

TINTAGEL PARISH COUNCIL



'Tintagel's Great Seal'

Clerk: Carolyn Y. May

Phone: 01726 210139
House

E-mail: clerk@tintagelparishcouncil.gov.uk

Website: www.tintagelparishcouncil.gov.uk

A2 Victoria Advent

Station Approach

Roche

Cornwall

5th February 2021

Minutes of the Virtual Meeting of Tintagel Parish Council
Wednesday 3rd February 2021

Present: Cllr Flower (Chairman), Cllr Brooks, Cllr Goward, Cllr Harper, Cllr Appleby-Tremain, Cllr Coshall and Cllr Callcut. Also, Cllr Fairman, (Cornwall Council).

Members of the Public: 10

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, the Vice -Chairman read out the notice relating to the recording/ filming of the meeting and advised all participants that the meeting would be recorded by the Clerk. No other persons declared an intention to record the meeting.

Apologies: Cllr Pearse, Cllr Dale

Declarations of Interest: Cllr Coshall - Christmas Lights Agenda Item

Invitation to members of the public to speak prior to the meeting:

No requests have been made to address the Parish Council under this heading.

AGENDA

MINUTES

Minute 85 – 2020/21

The Minutes from the Parish Council Meeting, held on the 6th of January 2021 were considered by Members, on a page-by-page basis. No comments were raised in respect of the same.

Prior to the Members being asked to vote on the matter, the Clerk sought the permission of the Chairman to raise two matters in respect of the content of the Minutes.

Firstly, the Clerk alluded to the second item under 'Correspondence', which related to a letter received from Mrs Jill Frewer. At the meeting of the 6th ultimo, Members stated that the letter had not been disseminated to them. That statement was erroneous and email correspondence records highlighted clearly that the document had, in fact, been forwarded to all Members by email on the 14th of December. The Clerk requested that this point be recorded in the Minutes of the extant meeting.

The second matter relates to a statement made on the 2nd December 2020, relating to the proposed Community Hub. It had been stated that the Clerk had, without the permission of the author, published a confidential document relating to the Tintagel Community Hub proposal. It has now been accepted that the 'confidential document' had not been received by the Clerk and that, ergo, the Clerk had not breached confidentiality. The document published had been the last received by her and was not marked as being 'confidential'. The Clerk suggested that all four documents relating to the progression of the proposal should be placed on the Parish Council website, so that Parishioners could view these.

It was accepted that the Clerk could not be blamed for the missing email and had not breached confidentiality. However, it was felt that placing all four documents on the website would detract from the finished proposal (which will now be publicised).

It was **proposed** by Cllr. Brooks **seconded** by Cllr. Goward and **RESOLVED** that the minutes for the 6th of January 2021 be signed as a true record of the meeting. Unanimous. **Carried**.

USE OF CHAT BARS – At this juncture, the Clerk sought to advise attendees that the use of 'chat bars' during the meeting was forbidden. This rule had been disseminated by CALC and forwarded to Members. At the extant time, two persons were seeking to intervene in the proceedings, using the 'chat bar'. This practice must cease.

Minute 86 – 2020/21

The amendment to Minutes for the 2nd December 2020 was considered.

It was **proposed** by Cllr. Brooks **seconded** by Cllr. Flower and **RESOLVED** that the amendment to the Minutes of 2nd December 202 be accepted and signed as a true record of the meeting. Unanimous. **Carried.**

CORNWALL COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE

Cllr Mould did not attend the Meeting.

VICE CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Cllr Brooks addressed the meeting. He advised those present that the Final Audit Report from the External Auditor had been received on the 2nd of February 2021.

Cllr Brooks made the following statement, in respect of the same. **This statement was recorded.**

‘On the 2nd February 2021, the External Auditor’s Report was finally received by the Parish Council.

Despite the steady stream of vitriolic and erroneous statements, which have been published by a group of people, apparently intent on mischief, it has been clearly shown in the Auditor’s report that no Parish Council monies are or have been misappropriated/ misplaced or mis-accounted for.

To date, the 2019/20 Parish Council accounts have been audited four times, and each time have been deemed to accurately reflect the true financial situation of the Parish Council.

The conduct of those, who have sought to undermine this Parish Council and its Clerk, through innuendo and libellous statements, can also be deemed responsible for the costs which have been incurred by the Council, in pursuance of a truth – a truth which had been presented by the Responsible Finance Officer, at the date of submission of the original External Audit Document for 2019/20.

