



**Lostwithiel Town Council  
Tuesday 06 October 2020**

**Cornwall Councillor Report**

Cornwall Councillor Colin Martin said he was pleased to see consideration of the Government's proposed changes to the planning system on the Town Council's meeting agenda. He reported that Cornwall Council had already considered these proposed changes and that most Cornwall Councillors were not in agreement with the proposals.

Cornwall Councillor Martin reported that he is looking into what is happening with Penquite Woods at Golant following contact from a number of members of the public regarding the current works in this ancient woodland.

Cornwall Councillor Martin also reported on the Footbridge at Lostwithiel Railway Station. He advised that a Committee of people at Network Rail want to pause the process of getting the bridge as it has been suggested that a bridge which incorporates a lift should be considered. Councillor Martin's preference is a footbridge now rather than a bridge with a lift which may take longer or never arrive. Councillor Martin reported that Community Network Panel met to look at local highways schemes. He decision was that the £10,000 was not enough to do small changes and suggested the money should go towards a feasibility study to tackle speeding in Lostwithiel and formulating a better plan for traffic in Lostwithiel.

## **Meeting Minutes**

A virtual Meeting of the Town Council was held on Tuesday 6 October 2020.

### **In attendance**

Mayor Tim Hughes, Deputy Mayor Karen Ross  
Councillor Anders, Councillor Clarke  
Councillor Duffin, Councillor Guiterman  
Councillor Hatton, Councillor Henderson  
Councillor Hensman, Councillor P Jarrett  
Councillor T Jarrett, Councillor Morgan  
Cllr Sweeney

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

Three members of the public were in attendance.

### **091/20 Apologies of Absence.**

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from the following Councillors -

Councillor Lindley, Councillor Hatton that for family reasons she may need to leave and re-join the meeting and Councillor P Jarrett advised that she would be joining the meeting late.

### **092/20 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Henderson declared a non-registerable interest in planning application PA20/06888 Gables Dark Lane Lostwithiel.

### **093/20 Public Participation**

No members of the public addressed the Council.

Councillor Hatton left the meeting.

**094/20 Minutes 01 September 2020**

It was noted that two corrections were needed on the minutes.

Correction 1 under Cornwall Councillors report on page 1 amend 'traffic lights' to 'street lamps'.

Correction 2 under minute reference **069/20** amend 'with Character Zone 6' to 'within Character Zone 6'.

It was **resolved** to accept these two amendments and that the minutes of the Virtual meeting held on 01 September 2020 are accepted, approved and duly signed by Mayor Hughes.

Vote – 10 in favour.

**095/20 Planning applications**

a)

Councillor Henderson left the meeting.

**PA20/06888**

Gables Dark Lane Lostwithiel  
Provision of a self-contained annexe over existing garage  
It was **resolved** to support this application.

Vote – 10 in favour.

Councillor Henderson re-joined the meeting.

**PA20/07308**

8 Coffee Lake Meadow Lostwithiel  
Works to tree namely - T1 - Oak -  
Height 11m spread 16m would like to reduce the whole crown by 2m in height and 1.5 - 2m spread to retain a shape - subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)  
It was **resolved** to support this application if the proposed tree

works meet with the approval of Cornwall Council's Forestry Team.

Votes – 10 in favour.

Councillor Hensman joined the meeting.

**PA20/07333**

Old Duchy Palace, Anna Dianne  
Furnishings Quay Street Lostwithiel  
Application for Listed Building  
Consent for Emergency remedial  
works to assess, treat and replace  
decayed floor and consent to retain  
temporary emergency works to  
basement undertaken in 2019

It was **resolved** to support this  
application providing works as  
described are in accordance with  
the recommendations of Cornwall  
Council's Conservation Team.

Votes – 11 in favour.

**PA20/07706**

Church of St Bartholomew North  
Street Lostwithiel  
Application for works to trees  
within conservation area: weeping  
willow height reduction by 2  
metres, snapped branches in past,  
weight on branches at high risk of  
breaking.

It was **resolved** to support this  
application if the proposed tree  
works meet with the approval of  
Cornwall Council's Forestry Team.

Votes – 11 in favour.

**PA20/07891**

Land South East Of 3 Lanwithan Road Lanwithan Road Lostwithiel Cornwall

Reserved Matters application following Outline approval PA17/09040 for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. It was **resolved** to support this application if Cornwall Council's Highways Team are satisfied that the entrance, as proposed, is not dangerous.

Votes – 9 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention.

b) None.

**096/20 Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government – Planning for the Future White Paper Consultation**

Councillor Guiterman requested that the minutes record his gratitude to Professor Scott for the input into Councillor Guiterman's drafted response to this agenda item.

