

TINTAGEL PARISH COUNCIL



'Tintagel's Great Seal'

Clerk: Carolyn Y. May

Phone: 01726 210139

E-mail: clerk@tintagelparishcouncil.gov.uk

Website: www.tintagelparishcouncil.gov.uk

**Tintagel Visitor Centre
Bossiney Road
Tintagel
Cornwall
PL34 0AJ**

19th August 2017

Minutes of the meeting of Tintagel Parish Council **Wednesday 18th August 2017**

Present: Cllrs. Hodge (Chairman), Brooks (Vice Chairman), Dale, Dyer, Flower, Goward, Hart, Wickett.

Also: Cllr Barry Jordan (CC)

Clerk: Carolyn Y. May

The Chairman read the following declaration:

Attendees please note:

This meeting has been advertised as a public meeting and, as such, could be filmed or recorded by broadcasters, the media, individual Councillors or members of the public. Please be aware that, whilst every effort is taken to ensure that members of the public are not filmed, we cannot guarantee this, especially if you are speaking or taking an active role.

Attendees were also advised that the meeting was being recorded.

Apologies: None

Members of the Public – Approximately 32

Declarations of Interest

Cllr Goward – Planning Application PA17/07088

Cllr Hart – Planning Applications PA17/07379; PA17/06893; PA17/06355

Cllr Hodge – any issues raised relating to the Code of Conduct

Cllr Brooks – any issues raised relating to the Code of Conduct

Cllr Dale – any issues raised relating to the Code of Conduct

Cllr Hart – any issues raised relating to the Code of Conduct

Invitation to members of the public to speak prior to meeting (10 minutes allowed for this item).

The Chairman stated that the public discussion is generally limited to 10 minutes but may be extended at his discretion.

The Chairman announced that the first item to be addressed in the public session of the meeting would be a presentation by Georgia Butters, Head of Operations in Cornwall, English Heritage, in relation to the proposed foot bridge between the mainland and Tintagel Castle.

Cllr Wickett stated that he felt that it would be appropriate to ask if any Members of the public, who had come along to the meeting, wished to speak. He stated that many of the members of the public who had attended at the last public meeting had been unable to raise matters due to the length of time that been devoted to the discussions relating to the Trebarwith Toilets matter.

Mr Iain McKay stated that he wished to speak, prior to Ms Butters and added that the issues would not take long, unlike the issues of the bridge and Post Office. Mr McKay also stated that he felt that his points were instrumental to how the whole of the meeting would run.

Meeting Suspension/ Minutes

Mr McKay alluded to the suspension of the meeting of the 7th June and the subsequent meeting of the 15th June. The assembly was advised of the existence of a transcript of the meeting (of the 7th June) and that this disproved the contention that the meeting was suspended due to persistent disorder. The transcript also proved that the decision to suspend the meeting was made whilst three Council Members were not in the meeting room.

Mr McKay added that the meeting of the 15th June had been convened for a date where it was known that three Members of the Council would be on holiday. He did not dispute the legality of the meeting of the 15th June but questioned whether the decision to call the same had been sensible.

Mr McKay then asked the Clerk if she had written the meeting Minutes (for June 7th) that had been ratified on 15th June. The Clerk advised that she had written the draft Minutes for the meeting of the 7th, which were then forwarded to the Chairman for his consideration. The Minutes (for the 7th June) had been amended by the Chairman to reflect parts of the

discussion which he felt that the Clerk had not included. Mr McKay added that the, clearly erroneous, Minutes for the 7th June had then be ratified by three Councillors at the meeting of the 15th June. He queried whether this was a properly run Council. Mr McKay asked the Chairman if he would resign if the Minutes of the 7th June were proven not to be correct. The Chairman stated that he would not resign.

Cllr Hart asked, if the Minutes of the 7th June were proven to be incorrect, would the Chairman remove them from the Meeting Minutes of the 15th June. The Chairman stated that, if alterations were required, then they would be made.

It was pointed out that the action detailed (above) could not be undertaken.

