

**MINUTES** of the **Properties Committee** Meeting held on Thursday 2 June 2016 at 6.30 p.m. in the Shire House Suite, Shire House, Bodmin.

**PRESENT:** Chairman, Councillor K W Stubbs presiding; together with Councillors, J Gammon, A M Kerridge, S H Kinsman and J M Lyne, Councillors A J Coppin (arrived 6.49 p.m. from Item PP/2016/045), J R Gibbs, P L G Skea and R Solomons were also in attendance but did not vote, not being Members of this Committee.

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Stephen Facer (Town Clerk) and Richard Davies (Parks & Open Spaces Manager).

#### **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND APOLOGIES:**

There were no announcements and apologies were received from Councillors S J Horne, L G J Kennedy, S R Stephens and C J M Wilkes.

#### PP/2016/038      **Election of Vice-Chairman**

Councillor J M Lyne was elected as Vice-Chairman of this Committee.

#### PP/2016/039      **Public Representation Session**

Mr Pete Hodges was in attendance but wished to make no representation.

#### PP/2016/040      **Declarations of Interest – Members to declare interests in respect of any item on the agenda**

No Declarations of Interest were made.

#### PP/2016/041      **Minutes of the Properties Committee Meeting held on Thursday 31 March 2016**

These minutes had been through Council and were acknowledged as a true record.

#### PP/2016/042      **Terms of Reference**

A copy of the Terms of Reference dated June 2013 had been circulated with the agenda.

The Town Clerk advised that having reviewed these Terms of Reference they seemed to remain fit for purpose and whilst succinct were a fair reflection of the remit and scope of the Committee. If committee was happy with these the date would be changed to reflect the review by Committee.

Following discussion, it was **AGREED** to **RECOMMEND** adoption of these Terms of Reference without amendment.

#### PP/2016/043      **Correspondence**

- a) **Email and photos from Lucy Hetherington – Accora Ltd requesting use of the Priory Car Park on 12 September 2016 for a healthcare equipment for local councils roadshow**

A copy of the e-mail and articulated vehicle specification from Lucy

Hetherington (Accora Ltd) had been circulated with the agenda.

The Town Clerk advised that this request is for the use of the Priory II car park on Monday 12 September for the road show, promoting healthcare equipment, as set out.

The request includes the use of a 16m articulated vehicle and 30 cars.

The Town Clerk considered that Committee might support this request subject to the 30 cars individually paying the appropriate day rate to park, displaying a valid ticket purchased from the car park ticket machine.

In terms of the articulated vehicle, the Town Clerk recommended that as this will take up 6.6 parking spaces calculated using the parking standards minimum standing space for an average car of 2.4m, that 7 parking spaces be allocated. An area of 16 metres could be coned off by the Parks Team on the morning of any visit and that the vehicle should display an appropriate ticket (for the Priory II parking area this would equate to 7 spaces at £1.50 - £10.50). However, should the Priory I area be preferred then this would also be charged at 7 bays at 60 pence per hour per bay for the duration of the visit.

Timings for this event are to be confirmed with Accora.

The Town Clerk advised that he would need to advise of the school parking in Priory II at peak times as this would be a material safety consideration given volume and movement of traffic.

There would also be the need to advise that vehicles purchasing a ticket from the machine in the long-stay Priory II car park are not able to use that ticket to park in the Priory I car park and that penalty tickets will be issued by the Car Park inspector to vehicles displaying the incorrect ticket (i.e. the area by the War Memorial and the tiered parking areas.

Whilst discussing this matter, Members were of the view that the preferred site would be the area opposite the war memorial in the lower tier of the car park as that would afford sufficient space for all users of the car park.

The Town Clerk was instructed to make the necessary arrangements in liaison with Accora.

Following discussion, it was **AGREED to RECOMMEND** that Accora Ltd be granted permission to park in the Priory Car Park on Monday 12 September 2016 subject to the articulated vehicle being parked in a suitable location and with the relevant day rate for the number of parking bays (7) being paid for the duration of the visit. The 30 vehicles would also be required to pay and display.

It was further **AGREED to RECOMMEND** that copy public liability and risk assessment / method statements are provided by Accora.

PP/2016/044

### **Priory Park Drainage Scheme**

The e-mail and scheme design detail from Inza Design (working on behalf of CORMAC Solutions Ltd) was circulated with the agenda.

