

LANTEGLOS-BY-FOWEY PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL MEETING HELD
ON TUESDAY 16th JANUARY 2024 @ 7pm
IN POLRUAN WI HALL

Minute	AGENDA ITEMS	Action
	<p>Present – Cllrs. Rooney (Chair), Adams, Ainley, Bunt, Carmichael, Goddard, Talling and the Clerk.</p>	
	<p>Chairman’s Welcome and Public Forum – the Chair opened the meeting and welcomed those present.</p> <p>Mr Peter Parkin, 10 Ocean View, read the following to the meeting:</p> <p>We have owned our property 10 Ocean View since 2011.</p> <p>9 Ocean View once bungalow of 750 square feet is now a massive two storey development of say 2000 square feet it has been designed and constructed with total disregard to the scale and size of the surrounding properties for which Nos 8 and 10 and other neighbours are suffering.</p> <p>Bringing it forward increases the visual footprint because the land slopes much lower to the front and further reduce what is left of a proportionally small front garden and soak away.</p> <p>Also visually making No 9 look higher so dominating the whole top of the Cul de Sac</p> <p>No 9 will is out of character with the other properties.</p> <p>The shifting of the building 1.5 M forward now has significant impact to the amenity of 10 Ocean View as the east elevation wall will now be visible from our lounge and will overshadow us - so impacting the enjoyment of our property.</p> <p><u>We should not be made to suffer this. We object to what appears to be a way of bending the planning rules to suite the applicant. No 9 SHOULD BE BROUGHT BACK 1.5 METERS</u></p> <p><u>No 9 is all house it does not fit on the present site there are no green areas</u></p> <p>The mention of the original decking at No 9 is false as the decking was put in by the Applicant during the summer before the bungalow was demolished. It was also put up without planning permission so it should not be taken into account as a president.</p> <p>We are also concerned that as No 9 development is brought forward an elevated terrace area and patio may be positioned at the front of the site adjacent to No 10’s front garden and so look directly into No 10’s front windows and impact our privacy at No 10 as well as potential noise and disturbance from No 9 terraced area over the Green.</p> <p>There was no need to bring the building 1.5 meters forward. The Nudura construction system is purposely made to be built on bedrock.</p> <p>CREATE mention of No. 10's side window is a red herring. No 10 is built in keeping with the rest of the Estate. The owners of No 10 circulated plans to all the neighbours on the Ocean View Estate to see if there was any objection before planning. Planning was passed July 2017 and no 10 is built exactly to PLANNING and was passed accordingly.</p> <p>IT WOULD BE GOOD TO SEE A REAL DRAWING OF No 9 AS A FINISHED BUILDING THEN THE RESIDENTS CAN SEE THE FULL IMPACT OF THIS VAST PROPERTY ON OCEAN VIEW.</p> <p>To sum up the building of No 9 Ocean View has and is being built incorrectly from the start it was not built to plan, the applicant had no planning permission to carry out the building, the ariel views of the plot size was</p>	