Sadly, the conduct and demands of a member of that group, and the consequent requirement to spend money in defence of spurious allegations and upon unnecessary auditing, has also deprived the Parishioners of Tintagel of the opportunities which could have been derived from positive, social investment of that money.

It is hoped that those, who have engaged in the behaviour outlined, will take this opportunity to reflect upon their conduct. Conduct that has caused hurt and distress and which, at all times was both unacceptable and reprehensible.’

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE

Accounts Payable – Appendix E (as published)

Minute 87– 2020/21

Members considered the schedule of payments to be made. It was proposed by Cllr Brooks, seconded by Cllr Goward and RESOLVED that the schedule of accounts, at Appendix E, would be accepted. Unanimous. **Carried.**

PLANNING MATTERS

Minute 88 – 2020/21

REFERENCE	PA21/00575
APPLICATION VALIDATED	Thu 21 Jan 2021
ADDRESS	Land North of Wishford Cottage Treligga Downs Road Delabole Cornwall PL33 9DL
PROPOSAL	Submission of details to discharge condition 4 in respect of decision notice PA20/07365 dated 9th November 2020
PARISH COUNCIL DECISION	It was proposed by Cllr Goward, seconded by Cllr Brooks, and RESOLVED that the Parish Council would not object to this application. Unanimous. Carried.

Minute 89 – 2020/21

REFERENCE	PA20/09606
APPLICATION VALIDATED	Tue 12 Jan 2021
ADDRESS	Trenouth Farm, Mill Barn Access to Trenouth Farm Delabole PL33 9DE
PROPOSAL	Conversion of garage into 2 bedroom dwelling
PARISH COUNCIL DECISION	It was proposed by Cllr Brooks, seconded by Cllr Flower, and RESOLVED that the Parish Council would not object to this application. Unanimous. Carried.

Minute 90 – 2020/21

REFERENCE	PA20/11278
APPLICATION VALIDATED	Wed 06 Jan 2021
ADDRESS	The Heights Trewarmett Lane Tintagel PL34 0ES
PROPOSAL	Addition of porch, garage, front terrace, and rear extension with associated remodel
PARISH COUNCIL DECISION	It was proposed by Cllr Goward, seconded by Cllr Brooks, and RESOLVED that the Parish Council would not object to this application. Unanimous. Carried.

PLANNING DECISIONS – Noted

Cllr Goward advised the Members that two recent matters, to which the Parish Council had objected and had yet been overruled. Under the new protocol, the opinion of the relevant Councillor representative is sought and it all seems to rest on his decision. We have had no contact from him about our views/ objections. There appears to be a problem in the system.

Cllr Brookes advised the meeting that the Clerk had articulated our concerns with Cornwall Council, and asked if a response had been received. The Clerk stated that a response had been received but that it was for consideration under Part II discussions.

ST NECTANS GLEN - APPLICATION FOR PREMISES LICENCE

Mr Stuart Hutchison was invited to address the meeting in respect of the application. Prior to the commencement of the discussions, the Clerk advised the meeting that a substantial amount of correspondence on the matter, which had been disseminated to Members.

Mr Hutchison thanked the Members for the invitation to address the meeting, stating that he was attending specifically to address any questions which anyone wished to raise in relation to the application.

The application has been lodged and properly advertised. It is also due to be advertised in the press on 4th February 2021.

Cllr Coshall intervened at this juncture to advise the meeting that she had a lot of questions from Parishioners about the application. The Chairman requested that people did not interrupt, and invited Mr Hutchison to continue.

Mr Hutchison stated that he understood that Cllr Coshall had a number of questions and that he was happy to try to answer the same.

Cllr Coshall stated that in Tintagel, 'we were all for tourism' but that she had a lot of concerns from Parishioners, including the parking facilities, lavatory facilities, dangers to pedestrians returning, on foot, to the main road, and problems experienced by the Fire Service.

Mr Hutchison asked if he could be permitted to deal with these matters one at a time, starting with the parking issues.

As far as parking is concerned, Mr Hutchison stated that he had met with two Parish Councillors, at Trethevy, in October 2020. There are no current parking problems at the site, however, he conceded that there was a period when there were parking difficulties during the summer. These were addressed by the Highway Authority.

