

**LOSTWITHIEL TOWN COUNCIL**  
**Edgcumbe House**  
**Fore Street**  
**Lostwithiel**  
**Cornwall**  
**PL22 0BL**  
**01208 872323**  
**clerk@lostwithieltowncouncil.gov.uk**

Dear Councillor,

Councillors are hereby summoned under the Local Government Act 1972 Sch. 12 para 9 to attend an Extraordinary Virtual Meeting of Lostwithiel Town Council to be held on Tuesday 12 January 2021 commencing at 7.00pm when the following business will be transacted.

*T Hughes*

Councillor T Hughes  
Mayor of Lostwithiel  
06 January 2021



**Lostwithiel Town Council Extraordinary Virtual Meeting  
will be held**

**on Tuesday 12 January 2021 at 7pm**

**Members of the public are able to join the meeting from a  
computer, tablet or smartphone**

**<https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/7966389865381202957>**

**or by dialling in using a phone on.  
020 3713 5012**

**Access Code: 207-105-067**

This meeting is open to the public and as such could be filmed or recorded by broadcasters, the media or members of the public. Please be aware that whilst every effort is taken to ensure that members of the public are not filmed, **the council cannot guarantee this**, especially if you are speaking or taking an active role. The council asks those recording proceedings not to edit the film or recording in a way that could lead to misinterpretation of the proceedings or infringe the core values of the council. This includes refraining from editing an image or views expressed in a way that may ridicule or show lack of respect towards those being filmed or recorded.

Housekeeping – Mayor Hughes will advise that the meeting may be filmed or recorded

Members and Members of the Public are asked to set device ring tones/alerts to silent

- To receive the Cornwall Councillor report

## **Meeting Agenda**

1. Apologies – to receive and accept Apologies of Absence.

If you are unable this meeting could you please email [clerk@lostwithieltowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@lostwithieltowncouncil.gov.uk) with your apologies before midday on the day of the meeting. Thank you to Councillors who have already advised the office that they are unable to attend the meeting.

2. To receive from Council Members any Declarations of Interest, written requests for new DPI dispensations and declarations of any gifts or hospitality.

Members are invited to declare disclosable pecuniary interests and other (non-registerable) interests in items on the agenda as required by Lostwithiel Town Council's Code of Conduct for Members and by the Localism Act 2011.

3. Public Participation - Time allowed for members of the public to address the Council on matters on the agenda – Maximum time allowed 15 minutes.

The Council has varied meeting Standing Orders and until physical meetings can be re-established Members of the Public are asked to submit any questions regarding items on the agenda to [clerk@lostwithieltowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@lostwithieltowncouncil.gov.uk). For this meeting, please submit your questions by 5pm on Monday 11 January 2021.

Planning Applications & discussions – ‘Whilst Members may express an opinion for or against the proposed development plans at this meeting Members minds are not closed and they will only come to a conclusion on whether they should support the scheme or offer an objection after they have listened to the full debate.’

4. To receive the minutes of the virtual extraordinary meeting held on 22 December 2020 having previously been circulated and taken as read.

5. Planning applications –

a) To consider planning applications

**PA20/11003**

Shi On Bodmin Hill Lostwithiel  
Construction of garage with study  
at first floor level

2 Comments.

**Mr Eddie Sugar**

**Comment submitted date: Thu 07 Jan 2021**

I object to this application for the following reasons:

The plot is already over developed - the house is very large for the size of the plot and allows very little space for garden or wildlife. The proposed garage/study would considerably worsen this.

The documentation (floor and roof plans and section) quotes the ridge height as 58.394 and that the highest point of the main house is 54.78. Surely it can't be correct that the proposed garage would be 3.5 metres higher than the existing house!! Whatever its height relative to the existing house, the proposed building would be right on the boundary of the plot adjoining the street/pavement and given that it would be a substantial two storey structure it would completely dominate the view from the street and would worsen the streetscene considerably. It would also be out of character with surrounding properties fronting Bodmin Hill which are set back from

the road and of modest proportions.

I also agree with the more detailed comments made by my wife in her separate letter.

Please take these points into consideration when determining the application.