	<p>misleading as it took in land from No. 8 and No. 10 and the National Trust Land.</p> <p>No 9 should be constructed in the position agreed on the original planning application. We appreciate your time in listening to our comments.</p> <p>Cllr. Ainley read a statement from Mr Peter Rushton, No.8 Ocean View:</p> <p>This building has been designed and constructed with total disregard for the scale and style of the surrounding properties. It dominates the top of the close and stands out like a giant monolith. Moving it further forward by 1.5m increases its dominance over the surrounding properties.</p> <p>The main entrance stands directly above the front windows of number 8 and anyone entering the property looks straight into the windows where the only solution is to draw the curtains.</p> <p>The nib on the East side projects across the side front window of No.10 removing light, the view and privacy. They even suggested that this window did not have planning permission and therefore did not matter.</p> <p>It is being built increasingly out of proportion with the plot size and the only reason why they are now communicating with the neighbours is because they have been forced to in order to smooth this process.</p> <p>This building should be constructed to the position agreed on the original planning application.</p> <p>Mr Vic Trueman of No.11 said:</p> <p>If the original planning application had been drawn correctly in the first instance none of this would have evolved. The architect had misled the rear of the plot size by encroaching onto National Trust land making Mr. Lawson's rear garden look bigger.</p> <p>Who initially did the ground survey and trial pits to establish suitability for construction. Have they got photographic records? Should the rock problem have been picked up then?</p> <p>All summer we have had to put up with a large swing shovel and compressor digging out bedrock.</p> <p>Please can the architect present inform us of the type of wall and roof finishes to be used.</p> <p>Also will the roof be in natural slate or tiled to match the surrounding buildings at the top of the village.</p> <p>I had given the council an aerial view of Ocean View and surrounding area.</p> <p>There was a comment made about the side window in number 10 being the wrong size.</p> <p>This window was put in to the right scale and passed by building regulations and Cornwall Council.</p> <p>I think throughout this project there has been a lot of obfuscation.</p> <p>Mr Jason Jarvis, architect for No.9 said nothing had changed from the approved planning application. The only matter for discussion today was the position of the building. In answer to Mr Trueman he said the finish is including in the planning papers and will be of render with a zinc roof.</p> <p>The owner of The Gables, Bodinnick said the lane between her home and the neighbouring property is a PROW and she and her neighbour are responsible for the lane – as stated in her deeds. With regards to Minute 4c/2023, The Old Ferry Inn, she cannot understand why it is necessary to have a 6ft high fence, resulting in the loss of a view from the PROW. She pointed out that the owners of the Old Ferry Inn do not own the land the fence is on and stated.</p> <p>Mr Richard Hughes was present regarding the grant application for St Wyllow and offered to answer any questions.</p>	
	<p>Outside Authorities / Bodies – Members received reports as follows:</p> <p>a. <i>County Councillor Report</i> – due to the continuing ill health of Cllr. Edwina Hannaford no report was available.</p>	

	<p>b. <i>South East Cornwall CAP</i> – Minutes of the meeting held on 5th December 2023 were previously circulated. Cllr. Rooney’s report followed.</p> <p>Next meeting will be held on 5th March.</p> <p>c. <i>Police</i> – PCSO Cocks advised that two crimes (1 theft and 1 Harassment) were reported from 1st to 31st December 2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cyber Security Support – details previously emailed. 	
1/2024	Apologies – Cllrs. Beresford, Clare-Dunbavand, Kelly; Cllr. Pyke was not present.	
2/2024	Members’ Declarations – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Pecuniary/Registerable Declarations of Interests</i> – none. b. <i>Non-registerable Interests</i> – Cllr. Adams in Church grant applications. c. <i>Declaration of Gifts</i> – Members were reminded they must declare any gift or hospitality with a value in excess of fifty pounds d. <i>Dispensations</i> none. 	
3/2024	Minutes of Meetings – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Full Council Meeting</i> – 28th November 2023 AGREED as a true record. 	
4/2024	<p>Planning Applications – Members considered the following:</p> <p>a. PA23/09586, Sailaway 9 Hockens Lane Polruan – demolition and replacement 2-storey front extension, single storey rear extension and Juliet balcony to first floor bedroom.</p> <p>OBJECTION</p> <p>The proposed property is one of pair of linked properties originating in 1880s and within the Polruan Conservation area. Whilst the PC understands the applicant wanting to make improvements to their property this application has significant impact to the amenity of the adjacent neighbour (No7), potential loss of privacy to adjacent properties and both the gable end 2 storey extension and the Juliette balcony are out of character to the linked property and surrounding area. The PC believes it should be possible for the applicant to work within the constraints of this characterful and linked property to make improvements.</p> <p>The PC objects based on contravening Cornwall Local Plan Policy 12.1a) Design and Character and 12.2 Design and protection of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>NPD Policy 1 Design and Character of Lanteglos by Fowey Parish specifically 1.1 and 1.3 NDP policy 3 Important and special views, and NDP Policy 9 ‘<i>does not cause detriment to the residential amenity of any existing or neighbouring properties....</i>’</p> <p>Whilst there are some gable end designs in the Hockens Lane Street scene the suggested front 2 storey alterations will dramatically alter the appearance of the front of the building with a gable end filling the current front entrance well and the intrusion into the glass porch panel will look odd. The front extension completely alters the appearance of the twinned houses and looks out of context with the surrounding properties. The size of the front extension is clear overdevelopment of the site. Although it will stop short of the front door of no 9, it will dominate and overshadow No 9 and feel boxed in and potentially claustrophobic for those occupants with corresponding loss of amenity.</p> <p>The Juliette balcony on the rear extension on this distinctive twinned property which is clearly visible for the Fowey estuary is out of context with the next-door property and will look incongruous from this treasured estuary view of Polruan.</p>	Cllr. Ainley / Clerk

