses and small scale residential as long as they do not alter the character of the area.

That seems to me to be generally satisfactory.

On housing development generally the current authority's view is that the Housing Needs assessment in the Core Strategy was too high and that we will need fewer new houses than that plan foresaw, but it will not make a major difference in the North area as owing to our low population the change in allocation is not very great.

They expect at least 20% of new houses to be affordable but as they affect only sites of 10 houses or more, and there are no set amounts for affordable provision but sites are to be assessed on a site-by-site basis my prediction is that the North area will get only a fraction of that percentage.

They are proposing to deal with the problem of too many second homes by stating that in any parish where more than 20% of the houses are identified in the latest census as having "no usual residents" then any development will have a restriction that the new houses will only be available as a "principal residence". Obviously this will not affect the ability of existing houses to become second homes so it will create a two-tier market, and I suspect the developers will try to challenge that.

On wind turbines they are intending to allocate areas which in principle are considered suitable for wind turbines despite many other authorities deciding not to do that (this is a legacy of the strong views of some now departed planning officers). They have tried to offset this by a policy that development will only be allowed where "planning impacts identified by local communities have been fully addressed and the proposal has their backing." Not an easy assessment to make when many communities may have residents of differing views on the subject. However proposals affecting views of sensitive landscapes such as the Cheviot Hills and the National Park provide a valid ground for objection. This is all pretty woolly and a potential minefield.

There is a policy on the retention of existing Community Services and Facilities which would support for example the retention of Rothbury Hospital, or at least prevent it being turned to an alternative use.

All in all it is a bit of a fudge in many areas and not so very different to the previous draft plan, but I did not find anything which I think we need to object to.

If anyone wants to borrow either the hard copy or the disc then either is available from me.

Jon Radgick

18 July 18