It was **resolved** to accept Councillor Guiterman's drafted response as the Town Council's response to the consultation with the addition of 'Councils should be enabled to increase provision of socially rented housing' suggested by Councillor Sweeney for answer 21.

Votes – 11 in favour.

Question 1 What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?

Answer - Effective thorough democratic

Question 2a) Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area?

Answer – Yes

Question 2b) If not, why not?

Question 3 Our proposal will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future? (Social media/Online news/Newspaper/By post/Other – please specify)

Answer - Notification from Cornwall Council (Local Planning Authority)

Notices displayed in the area affected by any proposed development. It is important that local residents who live in the near vicinity are individually informed.

We would like to see wider dissemination of planning proposals to the local public so as to meet the Government's intention to 'give neighbourhoods and communities an earlier and more meaningful voice in the future of their area' Notifications should be sent directly from the local Council's planning portal to those in a relevant post code who have registered an interest in planning issues; notices in social media and local newsletters and newspapers giving links to the planning portal; we suggest there should be the facility to add local civic groups and associations (on request) to the list of Consultees. The key principal must be to increase awareness of planning proposals at an early stage.

Question 4 What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? (Building homes for young people/ building homes for the homeless/Protection of green spaces/ The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change/Increasing the affordability of housing/ The design of new homes and places/ Supporting the high street/ Supporting the local economy/ More or better local infrastructure/

Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas/ Other – please specify.

Answer - Increasing the affordability of housing; the environment, biodiversity and action on climate change. These priorities are interdependent, not ranked. i.e., increasing affordability *while also* ensuring environmental sustainability and a green environment. It is vital to maintain the character of the local situation with respect to heritage, design, and green spaces.

Question 5 Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.

Answer - No; in Cornwall, the local planning system works well and should be retained. It could serve as a model for other authorities.

Question 6 Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally?

(Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Cornwall Council's Local Plan and its supplementary planning documents provide sufficient detail already. These documents could serve as a model for other authorities. as an integral part of the local plan. Neighbourhood Development Plans are a crucial means of local involvement in a democratic planning process.

Question 7a) Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of 'sustainable development', which would include consideration of environmental impact? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - The principles of sustainable development are vital to the health of the environment and to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases. There is insufficient detail in this consultation to comment further on this. However, 'sustainable' a single criterion, would mean there could be little opportunity for any objections on other grounds (for example, the issues given in question 1 or such things as design and appearance). 'Sustainable development' may simply be whatever the Secretary of State says it is.

Question 7b) How could strategic, cross boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?

Answer - The requirement to co-operate between local authorities should be mandatory.

Question 8a) Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.)

Answer - A template standard method would ensure consistency. However, it should be able to be modified to suit local needs. It is important not to introduce a one-size-fits-all system.

A formula driven approach tends to assume that all land is equally suitable for development, regardless of topography, etc. For example, the Cornwall calculations on housing numbers were simply allocated pro rata to local areas, regardless of the amount of designated or renewal land available and without consideration of green belt and similar issues.

It is also important that allocations take account of demand factors, not simply supply factors. Housing should be provided where there is clear indication of local demand and where there is local employment. There is little point in building in villages and towns that are not close to areas of employment.



Question 8b) Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - This section implies that the barrier to satisfying housing and other development needs is because land has not been identified for development. There is a great deal of land that has been earmarked for development and much that has planning permission. Developers are, however sitting on much of this land waiting for its development value to increase (land banking). The government needs to facilitate the use of this land and discourage land banking with strong measures. The Government should consider implementing stricter requirements of commencement within 3 years, and a maximum time allowed for completion and firm criteria for any applications for extensions of time.

Question 9a) Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for sustainable development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Outline planning permission should be subject to local planning authority scrutiny and local consultation. It could be dangerous to bypass this essential step in the planning process which in the majority of cases is not the cause of significant delay. The facility for the local authority to offer advice in the pre-application stage works well and ensures that potential obstacles are discussed with a view to their solution. This process should be used more widely rather than implementing so-called efficiency changes. It is important to retain local control over design issues.

Question 9b) Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangement for Renewal and Protected areas? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - For Renewal Areas, there needs to be the correct balance between efficiency of the planning process and the need to ensure the development is appropriate. It is important for a full consultation to take place so as to avoid inappropriate development. The consideration of Protected Areas depends on the degree of protection afforded to the area. For example, where a Neighbourhood Plan sets out a development boundary there should be no development allowed outside this area. It has been noted in Cornwall that the Rural Exception facility has been abused by 'land banking'. In general, the criteria describing the protection should guide the planning process.