It is apparent that the balcony of No9 will look into bedrooms of at least 3 properties on West St. Although that maybe the case from the current window enlarging the window and installing a balcony will increase the ease of view and encourage occupants to look out, therefore, impacting on the privacy of others. In an area where properties are tightly packed being overlooked is always likely, but that isn't a reason to increase the potential for being overlooked.

The PC supports the objection from the owners No7 who have comprehensively covered conservation area issues.

Other Comments: The PC would not object to a ground floor rear extension if the Juliette balcony is removed and the current window design retained.

The PC notes that the current windows at No 9 are all wood but the plan is to replace with UPVC; we are aware in other permissions given in a conservation area that wood windows have had to be replaced with similar design wood windows so we would like clarification from the Planning Dept on what is required for this property.

- b. PA23/09442, Sladen House 78A Fore Street Polruan – construction of Two-Storey Side Extension with Integrated Garage and Roof Terrace.

COMMENT: The property has already been extended twice over the last five years (PA18/03289 and PA 20/07933) and the PC is concerned that this latest extension now represents overdevelopment of the site and, therefore, there should not be any further development in the future.

The cut-out roof with additional terrace is not aesthetically pleasing or in keeping with the surrounding area. If the Planning Dept is minded to give planning permission the PC request that the terrace is removed and the roof line filled in. The PC notes that there is a proposed new foot access onto Policeman's Lane; there is an old stone wall which would need to be cut into to provide access so PC assumes Highways will review suitability and ensure any damage to the wall is repaired.

Cllr. Ainley / Clerk

- c. PA23/09315, Old Ferry Inn Old Road Bodinnick – retrospective application for fencing and decking North of The Old Ferry Inn.

OBJECTION: The PC objects to the 6ft high solid fence (Elevation C) which will obstruct the view from a well-used footpath NPD Policy 3. If the fence is left at 3ft high or replaced as was with an open style post and railing design this would rectify the situation. The PC has no objection to the rope and post fencing (elevation A).

Cllr. Ainley / Clerk

- d. PA23/09784, The Old Sunday School School Lane Polruan – demolition of garage and addition of additional storey to dwelling.

COMMENT: this is the third iteration of the proposed development, and the PC believes this is an excellent example of how the planning process can work with the applicant and their architects engaging with the concerns of the PC. The reduction in mass of the property, and the reduction of glass windows and balcony plus the use of a slate roof has rectified the main reasons for objection. In addition, we would like to thank Rowett Architecture for their high-quality application enabling a clear understanding of the proposed changes in the development and associated impacts.

Cllr. Ainley / Clerk

- e. PA23/10054, 9 Ocean View Polruan – replacement dwelling without compliance with Condition 2 of decision notice PA21/07433 dated 15.11.2021.