Thank you

**Mrs Julia Sugar**

**Comment submitted date: Thu 07 Jan 2021**

I would like to register my objections to this planning application for the following reasons. I would also like to express my dissatisfaction at the timing of it. We received the notification on Christmas Eve. The date on the letter was 18th December 2020, 21 days from that date is 8th January 2021. This covers the whole of the holiday period and doesn't give anyone a chance to properly consider the application, especially town councillors.

1. When the existing dwelling, Shi-on, sought planning permission (application no 10/00733) assurances were given that the streetscene would be maintained. The dwelling's ground floor would be "obscured by the existing Cornish stone hedge and mature trees" and the first floor would also be "obscured by a mature horse chestnut tree".

The Council granted permission for the application, citing among its reasons the fact that the development "maintains the streetscene."

When the development commenced the Cornish hedge was removed and the ground was dug away deeply around the mature horse chestnut tree, taking away a great deal of its root system. This resulted in the tree being felled for safety reasons.

Now the "existing Cornish hedge with shrubs" and "existing mature tree" as labelled on the application, have been replaced by a fence.

This greatly changed the streetscene.

The present application would further damage the streetscene by the view of a building right on the boundary over 6m wide and at least 5.5m high. (Note the application does not give the height of the building relative to the surroundings as the quoted ridge height of 58.394m is obviously wrong. The highest ridge point of the main house is 54.78m). The ridge height of the bungalow, Penfrayne, immediately to the south is only 52.413m. Datum level at the base of the garage is approximately 49m which would make the ridge height about 54.5m. The level of the road here is 47.5m, lower than the base of the garage, and sloping even lower down Bodmin Hill, so the building would tower about 7m above road level.

2. The proposed building is of a substantial size, occupying a larger proportion of the front of the main house than the Block Plan suggests. The front of the plot does not widen as shown on the plan, but is approximately the same width as the rear of the plot. The cars illustrated are small, giving the appearance of space that isn't there. This building would take up an excessive amount of the limited outdoor space available to the main house.

3. The proposed garage covers the only area of green in front of the main house. Natural drainage of rainwater would be eliminated.

4. There is an existing mature horse chestnut tree close to where the foundations of the proposed building would be dug. I feel that damage could be done to the root system of this tree, especially in view of what happened to the other one when the main house was built.

I trust you will take these points into consideration when considering this application.

# Shi On, Bodmin Hill, Lostwithiel, PL22 0AJ









<https://planning.cornwall.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QL4OG1FGKZO00>

b) To consider any planning applications received since the publication of the agenda

6. Covid 19 risk assessments to review the following risk assessments: -

Lostwithiel Skatepark

Lostwithiel King George V MUGA

Lostwithiel King George V play area

Lostwithiel King George V outdoor gym

Coulson Park play area

Pendour Park play area

Lostwithiel Public Toilet

Lostwithiel Library courtyard click and collect service

Lostwithiel park and picnic benches

In accordance with Government guidelines the outdoor gym and MUGA are closed. In accordance with information published on SkateboardGB namely 'The government has announced that all sports and all exercise venues, indoor and outdoor skateparks must close during the period of lockdown in England.' The skatepark is also closed.

7. Cornwall Council Climate Emergency Development Plan Document  
Proposed draft – to agree Lostwithiel Town Council's response.

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

Copies of the document can be downloaded from:

[www.cornwall.gov.uk/climatechangedpd](http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/climatechangedpd)

### **How to view the documents and comment**

Due to the ongoing situation caused by Covid-19, the consultation will be held predominantly on-line, and no face to face public events or exhibitions are planned. This is to protect the health of our communities. We recognise that people may want to contribute ideas and comments through other means – if you are unable to view the document in any other way, we can provide a paper copy of the documents. We have organised online events that you can reserve a place on. Please let us know if you would like to register for one of these sessions using our dedicated email address:

[climateemergencydpd@cornwall.gov.uk](mailto:climateemergencydpd@cornwall.gov.uk)

Tuesday 12th January 1.30pm – 3pm

Wednesday 13th January 10.30am – 12noon

Thursday 14th January 3.30pm – 5pm

Friday 15th January 2pm – 3.30pm

8. Cornwall Association of Local Councils – Government Committee on Standards in Public Life consultation - to agree Lostwithiel Town Council's response to the following questions: -

Question 1: Standards of Conduct in the UK

A. How well do you think ethical standards - as enshrined by the Seven Principles of Public Life - are upheld in public life today?

