

**Minutes of a meeting of Landulph Parish Council Meeting held on
Monday 15th October at 7.30pm in the
Landulph Memorial Hall Annexe, Landulph**

PRESENT: Councillors M Worth (Chairman), Mrs G Braund, P Braund, Mrs R Cradick, M Dennis, M Shirlaw, M Worth.

Also present: Councillor Jesse Foot; and Katherine Williams - Clerk to the Council.

Public Forum

116-18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE – none.

117-18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST RELATING TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA – none.

118-18 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS (17th September 2018) – agreed, although noted that the meeting was an ordinary meeting (not extraordinary as stated).

119-18 MATTERS ARISING - none

120-18 PLANNING

- a) [PA18/08742](#) | Listed building consent for installation of wood burner and flue | Barn 1 Bittleford Farm St Mellion Saltash Cornwall PL12 6QE
- b) [PA18/08438](#) | Installation of wood burner and flue (powder coated black) | Barn 1 Bittleford Farm St Mellion Saltash Cornwall PL12 6QE

It was RESOLVED to agree with both applications.

121-18 PENYOKE RECREATION GROUND REFURBISHMENT, ANNUAL INSPECTION REPORT, ROLLING PROGRAMME

The Clerk has requested that the playground inspection company undertakes the inspection in Autumn 2018, and to be accompanied, at a cost of £100. It was RESOLVED to pass on Cllr Dennis' contact details. [ACTION: Clerk].

Ray Hall has been asked for a quote to repair the aeroplane playground equipment that has been cordoned off following the accident that was reported last time, and a notice has been put on the website.

Cllr Mrs Braund provided an update on this incident – the Fire Brigade were on their way, but in the meantime a parishioner had dealt with the situation, and therefore the Fire Brigade were stood down.

122-18 PENYOKE DRAINAGE ISSUES: ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY LAND DRAIN; SEED FUND GRANT / CROWDFUNDING

Cllr Braund has spoken with the contractor, who will cut the bank in a few weeks' time. Cllr Braund has procured the seed, at a cost of £83.30 + VAT, to be reimbursed by the Parish Council.

123-18 SOLAR FUNDING – DISCUSSION RE OTHER FUNDS

There was a discussion regarding other funds within the parish to be passed to the Parish Council and allocated by the Council to various projects, in a similar manner to the Solar Funding. It was reported

that there are restrictions on how much the Parish Council can spend using Section 137 based on the amount of electors in the parish (c£3,500), there are VAT issues, and the Parish Council has to spend and act within certain powers. It was RESOLVED that this would not be undertaken.

124-18 DOG BIN

Cllr Shirlaw reported that he would investigate drawing up the contract in November. [ACTION: Cllr Shirlaw].

125-18 PARKING IN FORE STREET

Cllr Shirlaw reported that the public meeting was cancelled, due to many adverse comments received by parishioners. Cllr Worth advised that Cormac has stated that investigation into a residents' parking scheme cost would start at £10k, but they wouldn't be looking to implement this in Landulph.

126-18 HIGHWAYS PROJECTS UPDATE – CORNWALL GATEWAY COMMUNITY NETWORK PANEL

Cllr Worth reported that 17 expressions of interest were received, more can be submitted by 12th November, for consideration in the next round.

Good news! An initial assessment has been carried out by CORMAC's Paul Allen, and agreement has been granted to:

1. Extend the 20mph limit through Cargreen down Fore Street to the river – delivery within 6 months;
2. Extend the double white lines at North Sillaton Junction A388 – delivery within 9 months.

127-18 MAINTENANCE – LIFEBOUY

Cllr Worth reported that he holds the access/maintenance kit for the lifebuoy, and that he has inspected and resealed it. It was RESOLVED that this inspection would be undertaken each year.

128-18 GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATIONS

Cllr Worth reported that all Councillors have new email addresses, and all Councillors have accessed the new server - this Google drive will be used for shared Council documents. Advice was sought on a good way to transfer old emails – this is to be investigated, but in the meantime Councillors were advised to simply email from their old email address to the new. Workshops in the use of Chrome / shared drive etc can be arranged for Councillors.

129-18 CORNWALL FIRE AND RESCUE 3-YEAR PLAN

It was reported the Cornwall Fire and Rescue Service Integrated Risk Management Plan is now open for consultation, available at their website www.cornwall.gov.uk/IRMP

130-18 EMERGENCY PLAN

Two parishioners have volunteered to work with the Parish Council on bringing together a Parish Emergency Plan. Councillors were asked to encourage other parishioners to become involved. It was RESOLVED that a separate meeting would be convened; and that the Clerk would contact Cornwall Council to enquire about the funding available. [ACTION: Clerk].

131-18 TREE WARDEN / TREE CHARTER DAY ON 24.11.18

Amanda Pugh is the Parish Tree Warden, and proposes to engage with Landulph School to see if children would be interested in collecting acorns and growing them on, with a prize for the best sapling. It was RESOLVED that this could be pursued.

132-18 CORRESPONDENCE:

- a) Application for Street Trading – for information.
- b) Correspondence from Royal Mail advising of scam mail – for information.

133-18 ACCOUNTS UPDATE

The Clerk provided an update on the Parish Council's accounts.

134-18 ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT

PAYEE	CHEQUE	REASON	NET	VAT	GROSS
Cormac	101150	Weedspray *raised in September	124.65	24.93	149.58
HMRC	101151	Tax Oct 2018	67.40	0.00	67.40
K J Williams	101152	Salary Oct 2018	268.94	0.00	268.94
K J Williams	101153	Office Expenses Oct 2018	30.39	0.00	30.39
M Worth	101154	Reimbursement for August Gmail invoice	8.51	0.00	8.51
M Worth	101155	Reimbursement for September Gmail invoice	52.80	0.00	52.80

135-18 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING

Please note the minutes for this part of the meeting have been recorded as verbatim, from the Parish Clerk's notes and an audio recording of the meeting.