OBJECTION

When the original application PA21/0743 was discussed in July 2021 the PC had concerns around overdevelopment of the plot. At that time the site plan included land belonging to the NT and No 8 and No10 which was misleading as the plot seemed just big enough to support the proposed large development; in addition, the applicant appeared to have taken into account positioning of the development east elevation to No 10 and west to No 8 to minimise any loss of amenity to these properties. The PC therefore

Cllr. Ainley / Clerk

made the following comment *'Members request the planning officer looks into the large increase in footprint and ensures there is sufficient green space around the plot.'*

The architects have made a Section 73 request to override condition 2 of the original application - which stipulates the development will be built to the plan agreed in the permission. The new plans show the plot as being smaller with the property repositioned 1.4m further forward. This will have a significant impact to the neighbouring properties and the Ocean View scene and is clearly an outcome of the property being too large for the plot leaving no wriggle room for any changes.

In addition, the PC is concerned the current situation represents an unfair planning process allowing the applicant to 'ride rough shod over the planning process' to the detriment of the neighbours' amenity. If errors have occurred either by CC planning department or the architect, then the innocent parties in this process should not have to suffer the consequences.

The PC objects to the request for the section 73 rescinding Condition 2 of the original application. Based on contravening Cornwall Local Plan Policy 12.1a) Design and Character and 12.2 Design and protection of neighbouring properties.

NPD Policy 1 Design and Character of Lanteglos by Fowey Parish specifically 1.1 and 1.3 ii), and NDP Policy 9 *'does not cause detriment to the residential amenity of any existing or neighbouring properties....'*

1. There is significant impact to amenity and privacy to both neighbouring properties No10 and No 8
No 10 - the high protruding wall with roof over at the east elevation wall will now be visible from the lounge, it will appear overbearing, cause overshadowing and reduce light to the property. The perspective of the photo provided by the applicant is deceptive and does not provide a true representation of the impact from to No10. The PC has visited the property, and the wall is very visible (see attached photo of half-built wall).
No 8 – the raised front entrance which has now been brought forward and looks directly into the kitchen and lounge and patio of No.8 resulting in a significant loss of privacy as well as being overbearing to the front of the property. The raised path along the western elevation adjoining No 8 will mean anyone walking along this path to access the very small back garden will see straight into No 8 again impacting on their privacy. The large retaining wall has only been built one breeze block thick with no weep holes which is inadequate and will undoubtedly lead to cracking, damp and potential falling apart. See attached photos.
2. The reduction of plot size and the trebling of footprint is now clearly over development of the site. By moving the property forward on a sloping site which drops away at the front will increase the *appearance* of its height and size and reduce what is left of a proportionally small front garden and soak away. The result being No 9 look will appear higher and dominate over neighbouring properties and so be out of character with the surrounding properties with their large front gardens.
3. There is a concern that the applicant has plans to introduce a raised terrace to the front of the property originally laid to lawn. Not only will this be out of character with the surrounding properties it would lead to a loss of privacy and create noise disturbance to neighbouring properties. There has been mention made of some original decking that was put up by the applicant prior to demolition and without planning permission so this should not be allowed to take any precedent.
4. The Planning statement mentions bedrock to the rear of the No9 and border with No 10. and this being a reason for moving the position of the property forward. The PC understands that Nudura Polystyrene is designed for exactly such construction on bedrock, so there was no need to bring the