The Town Clerk reported that this information follows a recent round table meeting with representatives of Cornwall Council, BTC, the Environment Agency (EA) and CORMAC to discuss the new roundabout at the Launceston Road / Priory Road junction and the pipe being proposed to accept surface water run-off to mitigate flood risk to the Church Square area of the town.

This scheme has been discussed with the EA who seemed supportive given the flood risk benefits.

This information has subsequently come forward as a planning application PA16/04170 and was considered by the Town Council's Planning Committee yesterday morning (1 June 2016) where support was given subject to:

- the new surface water pipe headwall in Pen Dowr Meadow being faced with Cornish stone to reflect local materials and to harmonise with other walls surrounding Pen Dowr and Priory Meadow;
- That surface water diverted into Pen Dowr is monitored by the Environment Agency to ensure that there is no long term impact to lower lying areas at peak weather events i.e. the children's play area in Priory Park;
- That a vortex separation type device or similar is installed in any new surface water pipe discharging into Pen Dowr Meadow to mitigate contaminants and pollutants from entering the town leat which eventually discharges into the SSSI Camel River;
- Given the additional volume of surface water being diverted in to the town leat, together with the amount of development in the east of the town, the Town Council strongly recommends that Cornwall Council as planning authority and lead flood authority for Cornwall looks to collect funding via section 106 or other appropriate mechanism to assist with leat and flood improvement schemes for the town as there could be a future problem with the existing leat infrastructure to the west of the town given the additional load and capacity that is being collected from upstream developments;

The Town Clerk advised that the Lead Flood Officer from Cornwall Council was also at the meeting and like him she was keen to see that the wider developments in the town were playing their part by way of SUDs and other measures to mitigate the amount of surface water being generated given the impact on lower lying areas of the town.

This information was noted by Committee.

PP/2016/045

#### **Westheath Park Transfer**

An e-mail from Stuart Wallace (Cornwall Council Public Space Officer) and Section 106 Agreement paperwork had been circulated with the agenda.

The Town Clerk referred to the paperwork and reported that there was an opportunity to explore the Town Council taking on the longer-term maintenance of this site. However, the commuted sum is fairly low and the ongoing maintenance costs are likely to be higher given the grounds maintenance and the number of trees on the site requiring management. As this site is within a perceived gated community the direct benefit or value to the wider public might be difficult to justify.

Stuart Wallace therefore seeks a view as to whether BTC would like to take on this space. Should the Town Council decline the space, Stuart Wallace would be interested in the Town Council's opinion of the space, as it now functions, and whether it should be considered as public open space, or as semi-private communal garden?

The Town Clerk advised that from the e-mail trail that he had seen, this matter has played electronic ping-pong at Cornwall Council internally between legal and other departments since around 2012.

The commuted sum was originally £40,612.90, however reimbursement is determined pro rata – in March 2015 Cornwall Council legal advised that the amount potentially reimbursable by Cornwall Council had risen to £18,952.69 leaving a sum of £21,660.21 remaining.

As the Town Council's Parks Department is going through a period of change, Committee might feel that the offer and timing is not right and that this space should be declined in favour of the area being a communal garden area.

The Town Clerk further advised that the area had been under the control of a management company and the detail within the Section 106 document outlined the timeline regarding the commuted sum.

Councillor A M Kerridge advised that she was aware that the roads within this residential development were not adopted and doubted that any of the park / garden type areas were used by the wider public other than the residents living within the development. For these reasons Councillor Kerridge did not support the Town Council taking on this site under those circumstances. This view was echoed by other Members of the Committee with the general consensus being that it was hard to see how this site would benefit the wider public.

Following discussion, it was **AGREED** to **RECOMMEND** that Bodmin Town Council declines this offer and that the site would best be served as a communal garden.

PP/2016/046

### **Bodmin Pre-School External refurbishment proposal**

A copy e-mail from Bodmin Pre-School together with scheme design images had been circulated with the agenda.

The Town Clerk advised that this proposal has been put forward by the Manager of Bodmin Pre-School and picks up on previous discussions between Officers, Councillors and the former Manager of the Pre-School. The wooden fencing around the pre-school is in need of replacement as it has largely come to the end of its useful life. The replacement fencing is as per the drawing supplied and would see a 1.5m high fence with a 1.3m gate being installed.

