



**Lostwithiel Town Council
Tuesday 01 September 2020**

Cornwall Councillor Report

Councillor Colin Martin reported that the railway timetable has now been reinstated after the reduction in service due to Covid19. He stated that hopefully this will make it easier for people to get back to work. He added that Cornwall Council's staff are still working remotely - more than 80% of staff are working from home.

Councillor Colin Martin talked about the discussion at the last Town Council meeting regarding the extension of the 30mph limits at Cott Road and advised Council that the street lamps and the pavement does not extend past the houses. Councillor Colin Martin suggested that keeping everyone in the loop will allow this issue to move forward constructively.

Councillor Martin then said he would like to address the Council regarding three issues related to planning.

1. Cornwall Councillor Martin advised that Cornwall needs to find places to put wind turbines and solar panels. It has become more difficult to find places for wind turbines due to a change in law in 2015. Town, Parish Councils and the general public are being asked to suggest sites for use, considering that in order to

meet the renewable commitments, sites will have to be provided.

2. Councillor Colin Martin reported that the Government has draft proposals which will change current planning policy significantly. The government would also like to increase the number of new houses in Cornwall by 54% and to change the rules for affordable housing, so that new sites of under 50 houses do not have to include affordable housing.
3. Councillor Colin Martin advised Council that with reference to his own planning application, he will be leaving the meeting when this is discussed and that Lisa from Situ8 will address Council regarding the application on his behalf.

Meeting Minutes

A virtual meeting of the Town Council was held on Tuesday 1 September 2020

Councillors Present

Mayor Hughes, Deputy Mayor Ross
Councillor Anders, Councillor Clarke
Councillor Duffin, Councillor Guiterman
Councillor Henderson, Councillor Hensman
Councillor P Jarrett, Councillor T Jarrett
Councillor Lindley, Councillor Morgan
Councillor Sweeney

In attendance

Town Clerk Mrs Harris and Administrative Assistant Mrs Doyle were in attendance.

9 members of the public were in attendance.

065/20 Apologies of Absence

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Councillor Hatton.

066/30 Declaration of Interest

Mayor Hughes declared non-registerable interests in all planning applications listed under agenda item 5.

Councillor Henderson, Councillor P Jarrett and Councillor T Jarrett all declared a non-registerable interest in Planning Applications PA20/03567 and PA20/03565.

067/20 Public Participation

The Council was addressed by members of the public regarding planning applications: -

PA20/03567 1 Wesley Villas Restormel Road Lostwithiel

PA20/05724 Les Papillons Castle Hill Lostwithiel

PA20/06230 Land adjoining Delancey House Bodmin Hill Lostwithiel.

068/20 Minutes 28 July 2020

It was **resolved** that the minutes of the virtual extraordinary meeting held on 28 July 2020 are accepted, approved and duly signed by Mayor Hughes.

Vote – 9 in favour, 4 abstentions.

069/20 Planning applications

Mayor Hughes, Councillor Henderson, Councillor P Jarrett and Councillor T Jarrett all left the virtual meeting.

Deputy Mayor Ross took the Chair.

- a) **PA20/03567** 1 Wesley Villas, Restormel Road, Lostwithiel
Listed Building Consent for the conversion and extension of outbuilding to residential annexe.
It was **resolved** not to support this application for the following reasons: -

1. The proposal overlooks neighbouring property and will cause a reduction in light to this property.
 2. The materials to be used are inappropriate for a conservation area
 3. Lostwithiel Neighbourhood Plan Policy HH6 Housing Density section b states 'Housing development in gardens will not be supported within Character Zone 6.'
- Vote – 9 votes not to support this application.

Councillor Henderson, Councillor P Jarrett and Councillor T Jarrett re-joined the meeting.

PA20/05724 Les Papillons, Castle Hill, Lostwithiel
Proposed rear extension and side store and associated works.
It was **resolved** to support this application.
Vote – 12 votes in support.

PA20/06186 Lynwood, Restormel Road Lostwithiel
Extension and alterations
It was **resolved** to support this application.
Vote – 12 votes in support.