	<p>building forward. This point also seems to be at odds to the building being built to unsubmitted/lost plans which leads to the conclusion these plans never existed and were not 'lost' but simply have been submitted retrospectively to cover mistakes made on site.</p> <p>5. No notices of new planning request have been attached to the outside of the property, or letters received by neighbours, so the residents of Ocean View are not aware of the plans.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>If the applicant is able to make some compromises to reduce the impact to amenity and privacy to the neighbouring properties by supplying amended plans that are agreed with the neighbours, the PC would be willing to review this objection.</p> <p>The property is large so there are options that could reduce impact to neighbours e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce the frontage of both large wings back by 1.4m to meet original planning conditions. - Remove the current front door adjacent to No8 to an alternative area e.g. via one of the wings of the property. - Reducing the height of the foot path bordering No9 - Leave the protruding wall bordering 10 at the current height and cap off. <p>Conditions and Guarantees</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The PC requests a written assurance from the associated surveyor and building inspector that the retaining wall adjoining No8 is built to standard and a guarantee this will not lead to issues for No8 in the future or be put right at the cost of the applicant/owner of No 9. ii. Written assurance from the surveyor and building inspector that the borders of No 9 are at least 1M wide to enable all maintenance to be conducted from within the perimeter of No 9. iii. The PC requests a condition that what is remaining of the front garden to No 9 is put back to lawn with no hard landscaping (raised terraces, patios etc) or walls adjoining allowed adjoining either No 10 or No 8. 	
5/2024	<p>Other Planning Matters – details previously emailed.</p> <p>a. <i>Social Housing Manifesto</i> – Members APPROVED a proposal to amend Policy 2.1 and delete Policy 2.4. Minute 169b/2023 refers. Policy 2.1 to read:</p> <p><i>Make it less attractive to own second homes - INTRODUCE A CORNWALL-WIDE REGISTER OF SECOND HOMES, increase council tax levies, put in planning constraint, introduce caps on numbers of second homes in key areas.</i> Noted wording in capitals is the change.</p> <p>b. <i>Section 106 Funding</i> – Nick Marsden, CC Affordable Housing Manager advised the s.106 money for Affordable Housing from PA13/04961, Bones Meadow, Polruan (£132,875) was received by the CC in 2017. The current spending restrictions require the money to be spent within Liskeard and Looe Community Network Area. He confirmed the money is currently unallocated and available but needs to be spent by 2027.</p> <p>NOTE – Members disputed the sum available, believing it to be more. The Clerk to establish the TOTAL s.106 money available, with the assistance of Cllr. Adams. Cllr. Ainley favoured using the money (if it is sufficient) to purchase a small property on Fore Street that is currently up for sale. A meeting to then be set up with Mr Sam Irving, CC and Cllrs. Rooney, Ainley and Adams.</p> <p>Members AGREED the s.106 money should be used to build or acquire affordable housing and discussed options to meet that desire, including the Winklepicker. It was recognised there would need to be a suitable agreement or terms for use of funds for the Winklepicker as the PC</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Cllr. Adams / Clerk</p>

	<p>cannot fund commercial arrangements of others – this would be is an ‘aid leakage’ of public finances and there are rules/laws on this.</p> <p>Members AGREED in principle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. To establish if we are able to use a proportion of the S106 funding to acquire or build affordable housing and its use to refurbish properties with the appropriate financial terms/assurance (the Winklepicker being an example); and ii. To seek to get the S.106 agreement amended so funds can be used for wider community projects which depending on outcome of a) may include the Winklepicker within this amended scope. Details previously circulated by Cllr. Ainley. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. <i>Planning Guarantee</i> – the government had reduced the time period for non-major planning applications (including householder developments) to be decided from 26 to 16 weeks. Details previously emailed. It was AGREED to take this to the next meeting of the SW Cornwall CAP. d. <i>The Covey</i> – Cllr. Rooney raised concerns that The Covey is not being built in accordance with the agreed plans. The Clerk to obtain the reference number. 	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk / Cllr. Rooney</p>
6/2024	<p>Planning Applications Approved by CC – for information only.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. PA23/05808, 5 Moss Terrace East Street Polruan – retrospective application for the erection of a summerhouse/shed and decking. b. PA23/07168, Ferry Climb Townsend – proposed alterations to roof to form gable ends and increase ridge to match the heights part of the existing roof. c. PA23/07185, The Winkle Picker The Quay Polruan – proposal internal and external renovation of the Winkle Picker shop and flat and associated works. d. PA23/07654, Hoe Cottage Battery Lane Polruan – proposed replacement dwelling on land at Hoe Cottage following demolition of dwellings and outbuildings, with formation of improved access, proposed landscaping, associated works and a change of use of land to residential. e. PA23/08294, 7 Battery Park Polruan – reconstruction of conservatory and internal alterations. 	
7/2024	<p>Withdrawn Planning Applications – for information only.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. PA23/03657, 7 Fore Street Polruan – existing extension roof to rear of property to be raised 600mm to accommodate head height to existing mezzanine floor. Existing link corridor between existing dwelling and existing extension to be extended in line with current dwelling and extension to fill in existing court yard. 	
8/2024	<p>Environmental / Amenity Matters – including any items received after the agenda had been published.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Public Conveniences</i> – Members considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>St Saviour’s WCs</u> – see Closed Session below. ii. <u>Frogmore WCs</u> – in the absence of Cllrs. Pyke and Beresford no report was available regarding possible renewal of the lease with the National Trust (NT). NOTE – the lease expires on 31st May 2025. iii. <u>The Quay WCs</u> – see also Closed Session below. In the absence of Cllr. Pyke no report was available following the meeting held between the PC and Polruan TT. NOTE – Cllrs. Beresford and Pyke are the PC’s representatives and Mr Graham Palmer for the Polruan TT. 	<p>Cllrs. Pyke / Beresford</p> <p>Cllrs. Pyke/ Beresford</p>