The current safety surfacing is also in the form of old Wicksteed type tiles which are also in need of replacement and the proposal is for wet pour to be utilised. A 4m x 3m pergola canopy area is proposed to provide an undercover area for children during the summer.

These works would be funded by the Pre-School and permission is sought in line with their lease.

The only issue that the Town Clerk could potentially foresee related to the pergola attracting an area of shelter for unauthorised users of the outdoor area, particularly as a number of other undercover areas are being phased out. The Town Clerk however informed that this was more of a management issue albeit that he had raised this as a potential issue that the Manager might need to monitor once any structure is in situ.

The Town Clerk advised that if Committee were supportive of this scheme it would enhance the facility at the Pre-School and would support the ongoing business of the Council's tenant.

Bodmin Pre-School would need to explore planning permission regarding the pergola but assumed under the relaxed general permitted development rights this would be a fairly straightforward planning item for them to pursue.

Councillor J Gammon advised that it was not uncommon for an undercover area being provided in nursery / pre-schools and that any Ofsted inspection would usually recommend these types of areas to mitigate sun exposure to young children whilst attending any nursery environment.

Following discussion, it was **AGREED** to **RECOMMEND** that Bodmin Pre-School be granted permission to proceed with the refurbishment proposals as it would enhance this facility for the town.

It was further **AGREED** to **RECOMMEND** that in any letter to the Pre-School the Town Clerk includes the need for the Pre-School to obtain planning advice regarding the pergola and whether any planning permission is required as it is noted that the Pre-School is within the town's conservation area.

PP/2016/047

### **Hillside Park**

Further to Minute PP/2016/29 in the Properties Minutes of 31 March 2016, the Town Clerk advised that he had been forwarded an e-mail exchange between Julian Brooke-Houghton of the Environment Agency (EA) to Matt Severs of Cornwall Council on 11 April which indicates the following:

*We tried to get that section cctv'd but the contractors were reluctant to put the camera through it because it looks so close to collapse. You might find Glanvilles find the same, although they do apply themselves a bit more.*

*I've been in as far as the upstream end (just below the jail) and declined to go any further. There are extensive cracks as far along as one can see; there is a section which was accessible but that didn't really show much.*

*The land is, as far as I know, owned by Bodmin Town Council and we have had discussions with them in the past as the 'riparian owner', but that hasn't come to*

*anything.*

*Options really are renewal of the culvert or reversion to open channel, but the latter raises difficulties with the use of the land and safety of the public.*

The Town Clerk advised that this was new information and that the Town Council has not been provided with this information directly from the EA.

Further, previous discussions with them had provided, at times, some contradictory information other than the Town Council was the riparian owners and that the situation was 'bad.' This dates back to 2008 where the condition of the 1200mm pipe was classed as 'very poor' with a number of longitudinal fractures and pipe deformity at around 35 to 45%

However, since then we have had South West Water assert in 2012 that they are responsible for the leat running through Hillside Park.

The Town Clerk advised that Councillor Solomons and Councillor Skea would probably recall a round table meeting with Julian Brooke-Houghton in 2014 where in his opinion these cracks had always been in situ and were probably made post installation as heavy plant tracked back across the site.

Further, and at the time, Officers did carry out tentative enquiries with the EA to explore options and grant funding to open-up the culvert but the view was less than encouraging – In April 2014 Mike Williams from the EA advised that *'there is a report, I believe – and it is not encouraging. There are some contaminated land issues to deal with and the culvert is quite deep on the ground, which means that opening it up (daylighting) is an expensive option (c £1m) compared to repairs. In addition, the depth means that a new open channel would need to be wide to keep slopes to a sensible angle, resulting in significant loss of existing amenity areas. Although the leat is clearly modified, it is only a small part of the WFD waterbody and therefore not designated as Heavily Modified and not qualifying for WFD funding. All very frustrating. Sorry not to be more encouraging, but right now there doesn't seem to be an obvious way forward.'*

The comparison cut and fill estimated costs from around 2008/2009 were around £230,000.

The Town Clerk clarified that WFD referred to Water Framework Funding.

What it has proved difficult to establish, as the Town Clerk doubted that anyone could provide an estimate, is a timescale for replacement of this section of leat culvert.

However, the Town Clerk did advise that he was aware that there might be a presentation coming to a Town Council Committee in the near future about Berrycoombe Vale and the potential use of this site and whilst he did not have any information at this stage Committee might want to see if that offers a viable solution to this longstanding issue.