PA20/06230 Land adjoining Delancey House, Bodmin Hill, Lostwithiel
Use of land for small scale holiday purposes (up to 5 seasonally-sited, tipis or bell tents and 5 camping pitches)
It was **resolved** to support this application.
Vote – 12 votes in support.

Councillor Henderson, Councillor P Jarrett and Councillor T Jarrett left the meeting.

- b). **PA20/03565** 1 Wesley Villas, Restormel Road, Lostwithiel
Conversion and extension of outbuilding to residential annexe.
It was **resolved** not to support this application for the following reasons: -
1. The proposal overlooks neighbouring property and will cause a reduction in light to this property.
 2. The materials to be used are inappropriate for a conservation area
 3. Lostwithiel Neighbourhood Plan Policy HH6 Housing Density section b states 'Housing development in gardens will not be supported within Character Zone 6.'
- Vote – 9 votes not to support this application.

Mayor Hughes, Councillor Henderson, Councillor P Jarrett and Councillor T Jarrett re-joined the meeting.

Mayor Hughes resumed as Chair.

070/20 Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government - Changes to the current planning system – Consultation on changes to planning policy and regulations

It was **resolved** to submit the response as drafted by Councillor Guiterman with the exception of the response to question 18 which should be amended to 5. It was asked that the minutes record the Council's thanks to Councillor Guiterman for preparing the draft response for consideration.

Q1 Do you agree that planning practice guidance should be amended to specify that the appropriate baseline for the standard method is whichever is the higher of the level of 0.5% of housing stock in each local authority area OR the latest household projections averaged over a 10-year period.

A1 No

Q2 In the stock element of the baseline, do you agree that 0.5% of existing stock for the standard method is appropriate? If not please explain why.

A2 No; In holiday destination areas such as Cornwall an element of the existing housing stock is used for second homes. Allowance must be made for this.

Q3 Do you agree that using the workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio from the most recent year for which data is available to adjust the standard method's baseline is appropriate? If not please explain why

A3 Yes; provided account is taken of the high variability of earnings in areas where the seasonal employment rate is higher than the national average.

Q4 Do you agree that incorporating an adjustment for the change of affordability over 10 years is a positive way to look at whether affordability has improved? If not please explain why

A4 Yes

Q5 Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting within the standard method? If not please explain why

A5 Yes

Q6 Authorities which are already at the second stage of the strategic plan consultation process (Regulation 19), which should be given 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate for examination?

A6 No comment

Q7 Authorities close to publishing their second stage consultation (Regulation 19), which should be given 3 months from the publication date of the revised guidance to publish their Regulation

19 plan, and a further 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate?

A7 No comment

Q8 The Government is proposing policy compliant planning applications will deliver a minimum of 25% of onsite affordable housing as First Homes, and a minimum of 25% of offsite contributions towards First Homes where appropriate. Which do you think is the most appropriate option for the remaining 75% of affordable housing secured through developer contributions? Please provide reasons and/or evidence for your views (if possible)

- (i) Prioritising the replacement of affordable home ownership tenures, and delivering rental tenures in the ration set out in the local plan policy
- (ii) Negotiation between the local authority and developer.
- (iii) Other (please specify)

A8 We prefer to achieve the maximum flexibility to respond in the most appropriate way to housing needs at the time. We think that retaining flexibility is a priority and consider that any delay as envisaged by this document will, in practice, be minimal.

Q9 Should the existing exemptions from the requirement for affordable home products (e.g. for build to rent) also apply to this First Homes requirement?

A9 No There is such urgency for affordable housing that no exemptions should apply.

Q10 Are any existing exemptions not required? If not please set out which exemptions and why.

A10 The exemption regarding developments of 10 or fewer dwellings from the requirement to provide affordable housing should be reduced to 5 or fewer.

Q11 Are any other exemptions needed? If so, please provide reasons and/or evidence your views.

A11 No comment

Q12 Do you agree with the proposed approach to transitional arrangements set out above?