Cllr Coshall stated that she had received videos relating to the parking issue and added that there had been issues with busses during the school run (not during the summer season). There are issues at the site, which have not been sorted out.

Mr Hutchison stated that he could not comment on videos that he had not seen but could say that the business has two car parks, which accommodate 47 vehicles. As far as Mr Hutchison was concerned, there are no current parking difficulties at St Nectans Glen, Trethevy.

Cllr Goward raised a point of Order and highlighted that the application relates to licencing at the Tree of Life Café. Parking outside the venue has nothing to do with the application.

Cllr Coshall stated that all of those persons attending an event will have to go home at some point. Cllr Goward asked if Cllr Coshall had read the application, which was for a drinks licence in the café, from 09.30 am until 5.00 pm only. The licence is therefore time constrained. Cllr Coshall sought to argue that the licence would be used for functions at the wedding venue and the obtaining of a Night Licence for those staying in the accommodation at the site— a point which was denied. Mr Hutchison

stressed that the licence was for the café and that no licence was being sought for the wedding venue. Should such a licence be required, the a 'Special Events' Licence would have to be sought.

Cllr Coshall then wished to discuss the difficulties which may exist for the emergency services. Mr Hutchison stated that he was willing to address matters, but that Cllr Coshall was not allowing him to do so.

Resuming the discussion, Cllr Coshall asked if, from an emergency perspective, if ambulances etc would be able to access the site. Mr Hutchison assured the meeting that they would, basing his view on an incident last year. He added that the emergency services were able to access the glen, without problem. Mr Hutchison stated that he did not really understand what this had to do with the extant application. The issues raised were actually matters for the relevant authorities to comment upon, during the licencing process. Any objections should be provided to the Licencing Authority.

Cllr Goward stated that one of the letters received listed a series of matters which are not related to the application, as they alluded to matters off of the premises, and away from the premises. In any event, this matter is one of notification of the application, it is not the place of the Parish Council to approve or disapprove of the same.

Cllr Harper stated that when a premise applies for a licence, there are many agencies which have to be notified (i.e.: ambulance service, fire service H&S (to consider the implications connected with the venue. Parking is also a matter that will be considered, prior to the issuing of a licence. She added that the parking at the site had been bad with vehicle being parked on and off the verge, with people walking between vehicles. The site is on a bend.

Unacceptable Conduct – During this discussion, the Clerk asked to interrupt in order to advise the Chairman of the unacceptable conduct of one member of the public. It was agreed, by the Chairman, that the person should be asked to refrain from the conduct and advised that he would be excluded from the meeting if the conduct continued. The Chairman agreed with that suggestion.

At the conclusion of the St Nectans Glen discussion, the Clerk advised the Chairman that the member of the public referred to previously had been excluded from the meeting due to unacceptable conduct.

PARISH MATTERS

TREVENA SQUARE

Building Matters at Trevena Square

Cllr Goward raised the issue of the recent building of steps and the breach of the boundary between the new housing development at Trerammet and Trevena Square.

As a result of these actions, Cllr Goward revisited the planning history for the site. He alluded to our recent objection to the installation of an access between the areas (the latter being the property of Tintagel Parish Council, purchased with the assistance of the then District Council and European Funding). At no time was it agreed that there would be an access from another area into the area of

Trevena Square – which runs from the main road (Fore Street) to the stream at the bottom of the site. Therefore, the entrance has been created without permission. Part of the Parish Council's boundary wall has been removed by the developers.

Cllr Flower highlighted the point that no person has the right to 'break through' into our property, without gaining permission from the owner (TPC). We are within our rights to fence the area off.

Cllr Goward stated that the developer would have to reinstate the boundary wall first. Cllr Flower stated that the boundary wall is a Cornish hedge, and it must be reinstated by the developer, or we will have the work carried out and charge the same to them. If necessary, the Parish Council will sue the developer.

It was acknowledged that the Clerk had spoken previously with the site manager, articulating our view at the time the last plans were submitted. The Clerk had been advised by Mr Killian Cochrane that Cornwall Council was insistent on the creation of an access at the point chosen.

Cllr Harper added that, in the event that the access was permitted to remain, it was likely that residents from the estate would park their vehicles overnight at the bottom of Trevena Square and that there would also be an access for dogs, thus compromising the cleanliness and safety of the area.