Cllr Worth opened the discussion by stating: It brings us on now I think to the position of ourselves as to where we are with our own Neighbourhood Plan that we are being asked to approve. From the Council's point of view, I think it's important, as we've said, that we've read it all, we've looked at it, and that therefore because this is so important for our next 12 years that we are all absolutely happy in moving this forward at this point, or do we consider that we need some more consultation back to the Neighbourhood Plan Team to work certain things through.

Cllr Worth stated: Now I'm going to say my opinion on this, but obviously everybody else is welcome to say. I think because this is so important it is critical to this parish that we get this right, that I think we need to have some more consultation with the Neighbourhood Plan Team over the next coming months in ironing out all our particular issues. So I'm going to open that now to the floor for parish councillors as to give their views as to what they think we should do.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: I think we need more consultation, if only it's on the final submissions - the 14 final submissions that we had, because they clearly breach GDPR, you can identify who has done them, and worse still I think in one of the responses, you could claim, I think it's response number 7, you could claim that it's libellous against an individual, which it clearly targets an individual, it targets me as well but I've got broad shoulders, but it targets one of my neighbours and it is wrong, it is factually wrong I'm afraid. And if I was that individual I would be looking for redressing this with the NDP Committee. And I think you're very lucky that he isn't of that mind.

The Secretary of the Landulph Neighbourhood Plan Development Group (NPDG)was present [as a member of the public] and stated: We did check – we phoned up the commission for IN information ..whatever it is, and were told those are put in and asked for from a public document, and it is known they are going to be published, we didn't publish anybody's names, so I don't know how you've identified anybody.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: You have published his address.

Secretary of NDPG asked: Where?

Cllr Shirlaw answered: The PC has also failed to address the issue of unlicensed, unregistered street trading of secondhand cars from [the individual's address], which further exasperates the problem.

Secretary of NDPG asked: From?

Cllr Shirlaw: [repeated the individual's address] That gentleman has had two...

Secretary of NDPG stated: We can't ... stop...

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Excuse me I'm talking. That gentleman has had two Council Enforcement Officers who have come down and they have said he is not street trading, you cannot put that information in a public circulated document which is accusing him of public trading, and you identify him.

Secretary of NDPG stated: We cannot change a comment that someone has made.

Cllr Shirlaw commented: It is public - redact it.

Secretary of NDPG stated: I don't think we're allowed to redact it.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Well you've redacted...I'm sorry, you've redacted these, because you haven't put names who have written.

Secretary of NDPG stated: That was advised from the information commissioner to keep the names off.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Yes but you've redacted it, so if you can redact people's names...

Secretary of NDPG stated: Well we can't alter an opinion someone's put in, surely?

Cllr Shirlaw stated: You can't put something like that in a public document.

Secretary of NDPG stated: I will check – I will phone the commissioner tomorrow.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: I'm sorry but I'm not happy with an NDP document which goes out like that with my name on it, because at the end of the day the Council are just as liable as the NDP Group for something like that to be kept as a public document.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Not only that, you say that you've redacted it, but it's very clear from a couple of these who have made the responses.

Secretary of the NDPG advised: Because had these come out a fortnight or so earlier they would have all had names on, like all the others have, it's because we've sort of passed over the time.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Yes, but all you've done is taken out ...#interrupted

Secretary of NDPG stated: Yes and that's all we were told to do.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: But you can still identify the people from these responses.

Secretary of NDPG stated: With any of the response someone's put in you can do.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: But that is one of my reasons why I can't today ... I want to have more discussions because I can't... That is just one item, there are other items that I'm not happy with but that is one which I just say we cannot let the NDP go forward because it's GDPR's rules.

Cllr Worth asked: Any other comments? ... obviously we don't want to go down the route of a tit for tat scenario.

Cllr Dennis stated: I personally, I've said all along, I think the Committee that worked on this has worked exceedingly hard, it's an evidence-based document, on the evidence that they followed – going through the procedure which is a very documented procedure that they had to follow to get to where they are now, and I think they've done a great job actually and I personally would be happy to sign off. I think that particular comment needs looking at as obviously the law has now changed and the GDPR thing is relatively new, so I can understand how that that may have slipped through.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: GDPR has ...[The Clerk couldn't hear a few of the words here]

Cllr Dennis commented: Yes but not everybody knows about GDPR in all fairness to them .. it's a long and complicated issue, but from the point of the view of the plan I have no issues with it.

Cllr Cradick stated: I would like to say that the Neighbourhood Plan – the Committee and everything has done sterling work actually to get it where it is.

Cllr Shirlaw commented: Nobody is disputing that.

Cllr Cradick stated: And I would be happy to support it. Everyone has their own opinion.

Cllr G Braund stated: I think we need to move it forward now, because what we're actually doing now is sending this plan to Cornwall for them to give their opinion, so if they think that something is in there in the wrong format, that is up to the professional team at Cornwall Council. That is what we're doing – we're not saying right this is it, it's going, we are now moving it on and asking Cornwall Council to now go through everything, and maybe come back and say you've got to change this, or you can't actually put that in any more because of new regulations and that, and until we actually send it to them we can't get their feedback, to then have maybe another discussion where we need to alter something ... you know the Neighbourhood Plan Team, where it needs to be altered for Cornwall to say right we're happy with all that, the Legal Team has looked at everything, and you know, all we're doing is prolonging that process.

Cllr Holmes stated: I think we need to be a bit careful what we're signing, in all honesty, the law has changed since it all started in all fairness, so I think it needs to be looked at a bit more first, before you put it through.