Question 9c) Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - There may be a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime however this should not be at the expense of bypassing local consultation. Local people have the knowledge of local requirements, conditions and constraints. This knowledge should inform any development consent. This is another area where 'demand' needs to be considered, not just 'supply'.

Question 10

Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - We support the use of IT to streamline the planning process where this would be useful. The aspiration to shorten the planning process should not result in a less thorough examination of and consultation over the applications in question. It would be useful to tighten up the deadlines but a degree of flexibility must be made to allow the unexpected. It is important that due process is pursued. Caution is however needed. Standardised digital tick boxing makes effective scrutiny more difficult. Simply ticking a box to say that, for example, highway access is appropriate or has been considered needs to be complemented by evidence-based justification for the tick. This is the only way in which developer assertions can be challenged or tested.

Question 11 – Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - We fully agree with this aspiration. Cornwall Council's system could be used as a model from which to develop national standards. It is always prudent to base developments on existing and proven good practice.

Question 12 - Do you agree with our proposals for a 30-month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Yes, this should be achievable and has been by a number of local authorities without the need to circumvent the proper process of full consultation. The government will however need to ensure that all local authorities have the resources to meet the 30-month deadline. Government grants should be made available. It is vital that the aspiration to reduce deadlines does not compromise engaging in the full democratic consultation process.

Question 13a) Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Yes; Neighbourhood Plans are a vital part of ensuring the local communities are involved in the planning process. It is local people who are familiar with local conditions and needs. There should be few if any planning processes which do not conform to the requirements of the relevant Neighbourhood Plan.

Any timetable should include sufficient time for public involvement and consultation. A tight timetable can be imposed on Council officials who are full-time involved, but local residents give their time voluntarily and must be able to work to a longer time scale or they will not get involved.

Question 13b) How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?

Answer - It is important that Neighbourhood Plans are revised in line with local plans and the NPPF. Any assistance that could be provided to make this onerous (but very valuable process) easier would be appreciated. Members of the local community who draw up Neighbourhood Plans would welcome on-line as well as face-to-face training to assist them draw up their plans. Such training should include techniques involved in effective public consultation.

Question 14 Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Yes; experience has shown that there is too much land banking resulting in land ear-marked for development and land with planning consent not being built-out.

Question 15 What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area? (Not sure or indifferent/ Beautiful and/or well-designed/ Ugly and/or poorly designed/ There hasn't been any/Other – please specify)

Answer - The design of recent developments in our local area has, by and large, been good. Design should reflect the well-designed buildings in the immediate area. Good Neighbourhood Plans specify that designs should reflect best local practice and use traditional, preferably locally-sourced materials which are already in use.

Question 16 – Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area? (Less reliance on cars/ More green and open spaces/ Energy efficiency of new buildings/More trees/ Other – please specify)

Answer - It is important that, where possible, developments provide access to green spaces and, where practicable, the open country without the use of cars. With the recent advance in solar-panel technology (30% increase) all buildings should, unless impracticable, have solar panels on their roofs. Trees and open spaces have been shown to increase the health and feeling of well-being of residents and tree-planting and retention should be encouraged.

Question 17 – Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Yes; design codes should reflect the best-practice architecture of the locality. Neighbourhood Plans should be required to be locally-specific in their design requirements to retain local character

Question 18 – Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Yes; the requirement for each local authority to identify a chief officer to oversee design will help ensure that planning officers consider design a priority. This kind of leadership is appropriate for insulation, quality of building materials, energy efficiency, etc., but not for appearance and appropriateness to conservation areas. These latter aspects are best decided on a neighbourhood Plan level. A new supporting body could well provide useful assistance

Question 19 – Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Yes; good design is important not only for aesthetic reasons but helps ensure a building's maximum functionality and longevity.

Question 20 – Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Yes; with reservations. It is important that design reflects the best-practice architecture in the local area. This is especially important in architecturally heritage-rich locations.

Question 21 – When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it? (More affordable housing/ More of better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health provision)/Design of new buildings/More shops and/or employment space/ Green space/ Don't know/ Other – please specify)

Answer - It is important that, where possible, developments provide access to green spaces and, where practicable, the open country without the use of cars. In areas like Cornwall which are popular holiday destinations the purchase of dwellings for second-homes has inflated the market price and so kept many poorer people from being able to afford to buy housing. Our priority is the provision of a range of affordable homes schemes. The purchase of second- homes has not only increased the market value of properties so as to be out of reach of many in low-wage areas but it has blighted the sense of community in many hamlets and villages. If the government is serious about providing more housing, it should consider ways of severely discouraging second-home ownership. In holiday destinations, this would significantly increase the availability of housing stock without additional development being needed. Councils should be enabled to increase provision of social rented housing. Councils should be enabled to increase provision of socially rented housing.