Minute 91– 2020/21

It was **proposed** by Cllr Brooks, **seconded** by Cllr Goward and **RESOLVED** that the developer would be requested to reinstate the boundary wall forthwith. The work to be carried out at the developer's cost. Unanimous. **Carried.**

Parking Permits

Cllr Harper advised the meeting that she had received a number of enquiries from business owners on Fore Street, Tintagel. They have stated that they are experiencing problems with parking. These people have enquired about the possibility of the procurement, from the Parish Council, of annual parking permits in Trevena Square Car Park.

Cllr Harper advised the Members that it was possible to purchase a permit from Cornwall Council, for the Bossiney Road Car Park (1, 3 or 6 months – costing £1.10 per day to park) and that such a purchase would cost less than the Parish Council would charge for a commensurate permit. Furthermore, 'Just Park' also offers a 'multi-use system'.

Further to the above, there is a requirement to set a time limit for the car park at Trevena. There is no point in issuing permits if a time limit is not set.

It was **agreed** that the Parish Council would not engage in the sale of all day parking permits.

The method of policing the parking at Trevena Square was raised. It was pointed out, by Cllr Goward, that the Parish Council had previously employed a company to undertake that task. However, due to

the high number of complaints received from Parishioners, relating to the conduct of the employees of the company, the contract was terminated.

The Clerk advised the meeting that Cornwall Council was offering enforcement training for car parking areas.

Minute 92– 2020/21

It was **proposed** by Cllr Brookes, **seconded** by Cllr Flower and **RESOLVED** that the Parish Council would place a sign at Trevena Square, detailing the permitted parking time, and that the Clerk would investigate enforcement Training Course offered by Cornwall Council.

Councillor Coshall asked if there was to be any consideration in relation to the allocation of parking spaces for businesses. She emphasised the view that businesses were currently struggling due to one provider selling their car park. Cllr Harper responded by stating that it would not be a good idea to issue permits for businesses, allowing them to park in the residents parking bays. She reiterated the fact that permits were available for Bossiney Road Car Park (through Cornwall Council).

Cllr Coshall reiterated her point about the difficulties faced by businesses and re-stated the question relating to the allocation of parking spaces for businesses. The Chairman intervened at that juncture, pointing out that Cllr Coshall was continuously talking over others. Cllr Coshall apologised and advised that she would mute her connection to the meeting.

Cllr Appleby-Tremain, questioned whether the training would be enforceable on private land.

Cllr Flower proposed an amendment to the proposal.

It was **proposed** by Cllr Flower, **seconded** by Cllr Coshall and **RESOLVED** that the Clerk would look into the enforcement training opportunities and that the matter would be considered at the Parish Council meeting on March 3rd, 2021. Unanimous. **Carried.** The Members then voted upon this **RESOLUTION** as the substantive motion. Unanimous. **Carried.**

Unacceptable Conduct – Cllr Brooks asked the Clerk to mute a member of the public who had accepted a telephone call and was speaking during the meeting.

TOWN TWINNING – Cllr Harper advised Members that a poster, relating to this matter, had been placed upon all Parish Council Notice Boards.

Cllr Harper explained that the Parish Council had received an enquiry in November 2019, from the Mayor of Silvi, asking if Tintagel would consider ‘twinning’ with his town. Silvi is a coastal area, situated on the east coast of Italy, in the Abruzzo region, and is also a tourist destination. It has a population of approx. 15,000.

The purpose of ‘twinning’ is to provide an exchange of cultural, sporting, business, and educational opportunities for each community.

However, due to the pandemic, there is not much that can be done, other than putting an agreement together, in which reciprocal undertakings can be set out.

It is thought that the proposal could make use of the TCH.

Cllr Coshall stated that whilst she felt that the proposal was a lovely idea, the timing was wrong. At present, the Parish is dealing with COVID-19, holiday makers and other matters. She added that the Parish Council needed to gain the trust of the Parish. Therefore she will not support this proposal.

The Clerk, at that juncture, requested permission from the Chairman to speak. She advised the meeting that this matter is still under discussion and will take a substantial amount of time to put in situ. What the opportunity does offer is cultural exchange and an expansion of the business base of the Parish.

Further to this, the comment relating to the 'trust of the Parish' was addressed.

The Clerk advised that trust in the Parish Council should never have been an issue. It only became an issue as a result of slanderous allegations, which have been proven to be false and unsubstantiated. Now was the time to start putting in situ, plans for the future.