Cllr P Braund stated: It's a good point that's been raised – I think that needs to be checked and we need to perhaps make a note that the document is gone through to make sure that it meets all those new regulations, I think that's quite important, that can be done at the Cornwall stage, if we make them aware and just ask them to check a few things, I think that can be dealt with. I have looked at other plans of a similar sized village, and there aren't actually that many of this size, and it kind of stacks up quite well with the ones that I've looked at, there are a few things that I don't agree with but we all have our own opinions, but generally I think this is a fairly good plan. I think the team has worked really hard, and I'd like to thank them personally. It's important that we have a plan, it is critical and I know what you're saying that it's got to be the right plan, but as individuals I don't think it's ever going to meet all our expectations as an individual, and I would probably be happy to move ahead with it at this stage.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: I think the problem is that we're 99% there, and if we just rush this stage, we might come to the point where in 6 months' time we go ..we want to change that and we don't half look *silly* if we've rubberstamped it, and we come back after 6 months and say actually we might want to have a look at that again.

Cllr P Braund commented: As a Council we can't change things, it has to be factual.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: We have an opportunity to review it, and I think we've got to get it right.

Cllr G Braund commented: Yes, but the review is in position after it's gone through everything, all this is doing is just prolonging the next stage, the plan is there to go to Cornwall – for them to then say do this and do that and then to give the parish the opportunity to have their say in the referendum. Obviously not everyone is going to agree with everything in it, that's what the referendum is for, but until we get past this stage for Cornwall to approve, then we can't put it to the referendum for everyone to have their view.

Cllr Shirlaw commented: But the referendum is going to be a fairly sterile event.

Cllr G Braund stated: But it's the procedure that has to go through, isn't it.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Because there can't be any canvassing on either side, so you just put it out there and if you say oh well you leave it to the public – well, if the public don't know what the issues are, how can they vote. Because we're not allowed to canvass and sort of say yes this is a fantastic plan you should vote for it or, conversely, we can't say this is a dreadful plan don't vote for it. It's our plan so we can't do that.

Cllr P Braund asked [Cllr Shirlaw]: Have you got any particular issues?

Cllr Shirlaw commented: Well yes I do ..I have a major issue with policies 1 and 4 – because I think they don't sit happily together, I really don't think policies 1 and 4 sit well together. I also have a problem with the number 5, and Martin [Cllr Worth] went to a meeting. A lot of us sat around here, and we sent a letter to the NDP group which said we're not happy with the 5, we want to go for the 6.

Cllr Cradick commented: Oh, yes.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: It goes to the Executive Committee – the Executive Committee come out with the wording which says would you be happy with ‘approximately 5’, I paraphrase I wasn’t at the meeting, Martin was at the meeting. He said, well I’ve got to take it back to the rest of the Council, but on the surface that looks like a good idea. It then goes to the full NDP group who vote it down. We then get an email off their Chairman a few days later stating they never agreed to ‘approximately 5’ – well it’s in black and white in one of their minutes. So the whole process, I have real problems with the process. But I don’t think that Policy 4, which is basically protecting the main things – which is the waterfront and the quay – will be protected by Policy 1. Because what we’re trying to do is protect the quay and waterfront - fantastic idea, but by limiting the number of houses in any one development to 5 effectively means there is going to be no development down there. At the moment we have a decaying pub and decaying quay. Is that what we want to see? Do we want to see the quay fall into the water, do we want to see the pub without a roof on it? Because that’s realistically what’s going to happen if Policy 1 gets adopted. I would ask this question of the NDP Group – is that what you want?

[The Parish Clerk left the meeting at this point].

The Treasurer of the NDP Group stated: If I may say so, 3 years ago I volunteered to be Treasurer to the NDP – 3 years ago we found out about all the various things that Martin listed - we have been through this, a lot of us has spent hour after hour going through, getting the evidence.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: I’m not disputing that.

Treasurer of the NDPG continued: Following all the twists and turns of meeting the regulations, and getting this plan - with a lot of close co-operation from the planning officers - to this stage. It is absolutely indefensible for you to come along at this very late stage and just wreck it.

Cllr Shirlaw commented: I’m not wrecking it.

Treasurer of the NDPG stated: Yes that’s what you’re trying to do – you’re trying to wreck it.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Excuse me, I’ve sat down, I have spent hours reading these documents, and you say oh you’re doing it at the last minute. Well I take, for instance, the basic statements which we asked for the other day, we get a copy of it on 11th October I think it was – if I’d sat down and read that 30 page document, and find out 4 days later it’s changed. At some stage...#interrupted

Treasurer of the NDPG stated: If I could just answer this question.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Yes, ok.

Treasurer of the NDPG stated: The point about the basic conditions – we made the point that these are draft documents which cannot be finalised until after they’ve been through the examination process, by the independent examiner that will be appointed by Cornwall Council. And it is only at that point that these things like the basic conditions and the consultation statement which are really documents for information, are they not?

Secretary of the NDPG stated: Yes.

Treasurer of the NDPG stated: They are not part of the policy in that sense.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Well we sat in a meeting with a [Cornwall] Council officer who said that when we approve the NDP we should approve those two documents as well at the same time.

The Secretary of the NDPG queried: Did she use the word approve?

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Yes.

Secretary of the NDPG queried: Or just that you can look at them?

Cllr Shirlaw stated: No, approve.

The Secretary of the NDPG stated: When I phoned them up, they said of course the Parish Council is entitled to look at them.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: No, we were told that we should be approving those documents at the same time.

Treasurer of the NDPG stated: Well our understanding is not that. It's that these documents will not be finalised until such time as it has gone through the examination process, both by the independent examiner and by the planning officers.