A12 Yes

Q13 Do you agree with the proposed approach to different levels of discount.

A13 Yes; allowing local authorities to increase the discount to take into account areas where the market value of housing is inflated by purchase of second homes coupled with a low-wage economy.

Q14 Do you agree with the approach of allowing a small proportion of market housing on First Homes exception sites, in order to ensure site viability?

A14 No; the criteria for assessing the proportion of market-value housing should be based on the cost of site development. Affordable housing should normally be 100% of the development but reduced only if clear and convincing evidence that the site would not be able to be financially viable were there to be 100% affordable houses. If a developer considers providing 100% affordable houses on a site, consideration should be given to allowing a not-for-profit organisation to develop the site.

Q15 Do you agree with the removal of the site size threshold set out in the National Planning Policy Framework

A15 No; It is important to allow local people to decide on the size of the site as it is they who are best placed to balance the need for affordable housing with ensuring that the impact of any development is in keeping with the existing built environment.

Q16 Do you agree that the First Homes exception sites policy should not apply in designated rural areas?

A16 Yes

Q17 Do you agree with the proposed approach to raise the small sites threshold for a time limited period?

A17 Yes

Q18 What is the appropriate level of small sites threshold?

- i) Up to 40 homes
- ii) Up to 50 homes
- iii) Other (please specify)

A18 5

Q19 Do you agree with the proposed approach to the site size threshold.

A19 Yes

Q20 Do you agree with linking the time-limited period to economic recovery and raising the threshold for an initial period of 18 months?

A20 Yes

Q21 Do you agree with the proposed approach to minimising threshold effects?

A21 Yes

Q22 Do you agree with the Government's proposed approach to setting thresholds in rural areas?

A22 No, our preference is a reduction in the current limit from 10 to 5 units.

Q23 Are there any other ways in which the Government can support SME builders to deliver new homes during the economic recovery period?

A23 No comment

Q24 Do you agree that the new Permission in Principle should remove the restriction on major development?

A24 It is important that local people are fully consulted. Areas of land potentially subject to Permission in Principle' should be part of Neighbourhood Development Plans which should be updated accordingly.

Q25 Should the new Permission in Principle for major development set any limit on the amount of commercial development (providing housing still occupies the majority of floorspace of the overall scheme)? Please provide any comments to support your views.

A25 An element of commercial development is desirable as it has the potential to increase local employment. It should be up to Neighbourhood Plans to determine the proportion, if any, of commercial development.

Q26 Do you agree with our proposal that information requirements for Permission in Principle by application for major development should broadly remain unchanged? If you disagree, what changes would you suggest and why?

A26 It is important that local people are involved in the planning process. Neighbourhood Plans should be updated to identify land suitable for Permission in Principle sites

Q27 Should there be an additional height parameter for Permission in Principle? Please provide comments in support of your views.

A27 It should be up to Neighbourhood Plans to determine this. It is local people who understand the impact of height on the local environment

Q28 Do you agree that publicity arrangements for Permission in principle by application should be extended for large developments?

If so, should local planning authorities be:

- (i) Required to publish a notice in a local newspaper?
- (ii) Subject to a general requirement to publicise the application or
- (iii) Both?
- (iv) Disagree

A28 All plans should be publicised as thoroughly as possible. Again, Neighbourhood Plans should be the vehicle through which sites are identified.

Q29 Do you agree with our proposal for a banded fee structure based on a flat fee per hectare, with a maximum fee cap?

A29 No comment

Q30 What level of flat fee do you consider appropriate, and why?

A30 No comment

Q31 Do you agree that any brownfield site that is granted Permission in principle through the application process should be included in Part 2 of the Brownfield Land Register? If you disagree please state why

A31 No comment

Q32 What guidance would help support applicants and local planning authorities to make decisions about Permission in Principle? Where possible, please set out any areas of guidance you consider are currently lacking and would assist stakeholders.

A32 No comment

Q33 What costs and benefits do you envisage the proposed scheme would cause? Where you have identified drawbacks, how might these be overcome?