Both Cllr Appleby-Tremain and Cllr Coshall stated clearly that the town twinning proposal would not be supported by either of them, as part of Cllr Appleby-Tremain's TCH proposal.

It was **agreed** that this matter would be deferred until the March 2021 meeting.

TVC STOCK PROPOSAL - deferred to March meeting, due to poor transmission.

CHRISTMAS LIGHTS – deferred to March meeting, due to poor transmission.

SEADOG IT - Cllr Brooks suggested that this matter be deferred and considered under the rules of a Part II meeting. Cllr Appleby Tremain requested to be advised of the reasons for this proposal. Cllr Coshall interrupted by stating that the Parishioners want to know why they 'couldn't get in touch'.

Cllr Brooks responded that he had been in touch with SeaDog IT over the past few days and was still awaiting confirmation of some matters, he did not have the information at present. Cllr Coshall interrupted again, stating that Cllr Appleby Tremain had the information required. She was advised by the Vice-Chairman that there was some other information to be confirmed, which needs to be discussed under Part II.

Cllr Appleby-Tremain reiterated a request to consider upgrading the website which, at this point, is not compliant, it is 10 years old and is letting us down. Therefore, we need to start again.

It was explained that this matter has been addressed previously and that work was underway. However, that was interrupted by COVID-19.

The Clerk began to explain the current situation and options. Cllr Coshall interrupted by stating that she thought SeaDog should have to give an explanation (re: website problems). The Clerk advised that, with respect, SeaDog had already given an explanation.

Cllr Coshall continued by stating that she was of the opinion that the Clerk may not have the information needed but that Cllr Appleby-Tremain was in possession of the same, having been in touch with SeaDog.

Cllr Brooks asked why Cllr Appleby-Tremain was in possession of the information, when seeking the same was the job of the Clerk. Cllr Coshall disputed the statement stating that it was 'the job of the Councillors'. This point was addressed by the Chairman who advised Cllr Coshall that it was the job of the Clerk to contact suppliers. It was the job of the Councillors to ask the Clerk to undertake the task of communication. He added that he was not happy with the actions undertaken by Cllr Appleby-Tremain, without the knowledge of the Clerk.

Cllr Appleby-Tremain (by telephone) made the following statement:

Previously, whenever anything has been discussed, the cost has been a factor. She is not attempting to be divisive, but she had asked for a cost for the work to be carried out. This would be £1,500 to £1,900.

The Chairman enquired if Cllr Appleby-Tremain had asked the Clerk to undertake the task of obtaining the information relating to the potential cost of upgrading the Parish Council website. The Clerk advised that she had not been asked to obtain the information. It was pointed out, by the Chairman, that the conduct that had been engaged in by the Councillor had been incorrect and did not fall within the Councillors' remit.

Members discussed the estimated costs provided, articulating the view that the figure seemed high. Cllr Coshall stated that 'whilst staying in lockdown we (the Parish Council) will be spending all sorts of costs on other things'.

The Clerk advised that, recently, the Parish Council had incurred horrendous costs in relation to the conduct of the group to which Cllr Brooks had alluded earlier (several of whom were Parishioners). Had that conduct not been engaged in, then the Parish Council would have been in a position to carry out these upgrades. However, as it stands at the moment, if the Parish Council is to manage financially until the end of the current financial year, it cannot afford to keep spending vast quantities of money. However, she added, the IT system upgrade is a legal requirement. Cllr Coshall responded by stating, 'It's a joke'.

The Clerk advised that, should the Parish Council decide to go ahead with the upgrade, she would be obliged to inform the Members of the requirement to withdraw monies from the Parish Council's reserves.

The Clerk requested of the Chairman, a decision, on the idea of holding an Extra Meeting of the Parish Council and discussing the matter under Part II regulations. The Chairman agreed to this proposal.

Minute 93 – 2020/21

It was **proposed** by Cllr Flower, **seconded** by Cllr Brooks and **RESOLVED** that an Extra Meeting of the Parish Council should be called, for Friday 12th February. The purposes of the meeting are to discuss and approve the External Audit, then to enter into Part II confidential discussions. Six in favour, one abstention. **Carried.**

The Meeting ended at 20.33 hrs.

Next Meeting: Wednesday 3rd March 2021

DRAFT