Secretary of the NDPG stated: If you read the beginning of the document it says this is to show how the plan complies with all the regulations – you can't show how it complies until it's finished. But you're not arguing about that anyway are you?

Cllr Shirlaw stated: I'm arguing about the process, because I have real problems with this.

Treasurer of the NDPG stated: If you think we're no good at doing this, then we'll all resign if you like.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: I'm not saying that. I'm saying I know, because I've spent hours reading these documents.

Treasurer of the NDPG stated: Then you must be a slow reader.

Cllr Worth stated: Please...can we...

Cllr Shirlaw stated: That's not a very nice thing to say. I take my job as a Councillor very seriously. When somebody asked me to review a document, to pass a document, I'm not just going to go "oh has everyone else read it ... then I'll sign it off."

Secretary of the NDPG asked: How long have you been on the Council, Mark?

Cllr Shirlaw replied: I've been on the Council ... I'm in my second year.

Secretary of the NDPG stated: And all that time, you've got at least 2 people, and in fact 3, that are both on this Council and on the Steering Group, and you've been party to every single thing that has happened. Why now come up with this? What happened over the last two years?

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Because it's now got to the stage where it's worth looking at...#interrupted

Secretary of the NDPG stated: I beg your pardon, was it not worth looking at before?

Cllr Shirlaw stated: In the sense that ...until we got the February or whatever one it was, that one there that you published. .which one was it...#interrupted

The Secretary of the NDPG stated: Well it doesn't matter what we've published, we've had meetings.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Yes our updates. And I've been having a look at the paperwork, we've had no realistic updates.

Cllr Worth asked: Can I just bring this back to the table?

Secretary of the NDPG stated: It's on our website, everything is on.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: You still haven't answered my critical question ...about the pub and the quay.

The Vice-Chair of the NDPG stated: Well, I'll answer that... because it's not about what we want, it's about what the community wants.

Cllr Shirlaw asked: But does the community want to see the pub go delapidated and the quay fall into the water?

Vice-Chair of the NDPG stated: Well they don't want to see development down there which is what we've written up and that's our evidence.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: You will not get development down there with the Neighbourhood Plan the way it is, you will have a derelict pub and you will have a derelict quay.

Cllr P Braund commented: I can't say that I agree with that really.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: You've said in your own responses that you're not interested in the quay anyway.

Vice Chair of the NDPG stated: Well it's not in our remit, no more than dog bins and car parking is, this is strictly about development, and this isn't a plan against development, it's a positive plan for development but protecting certain key aspects within the parish at the same time.

Cllr Worth commented: Can I bring this back to a fundamental point – and whilst discussion is good, and we should respect all our positions, this is the most important decision we're going to make for the next 12 years. And clearly at this moment in time, I don't feel, in all our interests, we're in the right state or right place, and it's right this should be all aired publically which is why this is being aired in a public forum in the Council and not in reserved business, But I don't feel we're in the right place right now to take a decision to pass this regarding the Parish Council to fully approve all the 3 documents we've seen, and I therefore ask the Parish Council to consider the proposal, that we take our time on this, we work together as a community that's been stressed, in the correct discussions and correct forums to work this through .. if this takes us another month or two, so be it. It's too important. If we just move this through just because it's been a period of time, I will hate the day that potentially in 2 or 3 years we are going to be in a position where if we don't get it right now then we have to go through a whole review process to get it back right again. I have concerns, and I would rather be in a position to have those discussions –

which are clearly going to be heated and are going to be difficult, but that's because we care, we're all volunteers, we're all in this room, we're all volunteers and therefore we all appreciate the time that's gone into this, and we've got to get into a position where we can 100% unanimously sign this off, that to me is the best message we can give to the planners, to the people in Cornwall, who see this all the time, and I've listened to some of these stories where it can start to go wrong – and what clearly comes out of it is that we've got to get this right, and the way we are going to get it right is to get around the table and make it happen. If people don't think that's the case, that we shouldn't get it right, and we just want to plough ahead, because we've got to a point - and points are raised about people haven't been around for very long - we are where we are, it's today, and we've got to get this right. At the end of the day, we as the Parish Council are responsible to sign this off and we have to agree it. So I would ask, in a situation like this now that we look, as a Council, to ask for more consultation with the Neighbourhood Plan team.

Secretary of the NDPG stated: It's not going to happen, it's not us [the NDPG] – your consultation will have to be with the community. One person here can't change all the evidence we've had from 5 public consultations, you're asking us to go out and do a new survey around the whole community.

Vice Chair of the NDPG stated: It's like Brexit, you could go on forever, trying to get it to meet your expectations, it's not going to happen, we have to work with what we've got.

Cllr Worth stated: I'll just come back and say ...it's not the actual words/ the housing numbers, the this, the that...#interrupted

The Secretary of the NDPG stated: Yes it was, that's exactly what Marc said – that is the only thing so far.

Cllr Worth stated: That was an example that Marc's raised. It's important that we get agreement that the plan is properly...#interrupted

The Secretary of the NDPG stated: He said policy 1 or policy 4 – to change those we need to go back out to the community.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: No you don't.

The Secretary of the NDPG stated: Yes you do.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Excuse me - we asked as a Council, we sent you a letter in the consultation period saying that you're bit about 5 or fewer, we asked you to change it to 6.

The Secretary of the NDPG stated: Approximately.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: No 6 - we asked for 6 at that stage. It went to your Executive Committee who agreed approximately 5. It then went to your ...#interrupted

The Secretary of the NDPG stated: That was agreed with your Chairman.

[The Clerk resumed attendance of the meeting at this point].