Question 22a) Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold?  
(Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - A consolidated levy would be useful but the charge should be nuanced to reflect local needs and costs. The threshold value should be set low so as to ensure that most developments contribute.

Question 22b) Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally?  
(Nationally at a single rate/Nationally at an area specific rate/Locally)

Answer - Set locally within an overall framework of guidance

Question 22c) Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities? (Same amount overall/More value/Less value/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - The levy should increase in value overall but will need to be set on a development-by-development basis to as the cost to the developer does not inhibit development which is of benefit to the local community.

Question 22d) Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.)

Answer - Yes; development of infrastructure associated with a development often has to take place before the levy is paid. The government should provide loans to local authorities at a very low or zero rate of interest.

Question 23 – Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Yes; given that the building of affordable houses is one of our top priorities

Question 24a) Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Yes; at least as much if not more in both categories



Question 24b) Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - It is important that the infrastructure levy is high enough to provide a substantial contribution to infrastructure. If the selling of houses below market-value is to be in part payment-in-kind, then this levy discount needs to be kept low. The right to buy at a reduced price would be beneficial only if the local authority had sufficient purchasing-power. Low-interest government loans or grants should be available to local authorities so they can increase their stock of affordable houses.

Question 24c) If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Yes; this would help local authorities being over-charged by developers.

Question 24d) If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - Yes; affordable housing within an otherwise market-price development should be indistinguishable from the market-value housing. This will prevent the development of affordable-house ghettos.

Question 25 – Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - The proportion of the infra-structure levy for local (parish/town council) use should be increased to 30% were a Neighbourhood Plan exists. Other than that, there should be fewer restrictions on how local authorities can spend the levy as this will provide for greater flexibility to meet local demands.

Question 25a) – If yes, should an affordable housing ‘ring-fence’ be developed? (Yes/No/Not sure. Please provide supporting statement)

Answer - No; that would reduce the flexibility.

Question 26 – Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

Answer – No

Councillor Hatton and Councillor P Jarrett joined the meeting.

**097/20 Forest Management carried out by Forestry England**

It was **resolved** to not submit a response to the Forest Management consultation.

Votes – 13 in favour.

**098/20 Community Network Highways Scheme**

It was **resolved** to apply to the Year 3 Community Network Highways Scheme for funding for a speeding feasibility study to alleviate speeding in Lostwithiel.

Votes 13 in favour.

It was further **resolved** to have a plan B that will be put in place if the funding is not approved for feasibility study. The plan B would be to put entrance gateways on the A390 and the road from St Winnow, so people are more aware they are entering a built-up area.

Votes – 13 in favour.

Councillor Hensman left the meeting

**099/20 Cornwall Council Library fines**

It was **resolved** to continue the current library fines amnesty until all Covid 19 restrictions are lifted, thereafter to reintroduce library fines.

Councillor Hatton left the meeting.

Votes – 11 in favour.

Councillor Hensman re-joined the meeting.

**100/20 Covid 19 risk assessments**

It was **resolved** to note the review of all the risk assessments and to approve retrospectively the actions of the Town Clerk and maintain the Lostwithiel Library courtyard click and collect service as a once a week service.

Votes – 12 in favour.

**101/20 King George V Tree damage**

It was **resolved** to note the report received and to authorise the removal of the tree at a cost of £375 plus VAT.

Votes - 12 in favour.

**102/20 Cemetery entrance trees**

It was **resolved** to authorise the removal of two trees showing signs of ash die back and one sycamore which is pushing out the wall at a cost of £725 plus VAT.

Votes – 12 in favour.

**103/20 Land between Quay Street car park & Coulson Park**

Councillor Hatton re-joined the meeting.

It was **resolved** that the Town Council seeks to establish ownership with HM Land Registry for the land between Quay Street car park and Coulson Park.

Votes – 7 in favour, 6 against.

#### **104/20 Lostwithiel Neighbourhood Plan**

It was **resolved** to note Professor Scott's comments, to thank him for what he has done and to advise that at the moment Council will not be taking forward the recommendations included in his correspondence and explain that we are in difficult times due to Covid19 and it will be taken forward when possible.

Votes – 12 in favour, 1 against.

#### **105/20 Bridgend Peace War Memorial plaque**

It was **resolved** to approve the cost of £326.45 plus Vat to supply and fit a 3mm new reverse etched bronze plaque 325 x 220mm with threaded bar on rear.

Votes – 13 in favour.