A33 No comment

Q34 To what extent do you consider landowners and developers are likely to use the proposed measure? Please provide evidence where possible.

A34 No comment

Q35 In light of the proposals set out in this consultation, are there any direct or indirect impacts in terms of eliminating unlawful discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations on people who share characteristics protected under the Public Sector Equality Duty?

A35 No comment

Vote – 13 votes in favour.

071/20 Cornwall Council Climate Emergency Development Plan Document Pre-Submission Report Consultation

It was **resolved** to submit the draft response as drafted by Councillor Guiterman with the addition of paragraph regarding the potential to mine lithium in Cornwall (to be approved by email by the end of the week). It was asked that the minutes record the Council's thanks to Councillor Guiterman for preparing the draft response for consideration.

Vote – 13 votes in favour.

Pre-submission Consultation Questions

1. Does Policy C1 pick up the right issues and principles – is there anything you would add?
2. Is there anything else that should be included in this policy?
3. Do you have an alternative approach to C1 that you think the council should consider?
4. Any further comment?

Answer

Add to C1-7 Develop policies to provide and encourage the use of public transport. Add to C1-10 The requirement to avoid visual pollution. As Cornwall is hilly, many of the roads narrow and the average age of its population is higher than average, there is limited scope for developing non-leisure cycling. This makes it all the more important to have a well-developed and well-integrated public transport system.

1. Do Policies G1 – 3 pick up the right issues and principles – is there anything you would add?
2. Is there anything else that should be included in these policies?
3. Do you have an alternative approach to policies G1 – 3 that you think the council should consider?
4. Do you think further clarification or advice on the interplay between green infrastructure design and green space factor (Policy G2) is required for minor developments?
5. Policy G2 requires the provision of Canopy Cover (trees and hedges) as part of biodiversity net gain. Given the Council's commitment to tree planting as a part of the Forest for Cornwall, should this be a separate policy?
6. Or would it be better having a policy requiring a specific proportion of tree provision with a policy setting out a requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain specifically for trees?
7. The mandatory minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain figure is specified by DEFRA as being necessary to reverse the decline of natural capital and allow a sufficient buffer to ensure that real net gains are made.
8. There is no legal reason why Cornwall Council could not set a more ambitious local target of 20% but a larger requirement could impact on the amount of developable land on sites or increase the financial contribution required and must be balanced against financial

viability. In your opinion should the target be 10% or 20% or another percentage target and why?

9. Metrics are being developed to measure the wider impacts of development on natural capital and eco-system services, such as flood risk and carbon soil storage. Do you agree that a requirement should be made through policy requiring that major developments are accompanied by a basic form of ecosystems metric?

10. There are different potential policy options to increase tree cover including building in requirements to the net gain policy (as per Policy G3) or setting out a separate requirement. How do you think this requirement should be expressed and made simple to understand and implement?

11. Any further comment?

Answer

1. The wording needs to be stronger. Any land which has the potential to form part of the habitat interconnection network should be identified and any planning application which reduces this potential should be refused.

1-3 Planting trees will in the short-term act as a carbon sink however it must be made clear that in the long-term the planted areas will be in equilibrium and no longer remain a significant carbon sink.

4. As the sum of all minor developments will have a considerable impact, it would be useful for specific guidance to be available.

6. Yes. Cornwall Council should develop a woodland management scheme which aims to achieve an open woodland landscape with woodland glades which imitated the open glades in the ancient greenwood which were biodiversity hotspots. Consideration should be given to encouraging the development of wood pasture. Trees growing in open habitats are significantly longer lived than those planted more densely.

7. Biodiversity is a complex and highly interconnected issue. There should be one overarching policy to reflect this complexity.

8. The more ambitious target of 20% is a useful aspiration to aim for as resources permit.

9. Yes; appropriate metrics are a useful guide to the effects of developments and their environmental mitigation.

10. Policies need to include a clear woodland management plan (see answer to question 6) and ensure it is clear that land which already contributes to the interconnected network of habitats and that which has the potential to do so is preserved from adverse development.