The Treasurer of the NDPG stated: Approximately came from a discussion with Martin [Worth]. It was not the Executive Committee who disagreed with 6, it was the full Steering Group who didn't like approximately. And we then found another way round it to try and meet your needs – by coming up with

the exceptional developments, so that is our way round the problem to meet your needs, so that is how we tweaked the plan to make that happen. So let's just try and get it straight. Forgive me, but we have really no idea what it is you see a further consultation solving. We have given you the plan not only by the Executive Group but by the full Steering Committee of the Plan – it is their unanimous vote, a formal vote, formally minuted, which says this is what we commend. In fact what we're really asking you to do is not so much to approve it, but to endorse it so that we can go through the next stage, and it is the next stage where there may be further alterations. That's what we're trying to do. I can't see, I won't speak for my colleagues, I can't see what there is actually to discuss, except that we may generate a lot of heat if we're not careful rather than light.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: If we were to say right ok fine fair enough we've got disagreements but we let the plan go forward...Ok hypothetically if we disagree with certain items in the plan because you say it may get changed in the future, but if we approve it then it goes to Cornwall and the referendum, then we as the Parish Council has done our bit and we never get a chance to look at it again.

The Treasurer of the NDPG stated: What do you mean you don't get the chance to look at it again? Forgive me, what happens is an independent examiner is appointed, who writes a long report who sends it back to us and we then have the opportunity to take on board to make the changes that have been asked for. So you will see it again.

Cllr Shirlaw asked: Will the plan then get referred back to the Parish Council to then get another opportunity to rubberstamp it again?

Treasurer of the NDPG: I'm not sure I know the answer to that.

The Secretary of the NDPG stated: No, every person in the parish will get one vote, whether a Councillor or not.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: So this is the one point where the Parish Council has their say, this is where the Parish Council can either say yes go ahead, or pause for a minute. Because if the Parish Council says yes go ahead today, that is it, the juggernaut goes, whether we like it or not, whether we agree with it all or not, whether we think it needs a bit of tweaking or not ...

A Member of the NDPG stated: Excuse me it is not up to Council members as a member of the public to tweak it, it is evidence based, it has been put together with Cornwall Council with all their advisors over a period of 3 years.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: I would love to have a meeting with you [stated name], as I think some of the processes which you say you've got which you say is evidence is questionable.

Cllr G Braund stated: But that's your own personal opinion, we've got to endorse this as a Council, you have your own personal opinion as does everybody else.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: You've got minutes here saying this is what we've found. But if you actually look at the surveys – the answers to the surveys do not follow through on what it says in the reports, and I think these things need to be talked through. There are small typo problems in this where you're carrying them between different things, the references are not right, it refers to two maps – they're missing two maps – where are they? Can't see them. If you look at the draft Condition Statement it refers to

Appendix 5 which is missing. How am I expected to approve this when it refers to documents that don't exist?

The Secretary of the NDPG stated: Have you looked on the website?

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Yes.

Cllr Worth stated: Marc is raising some clear points...

Cllr Shirlaw stated: That's why I think we need to sit down and we need to go through this quietly.

Cllr Worth stated: I would like to take this back up to the core situation where, one way or another, we have to agree or disagree to approve this plan. I would much prefer that we still have some consultation between the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Committee to sort this out because it's so important.

The Vice Chair of the NDPG stated: To sort what out exactly?

Cllr Worth stated: Well, there are situations ... Cllr Shirlaw has highlighted one as an example, where there was a clear letter that came from the Parish Council, which is representing its community, as a result of the situation we had from a planning discussion based around the 5/6 housing figures. There was a clear request ...#interrupted

The Vice Chair of the NDPG stated: But it's not Parish Council led, we consult with you, it's broad based, not just the Council.

Cllr Worth stated: The request was clear, we are in a position of having to approve this ...#interrupted

The Vice Chair of the NDPG stated: You can't make requests – it's not Parish Council led.

Cllr Worth stated: It's community-led, and the Parish Council has to deliver this over the next 12 years, and it has to be the right document for the community. #interrupted

The Secretary of the NDPG stated: That's what the referendum is for, to make sure it's the right document for the community

Cllr Worth stated: But the problem we have is this, is that therefore in those types of meetings, there were unanimous decisions taken therefore to reject the request from the Parish Council.

Secretary of the NDPG stated: Because that's one request out of 200 odd people/dwellings.

Cllr Worth stated: There were requests to broaden the scope of the meetings, by inviting additional members of the Parish Council to those meetings, they didn't happen...#interrupted

Secretary of the NDPG stated: I beg your pardon?

Cllr Worth stated: In your minutes there was a request made, because unfortunately (referring to Cllr Cradick) when was the last time you attended a Neighbourhood Plan meeting?

Cllr Cradick responded: I only came on in less than 12 months – when we had the changeover, and someone else came off, I don't know who came off. I haven't been on from the very beginning, I only came on for the last 8 months – so they've done all the work and I've just sat in and listened.

Cllr Worth stated: I have to be very clear – we've been asked to be accurate. I can't find a meeting minute with you attending since September 2017.

Cllr Cradick stated: Well that's probably correct, because there was no meeting.

Cllr G Braund stated: There were no meetings for a while because everything was all with Cornwall Council, we didn't have any meetings.

Cllr Cradick stated: There was one meeting which I didn't attend as it was a family event, I think I've been to all the meetings when there was a meeting I could attend.

Secretary of the NDPG stated: Well the Parish Council could always send somebody else like they used to.

Cllr Worth stated: In light of that fact, it was minuted, and Gaye has obviously minuted this, to request that another member of the Council would come and it was suggested # interrupted ... it's in your minutes.

The Secretary of the NDPG stated: It wasn't. I beg your pardon? Read it carefully what it says.

Cllr Worth stated: Well I am reading it carefully. It was recommended that a member of the Council – Gaye asked as the representative, that we would have somebody else to come, but it was felt that it wasn't appropriate as it was felt there wasn't time to ask the Chairman.