B. Do you believe that there have been any notable shifts in approaches or attitudes to ethical standards in public life in recent years?

C. What do you see as the most significant threats to ethical standards in public life today?

Question 2: The Seven Principles of Public Life

A. Do the Seven Principles of Public Life accurately describe the appropriate ethical responsibilities for those in public roles, including both political and non-political office-holders?

B. Would you amend or replace any of the principles or their descriptors? If so, how?

Question 3: The UK's arrangements for regulating standards

A. Are you confident that the UK's arrangements for regulating ethical standards are robust and effective?

B. Are there any areas of public life where regulation on issues of ethical standards is not strong enough?

Question 4: Best practice in standards regulation

A. What makes an effective standards regulator?

B. Do the UK's standards regulators have the right powers and remit to act effectively?

C. Should the independence of standards regulators be enhanced and protected, and if so, how?

#### Question 5: Creating ethical cultures

A. How can the Seven Principles best be embedded within a public sector organisation's working culture?

B. What are the most significant obstacles to embedding high ethical standards in a public sector organisation?

Please see email forwarded 08 January 2021

9. Cornwall Council – Code of Conduct consultation – to draft Lostwithiel Town Council's response to this consultation (closing date 18 February 2021).

Please see email forwarded 06 January 2021

10. Lostwithiel Community Centre grant application – to consider the application received. (This application is not in addition to but instead of the recent boiler grant application).
11. Lostwithiel Town Council 2021-2022 Budget - to further consider the draft 2021-2022 budget in the context of the Council Reserves Policy and the list of Earmarked and General reserves and to approve the budget, the required precept and to decide if Council wishes to use the tapering Council Tax Support Grant to offset the precept.
12. Lostwithiel Town Council 2021-2022 Precept – to resolve to instruct the Proper Officer to submit the precept demand as agreed under agenda item 11 to Cornwall Council.

13. Property Flood Resilience Pathfinder Project – to consider giving consent for Deputy Mayor Ross to submit a video for uploading to the BeFlood Ready website. The project is looking for videos which highlight the ‘fabulous work Community Flood Groups do enhancing local preparedness.’

Good afternoon Karen,

I hope you are well. I am writing to you today as the Property Flood Resilience Pathfinder Project are preparing some video stories to upload on the BeFloodReady website. We are extending our invitation to participate in this to Community Flood Groups, and I have been asked to get in contact with those who may be interested. We are looking for just a short video to highlight the fabulous work Community Flood Groups do for enhancing local preparedness as we feel it is really important to share this. We need a few groups from Cornwall to explain what they've been up to! It would be good to have a short piece to camera about how they formed the group, developed local flood emergency plans, any exercises they've had to test PFR deployment etc. and I wondered if you (or another member of the Lostwithiel Flood Group) would be prepared to do this?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best wishes,

Molly

Molly Flynn

Community Flood Resilience Co-ordinator

Cornwall Community Flood Forum

14. Lostwithiel Flooding December 2020 – to consider a report from Deputy Mayor Ross and to discuss topics for discussion at a multi-agency flood meeting to be held at end of January 2021.
15. Heritage Buildings Committee – to appoint new members to the Committee who have agreed to join for the purposes of facilitating the Cornwall Council Town Centre Revitalisation Fund application.
16. Cornwall Council Town Centre Revitalisation Fund – to receive a progress update from the Heritage Building Committee.
17. Grit bins – to consider correspondence received regarding:-
  - a) a replacement bin for Meadow Breeze

Hi Sandra,  
Happy New Year,  
Could we have a new grit bin in Meadow Breeze, please?  
On New Year's Eve after the snow, someone (Unknown) skidded into the old bin and literally smashed it into two pieces.  
Beyond economic repair is the technical term I think. Whoever was in the vehicle, it may have saved their life, without the bin they would probably have crashed down the bank into Tanhouse Road, a drop of 20ft or so.  
Since it was first installed the bin has saved us from being cut off on several occasions, it has had a lot of use.