The Clerk intervened at that point stating that she believed that, under the circumstances, it would be acceptable for the Minutes of the 7th June to be reconsidered in light of evidence that could be provided. She believed that such an action could be justified because references were made to people who were not present (on the 15th June) to discuss the same. The Clerk suggested that, if Members would agree to the course of action put forward, then that arrangement could be implemented. She added that, in the spirit of compromise (because there was a very full agenda for that evening, the matter should be placed on the Agenda for the next Parish Council meeting.

Cllr Goward expressed CALC's view of the Minutes not being listed on the Agenda of the 15th June. The Clerk advised that there is no such thing as an illegal meeting but that she felt the Meeting Minutes for the 15th June (ergo those for the 7th June) should be ratified at the next Parish Council meeting.

Cllr Hart raised the question about who should write the Minutes. He alluded to the process employed prior to May 2017, where the Clerk distributed the draft Minutes to everybody. He added that the SLCC had advised him that the Minutes were the responsibility of the Clerk and that the Chairman had no right to re-write the same. Cllr Hart added that the actions of the Chairman were undermining the position of the Clerk.

The Clerk proposed the drafting and adoption of a new standing order on this matter, to be agreed by Members. Such an order would provide for simultaneous dissemination of Draft Minutes to all Members and the consideration (by the Clerk) of proposed amendments to be put forward at the following Council Meeting.

Cllr Wickett stated that he was happy to discuss the Minutes alluded to above but that, in future, the Minutes must come out in their 'raw' form to Members, to be discussed.

Mr Iain McKay closed by stating that it is appreciated that the Parish Councillors work without charge and that the Parish wished to work with the Council. However, at present, the Council is chaotic; verging on illegal. The embellishment of the Minutes of the 7th June was inappropriate and tarnished the whole Council.

Councillors Meeting

Cllr Hart proposed that between the meeting of the 18th August and the meeting of the 13th September 2017, there should be a meeting of Councillors only, not in public, in order to sort the situation out and enable the Council to move on to the September meeting without issues like this being present.

It was **agreed** that a meeting of Councillors would be convened, prior to the next full meeting of the Parish Council.

The Chairman stated that Members were in breach of the Councillors Code of Conduct by what has been done during the present meeting (18th August); by involving the general public in Members internal issues.

Trevena Square Lavatories

A member of the public raised the issues surrounding the disabled lavatory in Trevena Square. She advised Members that the alarms had activated on frequent occasions, this in turn, locks the facility down and prevents access into the same. The member of the public pointed out that, should someone inside be suffering with a heart attack, the situation could be fatal and every minute would count.

The lady suggested that there had been a plan to provide a master key for immediate response and asked what was being done about this.

The Chairman advised that this matter was to be put to the Council during the Agenda discussions. It had been discussed, informally, that a key might be left at the Spar Shop (close to the lavatories) for emergency situations and that an appropriate notice would be placed on the lavatory doors showing a telephone number for the contractor, so they could be called.

Clarification re: 7th June 2017 Meeting

Mr Lewis asked the Clerk if the person who was noted, in the Minutes for that Meeting, as 'interrupting the Chairman, was him. The Clerk advised Mr Lewis that she did not know who the person was.

Meeting Information

Mrs Julie Keenan asked if the Parish Meeting information (particularly if altered from the normal pattern) was a better/ different way that the changes could be advertised across the village because people do not always read the notice boards.

It was agreed that this could be looked at. However, it was mentioned that the meetings are advertised on the Council website (including the Facebook page) and on notice boards. Perhaps leaflets could be put into local shops.

Planning Issues

Mr Peter Wonnacott, wished to allude to Planning Application PA17/05511; outline proposal for one new dwelling with all matters reserved except for access. Land at Kays Mews, Fore Street, Tintagel; offering to answer any questions in relation to the same.

Mrs C. Devereux-Mack P/A 17/07316; Application for outline consent with some matters reserved, for construction of two dwellings (only access for consideration). Land west of Bundu, Sanding Road, Tintagel.

Tintagel Foot Bridge

The Chairman introduced Georgia Butters who alluded to the high number of visitors to Tintagel Castle over the last year (227,000). This year it seems that there will be a similar number.