1. Do Policies AG1 – 4 pick up the right issues for rural areas – id there anything more that you would add?

2. Are the policy approaches that we are suggesting in policies AG1 – 4 about right – is there anything missing?

3. Do you have specific comments to make about the content or intentions of policies AG1 – 4?

4. Policy AG1 adds to types of exceptional development in the countryside that support the aim for Cornwall to be carbon neutral and provide public goods such as carbon sequestration, flood protection or increases in biodiversity. Should this include allowing small numbers of housing to meet local needs, particularly of the estate and how should this be tied to enabling land management improvements and delivery of our sequestration or biodiversity aims?

5. Policy AG2 adds a further exception for new housing in the countryside based on the creation of zero carbon homes and restorative low carbon agriculture – do you support this exception, and do you think that the policy provides protection against unnecessary development in the countryside?

6. Policy AG4 increases the development types that may be permitted on rural exception sites to help create more sustainable communities. This policy could potentially impact on the ability to delivery affordable housing on exceptions sites. Would you support this approach?

7. Do you have an alternative approach to AG4 that you think the council should consider?

8a: In addition to low impact development in Policy AG2, would you support a policy that encourages the development of low carbon co-housing schemes within or adjacent to existing settlements?

8b. Should a policy allow for co-housing to be developed on exception sites that would normally be used only for affordable housing where a mechanism for controlling future residents and price can be provided?

9. Any further Comment?

Answer

1. Developments within policies AG 1-4 should be implemented only with the support of the local community. The scope within each civil parish for these policies to be implemented should form part of the relevant Neighbourhood Plans so the local community is fully involved in decision-making. NPs will need updating in the light of these and other policies being developed nationally and within Cornwall.
2. See answer to 1 above
3. As the proposed Estate Management Plans are intended to be of benefit of the local community, they should be implemented only with local community support. As above, general principles concerning Estate Management Plans should outlined in updated Neighbourhood Plans.
4. The definition of a Rural Exception site should continue to determine where affordable housing development takes place. This policy should not result in extending the definition just because delivery of public goods is involved. All affordable housing developments should be required to deliver the public goods referred to in the policy.
5. It does not provide sufficient safeguard against unnecessary development in the countryside. See response to question 4 above.

6. Yes, but only within the context of our response to questions 4 and 5 above.

Whatever affordable housing is developed should be in response to well-evidenced local need for affordable housing.

7. The need for and the location of such developments should form part of updated Neighbourhood Plans. It is vital that the local community is fully involved in and supports such developments in its area.

8a. Yes, providing the present definition of Rural Exception sites is retained and there is well-evidenced local need.

8b. Yes, as response to 8a above.

1. Do Policies TC1 – 4 pick up the right issues for rural areas – is there anything more that you would add?

2. Are the policy approaches that we are suggesting in policies TC1 – 4 about right – is there anything missing?

3. Do you have specific comments to make about the content or intentions of policies TC1 – 4?

Answer

1. Great care needs to be taken if the intention to both increase town centre density and retain/increase the green-space area. Experience in high-density development in cities showed that communal green spaces shared by high-rise blocks became blighted. It was found to be much more conducive to health and well-being for each house to have its own garden. Population density similar to that obtained with the combination high-rise and communal spaces was achieved.

2. If retail premises are vacated, every effort needs to be made to provide for alternative retail or community use before allowing them to be converted to residential use. It is essential to the viability of town centres that car parking

spaces are provided for the number of cars likely to be used by occupiers of premises converted to residential use. The lack of parking facilities can effectively destroy town-centre businesses as potential customers are unable to park and patronise these businesses.

1. Do Policies T1 - 3 pick up the right issues for rural areas – is there anything more that you would add?
2. Are the policy approaches that we are suggesting in policies T1 - 3 about right – is there anything missing?
3. Do you have specific comments to make about the content or intentions of policies T1-3?
4. Should we develop a policy to encourage the provision of new distribution facilities at key locations where it can be shown that these would help to consolidate freight journeys, particularly those related to home deliveries of food or goods?
5. Should this specify certain typical locations or specific locations at key transport nodes or interchanges?