#### **106/20 Lostwithiel Museum window display**

It was **resolved** to agree to the request received to borrow the 'old' Mayor's robe and to allow the Mayors Chain, Mace and oar to be photographed for a window display late 2020/early 2021.

Votes – 13 in favour.

#### **107/20 Community Speed watch**

It was **resolved** to note the initiative set up by a Lostwithiel resident and concerns expressed by residents regarding speeding traffic & wildlife fatalities.

Votes – 13 in favour.

Councillor Hensman left the meeting.

**108/20 Lostwithiel Public Toilet**

It was **resolved** to install a new seal to the existing manhole cover and frame at a cost of £329.40 plus VAT.

Votes – 12 in favour.

Councillor Hensman re-joined the meeting.

**109/20 Lostwithiel Public Toilet**

It was **resolved** to instruct the Clerk to prepare a specification for a new door for the public toilet, to check if this can be an automatically closing door and to invite prices from the Lostwithiel carpenters listed on Yell.com and to invite further prices by ‘posting’ details on the Town Council’s Facebook page.

Votes – 12 in favour, 1 abstention.

**110/20 Litter bins & extra lifebelt**

It was **resolved** to put lidded bin next to the King George V play area and an additional bin at the skate park. It was further **resolved** to contact the members of the public to explain the difficulty in getting a recycling bin collection at the skate park.

It was decided that the dog bin and extra lifebelt by the boat ramp are given further consideration when ownership of the land has been established.

Votes – 13 in favour.

**111/20 Library alarm**

This item was deferred to the next Council meeting.

Councillor Hatton and Councillor Hensman left the meeting.

**112/20 Climate/Environmental Action**

This item was deferred to the next Council meeting.

**113/20 Lostwithiel Councillors email upgrade**

It was **resolved** to approve the upgrading of the current email system at a cost of £12 monthly.

Votes – 13 in favour.

#### **114/20 What3words**

This item was deferred to the next Council meeting.

#### **115/20 Condemned bench**

This item was deferred to the next Council meeting.

#### **116/20 Delegation to the Town Clerk**

This item was deferred to the next Council meeting.

#### **117/20 Accounts & Finance**

- a) It was **resolved** that payments to Pendour Park and two payments for the outdoor gym and considered in closed session, but that all other payments are approved. -

<b>Cheque Ref</b>	<b>Payee Name</b>		<b>Amount Paid</b>
101502 & 101503	Salary related expenses	Replacement cheques for 101486 & 101487	£1068.07
101504	Biffa	Cemetery bin (2 months)	£91.80
101505	British Gas	Electric	£75.15
101506	Cormac	Cemetery, cleaning & play area removal of swings	£2,231.69
101507	DCS Pest Control (Cornwall) Ltd	Pest control	£240.00
101508	D2C Ltd	Play area signs	£344.16
101509	Claire Doyle	Wipes & library milk	£20.14

101510	EDF Energy	Electric	£56.49
101511	Mr B Harrison	Pelyn Cross plants	£89.00
101512	Sandra Harris	Stamps, Library bags. Library outdoor table & JCT contract papers	£163.75
101513	K Hill & Partners Ltd	Grass cutting & weed spraying	£2,197.20
101514	Outdoor Play People	Pendour Park project retention	£1065.90
101515	Phoneta	Lone worker service	£12.00
101516	South West Councils	Lunchtime HR webinar	£30.00
101517	Cheque destroyed		£0.00
101518	Alexanders Invoice Finance	Outdoor Gym	£13,677.19
101519	Alexanders Invoice Finance	Outdoor Gym	£607.82
101520	Torch Fire Protection Ltd	Annual fire extinguishers & fire blanket maintenance	£113.55
101521	WesternWeb Ltd	Computer monitors & speakers, router for remote working, replace faulty back up drive, upgrade laptop to Windows 10 & install 500GB SSD & 2 GB RAM	£503.52

101522	SW Water Business	Water	£44.22
101523	Walter Bailey (Par)	Second wheelie bin for library	£55.00
101524 & 525 & 2 x BACS Transfers	Salary related expenses	Salary related expenses	£3199.58
		<b>Total</b>	<b>£25787.01</b>

Votes – 11 in favour.

### **118/20 Quarterly finance report**

This item was deferred to the next Council meeting.

### **119/20 For information**

Deputy Mayor Ross reported that Lostwithiel Town Council has been invited to do a presentation at the forthcoming Cornwall Flood Forum's Annual Conference on 06 November 2020.

Mayor Hughes reported that he attended a virtual Great Western Railway timetable planning meeting. Train services are now reported as being nearly back to normal again.

The meeting closed at 9.52pm.

Chairman

Date