Councillor A M Kerridge queried how this information had come to light.

The Town Clerk advised that this was generated following an enquiry and survey work by Cornwall Council who were carrying out cycle improvement works to the stretch of Camel Trail at Hillside Park / Scarlett's Well as part of the Growth Deal.

Members of the Committee considered that the Council had not received an official report from the EA directly and Councillor Kerridge advised that it would seem prudent for the Council to start to make budgetary preparations into the future should repair / maintenance work be needed to this section of culvert.

Councillor A J Coppin considered that given the South West Water indication regarding their responsibility for this section of leat it would seem sensible that this was pursued further for clarification purposes. In particular, Councillor Coppin considered that a large amount of surface water was being diverted into the leat and that this would seem to be the remit of South West Water.

The Committee noted this information.

PP/2016/048

### **Shire House Suite Entrance**

Further to the Minute on page 1 of the 31 March 2016 Properties Minutes, the Town Clerk advised that in liaison with the Chairman of this Committee quotations have been sought to enclose the Suite utilising PVCu doors and windows in colour Vandyke brown as a close match to the Suite.

To ensure that quotations were on a like-for-like basis Officers went back to all three companies to ask that their quotations reflected the preference as indicated by the Chairman of this Committee, as original quotes had been based on each contractor's assessment of the site, with the primary difference between each quote being the style of door. The preferred style of door is to have a double set of doors opening in a French door style with laminated glass and a low threshold for less able access.

Quotations were sought from:

1. CAW (Cornwall) Ltd;
2. Camel Glass;
3. Rodda and Hocking

In terms of quotations the Town Clerk advised that costs had been submitted from the contractors as follows:

1. CAW (Cornwall) Ltd have quoted - £4,277.00 plus VAT;
2. Camel Glass - £5,710.00 plus VAT;
3. Rodda & Hocking – did not provide a revised quotation so their quote is not on a like-for-like basis although they did submit an original quotation

The Town Clerk recommended that Financial Regulation 11.1(b)(ii) (expenditure requiring three quotations) be suspended and that CAW (Cornwall Ltd) be contracted to install these doors and windows for the sum of £4,277 plus VAT.

It is further recommended that a listed building application is prepared and submitted in tandem with this work. Given the presence of a number of other properties in Turf Street with PVCu windows and doors consent from the planning authority should not be withheld, particularly as these

windows and doors will be installed to the 1980s extension and not directly onto the Grade II\* Shire House.

Following discussion, it was **AGREED** to suspend Financial Regulation 11.1(b)(ii) in respect of three quotations.

It was further **AGREED** to **RECOMMEND** that CAW (Cornwall) Ltd be issued with an official order for this work for the total sum of £4,277.00 plus VAT and that a Listed Building Application is prepared and submitted to Cornwall Council.

PP/2016/049

### **Public Toilets Vandalism**

The Town Clerk reported that there continues to be an ongoing issue with vandalism at the public toilets in the town with a concentrated effort at, but not restricted to the Priory Park toilets.

Recent vandalism has been:

- 3 x radar locks vandalised in Priory at a cost of £172 per lock (£516);
- 2 x disabled doors to Priory and associated consumables - £247.08;
- Plus call out fees to secure disabled door at £137.00

Total - £900.08

This does not include the number of toilet roll holders (£40 plus VAT each) that have been vandalised at Fair Park and Priory Park or the number of times toilet paper is dispensed and thrown around Fair Park.

To ameliorate damage to the disabled toilet in Priory, Officers are in the process of ordering a steel security door set at a cost of £339.00 plus VAT. This door can then be reused at Fair Park should a new Priory toilet be commissioned in the future.

The Town Clerk advised that in his opinion the Council would need to consider whether it would wish to explore the option of installing a pay to enter system which seems to be universally accepted across public toilets and which does tend to assist with improving general maintenance and cleaning standards. Income raised by this route could then go towards offsetting these vandalism costs. The Town Clerk acknowledged that this would likely not be universally appreciated but considered that it could assist with offsetting vandalism costs which continue to be an ongoing occurrence.

The Town Clerk sought instruction as to whether it would like Officers to investigate this type of arrangement as there would be initial costs with installing doors and the pay entry units at Fair Park, Higher Bore Street and Priory Park and to report back to Committee with a paper.