Answer

1. Cornwall Council needs to consider very carefully the environmental impact of increased electric vehicle use. Obtaining the minerals used in the batteries results in significant environmental degradation and habitat loss in those countries where they are mined. Before committing valuable resources to encouraging increase electrical vehicle use, Cornwall Council would be advised to research the feasibility of encouraging the use of green electricity generation to sequester carbon dioxide and combine it with hydrogen to produce liquid fuel. The technology is already developed to achieve this.

At the same time Cornwall should aim to produce and distribute hydrogen to replace natural gas for heating. See also our response to RE 1-6 response 2.

2. See 1 above

3. The consultation is right in admitting that car parking will be needed for the foreseeable future. It is essential that adequate parking is provided for all residential development.
4. This would be useful if it can be clearly shown that there would be substantial benefit in reduced vehicle miles and emission levels of carbon dioxide and other pollutants.
5. We do not have the knowledge to answer this question adequately.

1. Do Policies RE1 – 6 pick up the right issues for renewables – are there anymore that you would add?
2. Are the policy approaches that we are suggesting in policies RE1 – 6 about right – is there anything missing?
3. Do you have specific comments to make about the content or intentions of policies RE1 – 6?
4. Do you have an alternative approach to Policies RE1 - 6 that you think the council should consider?
5. Is there anything that we could do to further promote or enable community led energy proposals?
6. Policy RE1 requires community benefit from renewables installations – do you have any opinion on the form that this should take?

Answer

1. Yes
2. Consideration needs to be given for the potential to use electricity generated from renewal sources to produce hydrogen for heating and for generating electricity during times when that produced from renewables is insufficient. Consideration also needs to be given to the potential to produce liquid fuel from surplus electricity by combining carbon dioxide with hydrogen (Air to Fuel — A2F technology) This has the potential to solve the problem of the intermittent nature of electricity generation by renewable means. The alternative of using batteries results in environmental

degradation to obtain the battery ingredients. As the use of lithium batteries is likely to increase in the immediate future, we would encourage the mining of battery-grade Lithium in Cornwall. As the UK extractive industries operate under tighter environmental controls than in many of the countries where Lithium is currently extracted the more we can extract in Cornwall, the less will be the environmental degradation in other countries. A thriving Lithium extraction industry in Cornwall would hopefully lead to the manufacture of Lithium batteries in our county using locally-sourced Lithium.

3. We welcome the intention regarding the erection of wind turbines. During consultation for the Lostwithiel Neighbourhood Plan we found that there was limited support for wind turbines and considerable opposition to them. Wind turbines represent a mature technology and, as such, it is unlikely that their efficiency will improve in the future. They also dominate the landscape and should be discouraged. In contrast solar power technology is advancing fast. Recent gains in efficiency of 30% have been achieved. Cornwall Council should consider mandating that all development should, unless it conflicts with local heritage or special landscape value, incorporate solar panels. Cornwall Council should consider encouraging the retro-fitting of solar panels. Encouragement should be given to improving the aesthetics of solar panels to make them more visually acceptable in architecturally sensitive areas.
4. See responses to questions 2 and 3 above.
5. If A2F (or other) fuel is burned to generate either mechanical or electrical energy, the waste heat should be used, where practicable, to heat homes as is being achieved in Denmark.
6. Installation of combined heat and power schemes as outlined in our response to question 5 above.

1. Do Policies SC1 and 2 pick up the right issues for sustainable construction – are there anymore that you would add?

2. Are the policy approaches that we are suggesting in policies SC1 and 2 about right – is there anything missing?
3. Do you have specific comments to make about the content or intentions of policies SC1 and 2?
4. Do you have an alternative approach to Policies SC1 and 2 that you think the council should consider?
5. Do you think that a Sustainable Development Checklist covering categories including energy, water, materials and waste, resilience, health and wellbeing with different requirements for different sizes of development proposal should be introduced?
6. Should development proposals be required to conform with an external standard such as BREEAM or a bespoke requirement made up of elements of the former Code for Sustainable Homes?