Secretary of the NDPG stated: Sorry, I'm not quite sure - are you criticising us for not having somebody else there.

Cllr G Braund stated: There wasn't time to send someone to that meeting, because we only knew within half an hour before the meeting that we only had one person going.

Cllr Worth stated: This Extraordinary meeting was called as Rose Cradick ... sent apologies [The Clerk couldn't hear a few of the words said here] JB asked GB (also on the PC) to invite another member, but felt it would be inappropriate without the prior approval of the Parish Council Chair – that's me and I knew nothing about it.

The Vice Chair of the NDPG stated: I'm sorry, how is this relevant to approving the plan?

Cllr Worth stated: It's relevant because of the concerns we have in making sure this is right. So in all cases...#interrupted

Member of the NDPG stated: Excuse me Mr Chairman, what do you mean by right – your opinion, Marc Shirlaw's opinion - how do you define right?

Cllr Worth stated: No it's not my opinion at all. I'm making the point, and I note in certain other parts of the meeting that you, as an ex-Parish Chair and now not being in the parish, also recommended that this is a community-led thing after a comment about not inviting the Parish Council Chair.

Member of the NDPG stated: I'm sorry I have said consistently that this is a community-led thing.

Cllr Worth stated: Yes and I'm also making the point that there's a minute in one of the meetings where it was highlighted that you should be inviting another member of the parish council, and you said at that time this is community led not parish council led.

Member of the NDPG stated: But that doesn't negate what was said about inviting another Parish Councillor, that was just merely a statement of the situation.

Cllr Worth stated: It's ironic that we haven't had, through reasons, full parish council attendance at these meetings for the last period of time.

Cllr G Braund stated: But you've had Parish Council attendance.

Cllr Shirlaw commented: We've had no feedback though.

Cllr G Braund stated: Well you've had feedback at every single meeting, it's been on the agenda. Other people have been here, and when the Steering Committee have been here they've given their opinions on what's been going on.

Cllr Worth stated: I appreciate that we've generally had feedback from the Steering Cttee, which is the right thing to get feedback direct.

#interrupted – lots of people talking at the same time ...Cllr P Braund: But that's not anybody's fault, it's the stage it was at.

Cllr G Braund stated: For the last 8 months it has been on the agenda and there has been feedback on what has happened at the meeting and whichever one of us been at the meeting when Gerry was on etc, we've answered questions and taken questions back, so I'm not having it that there's been no feedback because that's not true.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Well there's been no feedback in so much as there's been very little happening for the past year.

Cllr G Braund stated: Yes but there's always feedback when something happened.

Cllr P Braund stated: I've attended PC meetings for the last 15 years on a fairly regular basis as a member of the public, and there has been feedback over that period whilst Gerry was chairing there has been feedback constantly. So I'm sorry I can't agree with that point.

Cllr Worth commented: Where we are right now, and this is probably appearing that we're getting near the last hurdle and therefore why are we interested, well unlike you, some of us haven't been around for the 15 years, and we have turned up over the last 18 months, and I'll repeat this is the most important thing we're going to do for the next 12 years, and that's why the interest is there, that is why it's so

important and we're so passionate about it and we want to get it right, taking the advice from Cornwall to get it right – that's in simple terms, what we're being told.

Cllr Worth stated: Now, the final point I'm going to make, and I will again say that I would like to continue to consult and try and get this right because it's so important. Where I have my major difficulty on this is related to a particular statement that was said to me, and it was said to me by your Chair, and it was prior to the meeting that I was invited to in good spirit, to recommend that we had consultation and discussion, and what was put on the table to me was that we would do the approximately 5. I'm not getting hung up on the approximately 5 – that's not the issue – that's a number and we can talk about that. The challenge was that your Chair said to me very clearly at the end of one of these meetings, directly to me, you do realise the reason why these figures are in the neighbourhood plan is to stop the Spaniard development.

Secretary of NDPG asked: Sorry..?

Cllr Worth stated: I've just said what I said very clearly and very carefully.

Vice Chair of NDPG asked: When did she say that?

Cllr Worth stated: She said it to me after a Council meeting clearly, directly to me.

Secretary of NDPG stated: I think we need to report that back to her [the Chair] as I don't think she knows that.

Cllr Worth commented: It was very clear. I, at that particular point, then reported it to my Clerk and I reported it to our Cornwall Councillor.

Vice Chair of NDPG stated: Well 5 wouldn't stop a development like that – because they've applied for 5 before.

Cllr Worth stated: Please let's not get hung up about that.

Vice Chair of NDPG stated: Well I feel that's what you're doing Martin.

Cllr Worth stated: No I'm not, I'm not ...#interrupted

Vice Chair of NDPG stated: You're attacking people and raising a smokescreen in order to avoid this progressing. But it's irrelevant to whether the plan gets approved or not.

Cllr Worth stated: I'm reporting a situation that I was very surprised at and would have hoped that we didn't have to put into a public domain, because I will repeat we have to get this right and make it work because it's so important for our parish.

Treasurer of NDPG stated: Well I have to say as Treasurer I have never in all the time had any idea that anybody was cooking any figures, which is what you're suggesting, and that has not happened in my knowledge at all. The figures which are in any of the reports are simply figures that have been gathered as part of the data-gathering process.

Cllr Worth stated: The challenge we have, and I'm looking at you Sir (addressing the NDPG Treasurer) I believe that that's what you believe, absolutely, I believe you. But when that was said to me...
#interrupted

Secretary of NDPG asked: Could you repeat what was said to you, so that I can tell (the NDPG Chair) what was said?