	<p>iv. <u>Legionella Testing</u> – Mrs Kelly advised the water temperature is 10°.</p> <p>b. <i>Whitecross Land Registration</i> – the Clerk had submitted the PC’S Statement of Value and the amended Rights of Way to Ms Jessica Bishop, CC’s Legal Dept. Cllrs. Adams and Talling to meet Ms Bishop at County Hall. The Clerk to set up a meeting.</p> <p>c. <i>SW Water</i> – verbal update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Dumping of Sewage into the Sea</u> – Cllr. Rooney had been unable to attend the Meeting with South West Water, held on 30th November. • <u>Water Quality Testing</u> – the Clerk to request the EA to include Polruan waters in its testing regime. Mention was made of the recurring strong smell near The Quay. • <u>Planned Desalination Plant at Par</u> – there was general concern about these plans. It was AGREED to take this to CAP. <p>d. <i>Betty Woon/Hewan PROW</i> – a resident had reported that the grey non-slip edging on one of the recently resurfaced steps is coming away and the pieces had been laid on the side. The Clerk had reported this to Chris Monk, Countryside Access Team.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk / Cllr. Rooney</p>
9/2024	<p>Highway Matters – including any items received after the agenda had been published.</p> <p>a. <i>Public Rights of Way</i> – Members considered:</p> <p>i. Path running from Boddinick to Penmarlem had been walked by Cllr. Rooney who reported “...there is nothing to worry the Countryside Access Team about. All three stiles are in good nick and the fallen tree has very decently just avoided the path...” NFA</p> <p>b. <i>Flooding Issues</i> – a series of photos of the flood damage, taken on 17th November (by Cllr. Rob Rooney) had been submitted to Highways. They had responded saying: <i>The Area Steward will inspect the location and determine whether action is required in accordance with Cornwall Council’s Highways Maintenance Manual. Whilst we endeavour to respond to every report in a prompt manner, please note that the Area Steward covers a large geographical area and it may be several days before he inspects the sites.</i></p> <p>c. <i>Street Lighting</i> – CC advised that they plan to switch-off streetlighting (midnight to 5am) in the week beginning 15th January in various areas, including Bodinnick.</p> <p>d. <i>Motor Cyclists</i> – it was AGREED to adopt a suggestion from Cllr. Clare-Dunvavand to report serious potholes to the British Motorcycle Federation and the Motorcycle Action Group. They maintain a list of dangerous roads where the Council had been notified, thereby making it easier for those who have accidents to take legal action against the Council. The Clerk to advise Highways they will be doing this in the future.</p>	<p>Clerk</p>
10/2024	<p>Administrative Matters – not covered elsewhere on the agenda.</p> <p>a. None.</p>	
11/2024	<p>Financial Matters –</p> <p>a. <i>Grant Application</i> – Members re-considered the following applications:</p> <p>i. St Wyllow Church – grant “<i>for the improved safety of access...</i>” £1,560 applied for St Wyllow, £1,040 from church funds. AGREED. Cllr. Adams left the meeting whilst this was discussed.</p> <p>Mr Hughes said there had been no interest in the sale of St Saviour’s Church.</p> <p>ii. Friends of St John – grant for new heaters; guttering, replacement window frames, etc. £1,500 applied for, no contribution from own funds. AGREED.</p>	