Answer

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. See our responses to RE 1-6 above. The aspiration for Cornwall should not be to achieve carbon neutrality but should become carbon negative. There is an urgent need to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide content as fast as possible.
4. See our responses to RE 1-6 above. The aspiration for Cornwall should not be to achieve carbon neutrality but should become carbon negative. There is an urgent need to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide content as fast as possible.
5. The larger the scale of development the greater will be the opportunity for community energy schemes. Larger developments should be required to incorporate such schemes.
6. Any standards developed should equal or exceed BREEAM standards.

1. Do Policies CC1 - 4 pick up the right issues for coastal change and flooding – are there anymore that you would add?
2. Are the policy approaches that we are suggesting in policies CC1 - 4 about right – is there anything missing?
3. Do you have specific comments to make about the content or intentions of policies CC1 - 4?

4. do you have an alternative approach to Policies CC1 - 4 that you think the council should consider?

5. An alternative policy option to CC2 could be to allocate full Coastal Change Management Areas on adoption of the DPD. This would require the publication of mitigation plans for each of the areas. We do not support this option as we believe that the level of assistance that we could provide for each area would be limited given the number of settlements impacted. Would you support this, or should we consider an alternative approach?

Answer

1 – 4 We support the policies as outlined. We would like to add that consideration should be given to establishing the viability of natural coastal flood defence schemes as are being successfully piloted in the USA and elsewhere

5. We agree that the resources needed to implement such support would not be within the capacity of Cornwall Council without considerable Government assistance

072/20 Cornwall Council Draft Marine and Estuarine European Sites Supplementary Planning Document Consultation

It was **resolved** not to formulate a response to this consultation.

Vote – 13 votes in favour.

073/20 Cornwall Council Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Consultation

It was **resolved** to authorise the Town Clerk to submit the response on behalf of Lostwithiel Town Council. The Clerk was further instructed to advise that communities that have experienced flooding should have the opportunity to share knowledge and experience with other communities.

Vote – 13 votes in favour.

074/20 Cornwall Council ‘The Cornwall we want’ for future generations initiative

It was **resolved** to note the Cornwall Council’s initiative and encourage participation by promoting the initiative on Facebook and the Council’s website.

Vote – 13 votes in favour.

075/20 Looe Town Council - planning overhaul

It was **resolved** to instruct the clerk to respond to Looe Town Council advising that Lostwithiel Town Council’s shares their concern regarding the ostensible current Government position to weaken local input into Planning. The Council also strongly agrees with the views expressed by Local Government Association Housing & Planning spokesman Councillor David Renard on 22 July 2020 responding to an independent report commissioned by MHCLG into the quality standard of homes delivered through change of use permitted development rights.

The view expressed by Cllr David Renard reads as follows: -

“This independent report rightly backs our long-standing concerns over the detrimental impact on local communities of rules allowing home conversions without planning permission. It provides further evidence on why it is more vital than ever that planning should remain local.

“In particular, it rightly highlights how these conversions mostly avoid making any contribution to local areas, which is a requirement of the local planning system, fail to meet adequate design standards and create worse living environments.

“Under these rules, communities have no way to ensure developers build high-quality affordable homes in the right places, provide any affordable homes as part of the development, along with infrastructure that provides enough schools, promotes greener and more active travel, and tackles climate change.

“We urge the Government to act on these independent findings and remove permitted development rights. Developers must no longer

be allowed to bypass the planning system and local communities must be able to have a say on all new developments in their area. “It is vital that councils and local communities have a voice in the planning process and are able to oversee all local developments so councils can deliver resilient, prosperous places that meet the needs of their communities.”

Vote – 13 votes in favour.

076/20 BT payphone review – North Street phone box.