Cllr Worth stated: Well fine absolutely, you realise that the Neighbourhood Plan has been developed in this particular way in relationship to the Spaniards, and it related to the discussion at the end of May about the number 5 – 5/6 - approximately, whatever. But if we could have got to a position where we had that discussion and you were present, and we went away and came back to the Council, and we worked around the 5/6 and approximately, and that's the difficult thing – we've raised this as a Council, because we could find no evidence of where the 5 came from, and that's the whole point of where I'm coming from.

Cllr Worth stated: If you read the first statement it very clearly says: thinking about the possible number of new homes built in the parish, how many do you think is appropriate to our parish. An open question, very clearly to offer the parishioners the chance to answer that question. Number one.

Secretary of NDPG asked: Do you mean over the period of the plan?

Cllr Worth stated: Yes it clearly says here until 2030, yes. And the answer that came back was: none, up to 10, up to 20, up to 30, more than 30, so it's an open question and I accept it's gone up to 1500, but we're being realistic, it's come back as approximately how many do you think, and people have filled in their choices, and I appreciate that you can't read the numbers, but at the low end it's come back as:

No houses 4%

Up to 10 47 – that's 30 odd%

20 is 36

Over 30 is 25

And it tails off over the 30 at the top end

Cllr Worth continued: So there's a tranche around 20.... And I think we have no problem with that whatsoever, that that is a question that's been asked of the 155 respondents, of which [the Clerk couldn't hear a few of the words said here] and they came back with a response that puts the vast percentage around the 20. So you as the Neighbourhood Plan, not the Parish Council, came up with the word approximately 20.

Vice Chair of NDPG commented: No actually Zoe made us put that in, as she said we couldn't have a finite absolute figure for over the term of the plan.

Cllr Worth stated: Ok Zoe, fine. So one way or another we've got a figure of approximately 20. You then have referred to in many situations, and your answers to the consultation, and bit of pieces that have come up, a figure of 5, and this has come from the parish, this figure of 5 has come from the parish. I'm paraphrasing, but that's approximately what you've come back with.

Cllr Worth continued: I then look at the next question. And the next question says ok, so you want so many houses, bearing in mind the previous question. How suitable do you think each of the following are for the location and grouping of the new houses in Landulph parish, perfectly reasonable question,

perfectly reasonable. So, within Cargreen, outside, brownfield, redevelopment, doesn't mention the quay, absolutely reasonable, whatever.

Cllr Worth continued: But we then move on to the first mention of 5 anywhere in the document and therefore Parishioners have only been given the chance to answer on the figure of 5, maximum of 5, maximum of 5, greater than 5 in one location, greater than 5. Why's that figure not 10?

Secretary of NDPG stated: Because we've had consultations before, this is the 5th one. If you look at the first and second, that's the group one and the open day, that's where the figure of 5 comes from.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: No it doesn't, I'm sorry it doesn't. The open day in May 2016 came up with small scale development, maximum 6, total number 10-15. Your minutes of your meeting in July afterwards you suddenly refer to 5 houses, whereas the report suggested 6.

Secretary of NDPG stated: No, you're reading comments on open day, where's the one from before?

Cllr P Braund commented: I've seen somewhere where it says up to 5 or 5 to 10, and it's clearly - there was a huge majority of 5. Unfortunately I can't find this, I know it's there, I know I've seen that, I know I've seen it.

Cllr Worth stated: Please, let's go back to the advice of Cornwall, please let's not get hung up on the number, that's not the point, it really isn't.

Vice Chair of NDPG asked: So what was all that about?

Cllr Worth answered: I'm trying to explain if you let me, the point is it's so important to get it right, that we are comfortable that where these core figures are coming from ... And you're saying there from consultation 3 years ago - I wasn't here then, so I accept...#interrupted

Secretary of NDPG stated: But you'll have read the first consultation?

Cllr Worth stated: But the point I'm trying to make is, without the direct access to you in that sense, we're not able to have this type of discussion. And I really didn't want to have this type of discussion in this forum.

Secretary of NDPG stated: If you'd read the first public consultation, in the groups, I think that's where the 5 came from, it's on the website.

Cllr Shirlaw asked: What, the November 2015 one?

Cllr Worth commented: This is the November 2015 one.

Vice Chair of NDPG answered: No it's not, that's the December 2016 one, and the report was done in January 2017.

Cllr P Braund asked: I assume all these figures were independently looked at?

Vice Chair of NDPG answered: yes ... by [stated names of two people].

Cllr P Braund stated: So if anything was majorly wrong they would have picked it up I assume?

Cllr G Braund answered: That's why someone independent did it.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: There's no mention of 5 in the November 15 one, unless you can find it, I can't see it.

Cllr Worth stated: Please, in a sense, we've got to close and we've got to get to a resolution, we're not going to discuss everything. That's part of my point. I'd like to have the opportunity to really nail this out. Now, that decision isn't on that side of the room, that decision is between the 7 of us. So we have to make a decision now as to whether we're going to pass this through, or we're going to ask for further consultation.

Cllr G Braund asked: Who are you going to ask for consultation with?

Cllr Worth answered: The Neighbourhood Plan Team.

Cllr P Braund commented: I'm not sure we can go through that with rubber boots to say we want to change that and that You can't do that.

Cllr G Braund stated: I don't think we can keep doing that all the time.

Cllr Cradick commented: No, they've spent all that time on it.

Cllr G Braund stated: It's the Neighbourhood Development Plan that have done this. They're just asking us to send it on to the next place. They're not asking us, you know, to say we don't like this, we don't like that. It just seems to be going on too long.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: I'll ask a very simple question - what was the point of the final consultation, because the final consultation hasn't effectively changed the plan, and what we asked, our request as the Parish Council has been ignored.