Ms Butters highlighted the difficulty with the (120) step access and over-crowding. It was felt that an innovative solution had been identified, with the construction of a new footbridge and an associated one-way system around the site, via a series of footpaths. Currently, a substantial number of plants are being damaged through foot erosion. The site is a SSSI and this erosion needs to be limited.

Visitors would exit the island via the steps where, currently, there are two pinch-points where people won't pass each other during busy times.

This project is about managing the site and dealing with the increasing number of visitors. The quality and design will encourage a different group of people to the village and enable the flow to be managed appropriately. It will also provide step-free access to the castle, removing steps where necessary. This will enable visitors not currently able to access the castle an opportunity to do so. The access will not be completely DDA compliant but will enable access to wheelchair users and children in buggies.

One member of the public raised the issue of how visitors will get from Tintagel to the start of the bridge, for example; those in wheelchairs.

Ms Butters advised that the Mill path is to be widened and a better stopping area is to be created, thus Landrover service etc will be able to travel more easily along that section. Those in wheelchairs will be able to go further than the inner courtyard on the island and could access the first viewing point.

Wear and tear on the island will be managed through the use of floating footpaths, which do not require foundations. This will encourage people to take a particular route around the island. Another area will be turned into an eco-zone and signage will encourage people not to cross that area (but will not prevent them).

Cllr Flower stated that the scheme will ruin the view and necessitate 'ripping up' the side of the valley. Ms Butters refuted this assertion, the path is being cleared on the hillside and

slightly widened. Those who cannot, or do not wish to, use the steps will not be prevented from returning to the land side of the site via the bridge.

Ms Butters also emphasised that the organisation had been working with a highly qualified and skilled team of engineers to ensure that everything done will work with the geology. Should the project go ahead, local contractors will have the opportunity to tender for work.

Two Members of the public identified the benefits of the project to both the maintenance of the island and the economic benefits to be gained through increased access to the castle.

This matter is to be placed on the agenda for the next Parish Council meeting.

Post Office

Mr Deepak Kumar, owner of the Premier Food Store (previous site of the Tintagel Post Office) addressed the Parish Council. He emphasised that he would be willing to have the Post Office return to his premises, provided the remuneration for maintaining the service was acceptable. He advised Members that the cost to his business of running the amenity had been £21,000 for the year (he alluded to the Post Office staffing cost, which was met from his business income). Mr Kumar stated that, if the Post Office was prepared to pay the total costs of running the Post Office, he would re-open the facility on his premises.

Mr Kumar stressed that he did not wish to make a profit from running the post office service, only cover his costs. Any profit made from the service (in excess of his costs) could be returned to the Post Office and any deficit would require a reimbursement to him from the Post Office.

Mr Kumar stated that the Post Office did not meet staffing; heating; lighting and telephone costs. Due to the busy nature of the service in his shop, it was often necessary to have two employees working on the post office counter.

Mr Stuart Taylor, External Relations Manager for the Post Office, responded to Mr Kumar by stating that he wanted Tintagel to have a post office and the best way of sustaining a post office service is to combine it with a viable retail shop. The post office franchise is free and provides 180 products and services. The benefit of a Post Office is footfall.

When asked how a resident could post a package or letter, in Tintagel, at present Mr Taylor responded that residents could use on of approximately 5,500 Post Office competitors and pay all bills online. He added that the Tintagel Post Office had to change is because the original owner sold the business. He had to resign because he no longer had a property interest.

The Chairman asked Mr Kumar and Mr Taylor to take their discussion outside because it is a commercial issue and not one that the Parish Council can sort out.

TVC

Mrs Susan Moth made a statement relating to the TVC, responses to her letter/ email correspondence ('Reserving her Position'). She also alluded to the lack of a 'fruitful meeting' of the Parish Council since April 2017.

The Public Session was closed by the Chairman at 20:40 hrs

AGENDA

To approve the Minutes of the previous meeting, held on 15th June 2017.

Minute 2017/18 – 27

Councillor Goward proposed (seconded by Cllr. Hart) and RESOLVED that the following amendment is made. **5 in favour; 3 abstentions - Carried**

- Page 1 – line 6 : the words 'by the Chairman' to be added after 'Attendees were advised that the meeting was being recorded'.