It was **resolved** to instruct the Clerk to advise Cornwall Council that Lostwithiel Town Council wishes to maintain their objection to the removal of the North Street phone box on the following basis: -

- a) This is now the only payphone in Lostwithiel
- b) The Town has experienced two major floods and the mobile signal on all networks is poor therefore this phone is needed as an emergency phone.
- c) The Town is a tourist destination and it is important for visitors to have access to a phone when there is such limited mobile signal.

Vote – 13 in favour.

077/20 Remembrance Sunday – 2020 Commemorations

It was **resolved** to instruct the Town Clerk to write to all organisations that usually place a wreath to advise that currently the Town Council does not consider, due to the Coronavirus restrictions, that the usual Remembrance Day commemorations will take place. The Town Council will make arrangements, if the organisation would still like to order a wreath, for their wreath to be placed on the War Memorial.

It was decided that the Council will review final arrangements for Remembrance Sunday at the Town Council meeting on the 3 November 2020.

Vote – 12 votes in favour.

078/20 Remembrance Memorial bench

It was **resolved** to locate the memorial bench to the right-hand side of the commemorative stone on the Parade.

Vote – 12 votes in favour, 1 against.

079/20 Bridgend Peace Memorial

It was **resolved** to reinstate the inscription or if required purchase a new plaque for the Bridgend Peace Memorial.

Vote – 12 votes in favour.

080/20 Covid 19 risk assessments to review the following risk assessments

It was **resolved** to make the following amendments/decisions: -

- a) To amend the play area risk assessments (in order to increase clarity for the public) on page 1 Agreed Action box to read Open.
- b) To purchase Covid 19 signs for the benches in a smaller size but similar design to the red background signs currently on the lampposts.
- c) To increase the Library courtyard 'click and collect service' from one to two sessions each week.
- d) It was further **resolved** to purchase a sneeze screen for the Town Council office.
- e) To continue to review all Covid 19 risk assessments on a monthly basis

Vote – 13 votes in favour

081/20 Lostwithiel skatepark

It was **resolved** to contact the local resident to thank them for their kind offer to fund raise for new recycling rubbish bins at the skatepark and to advise that the Council will check with Cornwall

Council that it will be possible for the separated rubbish/recycling to be collected separately.

Vote – 13 votes in favour.

082/20 King George V Tree damage

It was **resolved** to defer this agenda item.

083/20 Land between Quay Street car park & Coulson Park

It was **resolved** to defer this agenda item

084/20 Library alarm

It was **resolved** to defer this agenda item

085/20 Lostwithiel Councillors email

It was **resolved** to defer this agenda item

086/20 Delegation to the Town Clerk

It was **resolved** to defer this agenda item

087/20 Accounts & Finance

- a) It was resolved to approve payment of cheques 101486-101501 and four bank transfers.

Cheque Ref	Payee Name		Amount Paid
101486 & 487 & 2 Bank transfer payments	Salary related expenses (July)	Salary related expenses (July)	£3199.78
101488	Palace Printers	World War II Commemorative booklet	£140.00
101489	Biffa	Castle Hill Cemetery bin	£40.80
101490	Cormac	Cemetery, cleaning & play	£1,891.96

		inspections	
101491	Cornwall Council	Legionella testing kit	£66.00
101492	EDF Energy	Electric	£102.52
101493	Phoneta	Lone worker service (2 months)	£24.00
101494	Restormel Property Services	Repair to public toilet tap & Pendour Park play area gate	£48.00
101495	Sandra Harris	Biodegradable plastic bags for books	£19.99
101496	EDF Energy	Car park electric	£122.44
101497	Walter Bailey	Wheelie bin for library	£55.00
101498	SW Water	Water bill	£40.00
101499 & 500 & 2 Bank transfer payments	Salary related expenses	Salary related expenses	£3199.78
101501	Cormac	Cleaning	£939.50
		Total	£9,889.77

089/20 For information

It was **resolved** to defer this agenda item

The meeting closed at 9.50pm.

Chairman

Date