Cllr G Braund stated: No it wasn't ignored, it wasn't ignored. Something was changed, and every single comment has been made and that consultation has all been put into the report, which will be sent to Cornwall so that they can see what responses came from that consultation. So nothing was ignored. Things might not have been changed because perhaps they were not deemed by the Committee to be enough to change, but nothing was ignored and every single comment has been put in it to be sent to Cornwall for them to see that there was a consultation.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: Out of the individual responses you could say 50% were positive, 30% wanted the number 5 to be changed.

Cllr G Braund stated: Well Cornwall will see that and then that's up to Cornwall to say whether the Neighbourhood Development Plan Committee have done the right thing or they think it should be looked at again, surely?

Cllr Shirlaw stated: 30% of those people have asked for the 5 to be changed.

Cllr Worth commented: I'm giving you the advice that was given to us from Cornwall, for the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Team to sort this out and agree it before it goes to Cornwall. That's the important thing. I fear at this moment we're not in agreement, clearly we're not in agreement, and we need to get in a position where all 7 of us are absolutely in agreement.

Cllr G Braund stated: Yes but you can't say it has got to unanimous when a Council speaks on something, we could be here for another 2 years, we've always been able to make our vote.

Cllr Dennis commented: Every other issue we've made the vote and it's gone on the majority decision.

Cllr Worth stated: I'd be the first to support the democracy of the Council please understand me, I realise that, absolutely I support the democracy, for the parish, the community and the Council. So that is not in question.

Cllr G Braund asked: So can we vote then?

Cllr Worth stated: I'm asking you as the Council to make that decision. Any of you can make that decision if you wish to, that's what I'm saying. I would offer, to table first, unless anyone else would like to, that we at this point in time take our time, for more consultation with the Neighbourhood Development Plan to make certain we have approval from the Council to deliver the best plan possible to Cornwall.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: I would second that.

Cllr G Braund asked: So what are you asking us to vote on here?

Cllr Worth answered: On whether we ask for further consultation.

Cllr Cradick stated: No some of us are not happy with that.

Cllr Worth stated: We have a democracy and that's the whole point.

Cllr Worth asked: So I'm asking who's in favour of that?

Cllr Worth asked: Who's against?

Cllr Worth stated: So in that case we continue to a vote.

Cllr G Braund: To propose that we vote on approving it to send for consultation to Cornwall? Yes, I'll propose that.

Cllr Worth stated: So those in favour?

Cllr P Braund stated: I'd go in favour as long as the issues that the names are looked at.

Cllr G Braund stated: Well that's what will be done, that's what they'll be doing.

Vice Chair of NDPG stated: But you can't do that though.

Cllr Shirlaw stated: You can't do that, as it's part of the condition, you either vote yes or you vote no, you can't vote on the condition.

Cllr P Braund stated: When it is sent to County, they're asked to review that, and make any changes they see fit.

Secretary of NDPG stated: They'll keep us in the law, if we're breaking the law they won't let us.

Cllr Worth commented: To make it clear, to propose that we're passing it as the Parish Council for approval, back to the Neighbourhood Development Plan team, and that's the 3 documents that we've been presented with.

Against:

Cllr Holmes stated: The wording's got to be sorted out.

Cllr P Braund stated: I'm sure County will do that.

Cllr G Braund replied: That's what they're job is.

Cllr Worth asked: Against?

Cllr Shirlaw stated: I've got to go against, because of GDPR if nothing else. I'm sorry but I cannot support a document which is factually incorrect and is potentially libellous and you'll be having my resignation in the morning, Martin, because I'm not opening myself up to that potential danger.

It's a public document which shouldn't be out in the public, it should be removed now, pending any redaction that is going to happen, because it is wrong. And I'm sorry but I don't want to be part of a Parish Council that allows people to libellously defame members of this community. Period.

Cllr Worth asked [Cllr Holmes]: Can I have a decision from you Martin?

Cllr Holmes answered: Against. You can't go with wording like that. Not against it, but you can't put forward a document that has errors in it.

Cllr Worth stated: I am against it as well, I am however, from the point I made earlier on, as this is such an important document, I'm not in a position to resign as I wish to see this through.

Cllr Worth asked the Clerk to record the votes.

Record of votes:

Cllr Worth proposed that the Parish Council should request more consultation with the Landulph Neighbourhood Development Plan Team:

Cllr Worth voted yes

Cllr Shirlaw voted yes

Cllr Holmes abstained

Cllr Mrs Braund voted no

Cllr Braund voted no

Cllr Cradick voted no

Cllr Dennis voted no

It was RESOLVED that the Parish Council would not request more consultation with the Landulph Neighbourhood Development Plan Team.

Cllr Mrs Braund proposed that the Parish Council approves the Landulph Neighbourhood Development Plan:

- Cllr Mrs Braund voted yes
- Cllr P Braund voted yes
- Cllr Cradick voted yes
- Cllr Dennis voted yes
- Cllr Holmes voted no
- Cllr Shirlaw voted no
- Cllr Worth voted no

It was RESOLVED that the Parish Council approves the Landulph Neighbourhood Development Plan.

136-18 CHAIRMAN’S URGENT BUSINESS - none

137-18 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- a) Cllr Mrs Braund reported on a meeting she had with the school to discuss the idea of the children making poppies and Councillors would put up the poppies on the cross. [ACTION: Cllr Braund].
- b) Cllr Cradick asked whether the Land South of the Oaks planning application has been approved, and was advised nothing has been posted on Cornwall’s planning website yet.
- c) Cllr Dennis reported that in Coombe Lane the school bus gets too close, and children have to go into the road. [ACTION: Cllr Worth to raise at the next SARS meeting].

138-18 DATE OF NEXT MEETING – Monday 19th November, at 7.30pm

DATES FOR 2018: 17th December

10 minute Public Forum to follow the meeting.

Meeting closed at 21.42pm.....Chairman