	<p>iii. Polruan WI – requested the PC pay for WiFi for the hall for 18 months at a cost of £300. AGREED.</p> <p>b. <i>Accounts for Payment</i> – payment schedule to a value of £6,292.36 was APPROVED for payment. The Clerk to place a copy on the website.</p> <p>c. <i>2024/25 Budget</i> – Members considered and AGREED the draft budget (previously circulated by the Clerk) for 2024/25 in conjunction with the Asset Maintenance Policy (NOTE - £10K for a new bus shelter was deleted). Cllr Goddard declared a non-pecuniary interest on the Village Hall elements of the budget and left the room for a period.</p> <p>It was further RESOLVED to set the precept at £49,850. The Clerk to advise CC.</p> <p>d. <i>Savings Account</i> – deferred from the November Meeting. Members to consider options for moving money to an interest paying account.</p> <p>e. <i>Bank Reconciliation</i> – copy of the Bank Reconciliation had previously been circulated.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Cllr. Adams</p>
12/2024	<p>Documentation / Correspondence – not covered elsewhere on the agenda</p> <p>a. <i>Highways Scheme Programme</i> – update circulated previously.</p> <p>b. <i>East Cornwall Health Hub presentation</i> – previously emailed.</p> <p>c. <i>Christmas Card</i> – from Sheryll Murray MP.</p> <p>d. <i>Peninsula Transport</i> – consultation on regional transport strategy launched. Previously emailed.</p> <p>e. <i>Forest for Cornwall Winter</i> – 2023 Newsletter. Previously emailed.</p> <p>f. <i>Cornwall Guide to Winter Wellbeing</i> – residents can download a copy at: https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/l42nbsrn/winter-wellbeing-guide_2023-24_web.pdf</p> <p>g. <i>Civility and Respect Newsletter</i> – NALC newsletter. Previously emailed.</p> <p>h. <i>CC Affordable Housing</i> – newsletter. Previously emailed.</p> <p>i. <i>Promoting the Veterans and Family Hubs</i> – poster, previously circulated.</p> <p>j. <i>CALC Strategic Review of Membership Services</i> – online survey, details previously circulated.</p>	
13/2024	<p>Diary Dates –</p> <p>a. <i>Parish Council Meeting</i> – it was AGREED to hold the next meeting on 20th February 2024. The Clerk to book the Polruan Village Hall.</p>	Clerk
14/2024	Information Only / Future Agenda Items – none.	
15/2024	Closed Session – in view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, namely quotations, it was RESOLVED that it is advisable in the public interest that the press and public be excluded and they were instructed to withdraw.	
16/2024	<p>Standing Contracts – Members RESOLVED to adopt a proposal to give authority to the Working Party to deal with the finalisation of the tender documents and publication of the same.</p> <p>Working Party – Cllrs. Ainley, Clare-Dunbavend and Goddard.</p>	Working Party / Clerk
17/2024	<p>St Saviour's and The Quay WCs – Members RESOLVED to adopt a proposal to give authority to the Working Party to deal with the finalisation of the tender documents and publication of the same.</p> <p>Working Party – Cllrs. Ainley, Clare-Dunbavend and Goddard.</p>	Working Party / Clerk

18/2024	Wherry Place – the property with the neglected garden had been reported to Cornwall Housing. Reference: CAS-04706-H7V1T5.	
19/2024	Planning Enforcement Cases – Cornwall Council had deemed planning enforcement matters to be confidential. The Clerk to obtain an update for the next meeting.	Clerk
20/2024	Meeting Closed – 21.21pm.	

Signature: (Cllr. Rob Rooney)
Parish Council Chair

Date: 20th February 2024