Hi Sandra

Happy New Year

Please can you order a new salt bin for Meadow Breeze? In the snow etc. this morning somebody crashed into the existing one and smashed it

Dear Sandra



Please could you ask the Town Council to consider funding a new grit bin for Meadow Breeze? The last one was apparently destroyed by a car skidding on ice last week. As you can see below, I have asked Cornwall Council to replace it, but as we are currently facing a shortfall of several million pounds due to unfunded COVID costs, we are struggling to fund anything beyond our legal minimum duties.

**b) Gilbury Hill**

Good morning

I have just telephoned Highways to enquire about gritting on Castle Hill. The operative advised that they had received calls re the A390 specifically near the Fowey Best Western.

However, they would not grit Castle Hill leading onto the estate. There are currently no grit boxes other than up the top by the Cemetery, which is no good to residents on the Estate. I fell over last week on black ice going down into Lostwithiel and ended up in Treliske.....

I am very concerned as residents including children walk down Castle Hill, and if any vehicle loses control on this road there could potentially be a very nasty accident. Is there any way we can get some grit boxes put on/near the entrance to the estate to try and prevent any accidents?

**18. Footpaths complaint – to consider the complaint received regarding trail bikes using a local footpath.**

Hello,

I would like this matter brought to the attention of the Town Council please.

Yesterday (Sunday January 3) my husband and I were walking down the footpath which runs due south along the edge of Poldew Wood, towards Tanhouse Road when we heard the sound of motorbikes behind us.

We turned to see two men on trail bikes coming down the footpath. We stopped and told them to turn around as the path is a footpath only and not open to motorised vehicles. The two men claimed that they had a right to use the path and refused to turn around. They forced their way past and continued on down the path. It was fortunate neither of us was injured.

I have reported this matter to the Police, who have since been in contact with me about it and to the Countryside section of Cornwall Council as I am aware that problems on footpaths are not the Town Council's responsibility.

I have also been in touch with our County Councillor to discuss this issue.

I am contacting you about this as I believe you will be concerned, as I am, about the dangers of motorised vehicles using footpaths. I would hope that you might agree to raise this matter with Cornwall Council to try to prevent this kind of access in future, perhaps with the imposition of kissing gates or stiles at either end of the path.

I should be grateful if you could let me know what actions you may agree to take.

19. Bench seat set on town side of bus stop adjacent to North Street – to consider the request received to arrange for the bench to be repaired.

Dear Mrs Harris,

On my walk round the town, I noticed the very poor condition of the bench seat set at the town side of the bus stop near to North Street. This is the only bench seat on the town side of the A390. Could you ask one of councillors to investigate with a view to having this repaired?

20. River Fowey Railway bridge works – to update Council.

21. Allotments – to receive an update on progress and to consider the following :-

a) the price received to remove the fallen tree

Price to remove the fallen part of the tree and arisings £420 plus VAT.

Price to remove whole tree and arisings £680 plus VAT. Treatment of stump to prevent regrowth £36 plus VAT.

b) the price received to replace the post and rail fence from the corner of the Cemetery path back to the allotment field hedge.

£420 plus VAT

c) the price for the removal of the ash trees on the top hedge of the allotment field.

£2,200 plus VAT (subject to the farmer allowing access from his side of the hedge)

d) the suggestions from Councillor Guiterman regarding hedging plants

e) the type of grass seed for the Cemetery extension area

f) the suggestion from the contractor that stone is imported for new parking areas

22. Delegation to the Town Clerk – to note actions taken by the Town Clerk under delegated powers.

23. Accounts & Finance

a) To approve payment of the following: -

<b>Cheque Ref</b>	<b>Payee Name</b>		<b>Amount Paid</b>
101576	National Allotment Society	Annual membership fee	£66.00
101577	Biffa	Cemetery bin charge	£40.80
101578	Cormac	Public Toilet and Library cleaning	£1,122.50
101579	DCS Pest Control	Mole treatment King George V	£180.00
101580	Tim Hughes	Stamps for Christmas cards	£65.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,474.30</b>

24. For information – to include an update on any meetings or training attended by Members or Officers as representatives of the Town Council and any future dates for the diary.