Cllr Wickett questioned how the Minutes of the 15th could be considered at this meeting, as they reflect how the Minutes for the 7th June were passed. If the Minutes for the 15th are passed by the Members, then the Members would also be passing the Minutes of the 7th (which are being disputed). If Members are to have a discussion in relation to the Minutes of the 7th June, then the Minutes of the 15th should be discussed at the same time. Therefore, nothing should be passed.

Minute 2017/18 – 28

It was proposed by Cllr Wickett, seconded by Cllr Hart and RESOLVED that consideration of the Minutes for the 15th June should be deferred to the next Parish Council Meeting. 5 in favour, 3 against. **Carried.**

Reports – Cllr. Jordan

Traffic Speed in Tintagel

Cllr Barry Jordan gave a report relating to speed checks through the village, carried out by Cormac. The findings identified that above 40 mph, leaving and entering the village was either 3% or 7% - there, therefore, has been very little speeding.

83.7% of vehicles were travelling at less than 30 mph or less going South West bound and 70.3% vehicle of travelling North East. Therefore, the speeding along Bossiney Road does not appear to be too bad.

Broadband

The problems relating to the poor quality broadband service in the area has been brought up in Parliament by Scott Man MP, and efforts are to be made to improve the same, over the next few months.

Trebarwith Toilets

Cllr Jordan stated that he had not been provided with detail re: expenses for running the toilets. Cllr Jordan has funded the same to date and will keep them going until the end of August. The people of Trebarwith are monitoring the facility but often groups of people hold the doors open in order to avoid paying the 20 pence charge.

£600 has been generated from the coin machines over the past 6 weeks and a Crowdfunding' appeal raised £160.

Parking Issues

Complaints had been received about the parking area at King Arthur public house. Cllr Jordan has passed the matter to Cornwall Council Planning Enforcement Team.

Mr Terry Dangan raised an issue relating to another car park in Tintagel. Cllr Jordan stated that he would pass the matter to Planning Enforcement Team.

Cllr Dyer asked why a card machine could not be placed in the Bossiney Road Car Park, for the convenience of motorists who were constantly requesting change at the TVC. Cllr Jordan stated that he was still awaiting an answer in relation to that matter.

Planning Applications

Cllr Goward raised the issue of Planning Applications arising between meetings. This was noted particularly when the Clerk was on leave. He added that the practice of dealing with these by email was not appropriate because:

- Members were not able to ascertain the views of other Members and;
- There is no public notification of the application, therefore, members of the public were being denied the opportunity to comment upon the applications.

Cllr Goward proposed that where this happens, a Parish Council meeting should be held to discuss the matter.

The Clerk alluded to a previous discussion, which mooted the creation of a Parish Council Planning Committee and suggested that the matter might be revisited.

Cllr Wickett alluded to the high number of Planning Application and the County Council's Planners reluctance to extend deadlines, notwithstanding that they are aware that the Parish Council meets on the first Monday of the month.

Cllr Hart raised the issue of Planning Applications not submitted to the Parish Council for consideration.

Reference	PA17/05087
Application Validated	Mon 19 Jun 2017
Closing date for comments Proposal	Tintagel Castle Castle Road Tintagel
	Construction of a pedestrian footbridge between mainland and island wards Castle and associated footpath improvements
Status	Awaiting Decision
Parish Council Decision	Deferred to the September 2017 meeting Proposed by Cllr Hart; seconded by Cllr Goward and Resolved – 5 in favour carried.

It was raised by Cllr Wickett that the next meeting of the Parish Council is 6th Sept. He wishes to attend but cannot. It was, therefore proposed by Cllr. Hart, seconded by Cllr Dyer and RESOLVED that the next meeting of the Parish Council would be held at the Tintagel Social Hall on 13th September 2017. 5 in favour, 3 abstentions. **Carried**

Reference	PA17/06608
Application Validated	Wed 12 Jul 2017
Address	Maymyo Back Lane Bossiney Tintagel Cornwall PL34 0AU
Proposal	Front extension to existing bungalow to form enlarged bedroom with ensuite and enlarged bathroom and rear extension to form kitchen and dining room and external decking.
Status	Awaiting Decision
Parish Council Decision	Proposed that there be no objection Proposed by Cllr Goward; seconded by Cllr Hart and Resolved – Unanimous. Carried.

Reference	PA17/06893
Application Validated	Wed 19 Jul 2017
Address	2 Glen House Trebarwith Strand Tintagel Cornwall PL34 0HB
Proposal	Construct retaining wall to form a parking area and construct a new balcony with steps and walkway.
Status	Awaiting Decision
Parish Council Decision	Proposed that there be no objection Proposed by Cllr Goward; seconded by Cllr Brooks and Resolved – 6 in favour, 2 abstentions. Carried.

--	--

Reference	PA17/0551
Application Validated	Mon 24 Jul 2017
Address	Land At Kays Mews Fore Street Tintagel Cornwall PL34 0EE
Proposal	Outline proposal for one new dwelling, with all matters reserved except for access
Status	Awaiting Decision
Parish Council Decision	17 August 2017

Reference	PA17/07336
Application Validated	1 st August 2017
Address	Karrek View Trebarwith Strand Tintagel Cornwall PL34 0HB
Proposal	Erection of a balcony to the south and west elevations at first floor level and enclosure of the existing internal open space with bi fold doors.
Status	Awaiting Decision
Parish Council Decision	Application Opposed It was proposed by Cllr Goward, seconded by Cllr Flower and RESOLVED unanimously that the application be objected to.

Reference	PA17/07088
Application Validated	Wed 02 Aug 2017
Address	Climo's Yard Land South East Of Trewethen Barn Tregatta Tintagel Cornwall PL34 0DX
Proposal	Outline application for the construction of a dwelling
Status	Awaiting Decision
Parish Council Decision	Cllr Hart declared an interest in this matter. It was proposed by Cllr Flower, seconded by Cllr Dyer and RESOLVED that the application be no objection to the application. 5 in favour and 2 abstentions.

Reference	PA17/07325
Application Validated	Mon 14 Aug 2017
Address	Trevillet Rustic Quarry Trevillet Tintagel Cornwall PL34 0HL
Proposal	Replacement of a partially collapsed wood and metal clad building with a new slightly smaller steel framed and metal clad building to house our stone saws.
Status	Awaiting Decision
Parish Council Decision	It was proposed by Cllr Wickett, seconded by Cllr Dyer and RESOLVED that the application left to the Planners to decide application. 5 in favour and 2 abstentions. Carried

Reference	PA17/07316
Application Validated	Thu 27 Jul 2017
Address	Land West Of The Bundu Sanding Road Tintagel Cornwall PL34 0HH
Proposal	Application for Outline Consent with some matters reserved for Construction of 2 dwellings (only access for consideration).
Status	Awaiting Decision
Parish Council Decision	It was proposed by Cllr Wickett, seconded by Cllr Flower and RESOLVED that no objection should be made to the application. 5 in favour, 2 abstentions. Carried

Planning Decisions - Noted

Correspondence

Mark Brocklehurst Employment Contract

It was proposed by Cllr Hart, seconded by Cllr Flower and RESOLVED that that the Parish Clerk would draft a letter of apology to Mr Brocklehurst and disseminate it to Members for approval. Unanimous - **Carried**

Sophie Lowe – AS Parking Fines

It was proposed by Cllr Hodge, seconded by Cllr Flower and RESOLVED that the Parish Council would reimburse Lowe Electricals the sum of £300 in respect of accumulated parking charges incurred, whilst working for the Parish Council. Unanimous - **Carried**

Accounts

The Parish Council accounts were considered by the Members and approved with one amendment. The proposal to accept the amended accounts was made by Cllr Goward, seconded by Roger Wickett and RESOLVED. 5 in favour, 3 abstentions. **Carried.**

It was agreed that all remaining agenda items would be deferred to the next Parish Council Meeting.

Next Parish Council Meeting: 13th September 2017.

The meeting closed at 10.30 p.m

DRAFT