Councillor A M Kerridge advised that from the discussions on this issue with some members of the public there had been a general view that they would prefer to see toilet facilities remain open rather than closed and if that meant paying a small fee to use the facilities then that would seem not unreasonable.

Councillor R Solomons queried the likely vandalism to the coin mechanism and the Town Clerk advised that he recognised that there would be initial issues of

that nature but that income raised by this method could go towards offsetting these types of vandalism costs. The Town Clerk considered that vandalism was a continuing problem unlikely to ever be eradicated and that the Council would need to consider an appropriate way to offset this burden.

Councillor A J Coppin queried the necessity for this type of system at Priory Park if the longer-term plan was to provide a new build facility which would include a kiosk providing some level of supervision.

The Town Clerk advised that this project was only at the scoping stage and that the Council would need to work through a range of issues before getting to a position to provide new facilities i.e. the funding package, the planning application process, procurement etc. It was therefore likely a minimum 2 year project.

Councillor J Gammon considered that the toilet with the highest level of vandalism was the Priory toilets and that a rationale for making a charge could be more easily justified. Councillor Gammon considered that the Fair Park toilets should not be charged as the children who play there could not afford the fee.

The Town Clerk advised that a similar argument could be made for the facilities in Priory and that in reality the council would probably need to be consistent with how charges were applied. Further, these issues could be addressed by way of a paper exploring issues but that vandalism was taking place in each of the three toilet facilities but with different and varying issues.

Councillor J M Lyne queried if the disabled toilet in Priory Park would benefit from a more secure lock. The Town Clerk advised that staff had been discussing the need to provide a deadlock to secure this toilet facility in line with the opening times of the toilets but that this would remove a 24/7 facility to less abled users. Should this be necessary there would need to be the appropriate signage in place to advise of the opening times. Members considered that it was unlikely that there would be an issue with operating this in line with the opening times for the other toilet facilities.

The Town Clerk advised that he had recently discussed this type of system with the Town Clerk from Newquay Town Council and his view had been that the income assisted with offsetting costs to provide the facility and that in general terms, cleaning standards were raised which members of the public appreciated.

Following discussion, it was **AGREED** to **RECOMMEND** that a paper exploring a pay to enter system is prepared and brought to a future meeting for consideration.

It was further **AGREED** to **RECOMMEND** that a media release be prepared to outline the vandalism that has been taking place in the town's public toilets and the cost of repairs.

PP/2016/050

### **Cemetery Programme of Works**

A report by the Parks & Open Spaces Manager (POSM) had been circulated with the agenda.

This report and the improvements as set out was welcomed and noted by the Committee.

The POSM advised that the contractor carrying out the refurbishment to the New

Cemetery building had met that day with the specialist from Cornish Lime to investigate and discuss the internal paint issue and whilst an action plan was not yet available he hoped to progress this in the next day or so. This issue had unfortunately delayed completion.

The POSM provided a quick update on works in the Old Cemetery and routine maintenance work in the New Cemetery which should demonstrate an intent to be more pro-active rather than reactive in these sensitive areas. The value of a Sexton was the dedicated time at the site. The POSM also outlined the scope of resurfacing work which was being programmed and that this would need to be discussed with funeral directors so that they were aware of the limitations during contractors being on site. Appropriate signage would also need to be in place to advise and to notify the public of the work and the restrictions.

The POSM also informed that a new ground protection system, as used by Falmouth Town Council had also been purchased to ensure that day-to-day work associated with interments did not unduly cause distress to the public as the ground conditions had at times not been conducive to grave digging equipment. This protection system would therefore mitigate the issues.

The Town Clerk advised that the cemetery opening times would again be enforced with a restriction to vehicular access i.e. open from 8.30 a.m. to 2.30 p.m. Monday to Friday. These opening times aligned with the unisex toilet facility and the hours worked by the Sexton throughout the year. Pedestrian and wheelchair access would be maintained at all times. An appropriate sign would be in place at the vehicular gates. The Council's website would be updated with these revised opening times. Further, a new sign on the New Cemetery building would display the Council's Memorial Regulations. Implementing these opening times would restrict the extracurricular activity that can and does take place in the cemetery and from time to time.

This information was noted by Committee.

PP/2016/051

### **Heritage Day**

The Town Clerk advised that he met recently with Pam Hartill and Paul Ellis to discuss this event and things remain largely the same as per last year. The Town Clerk confirmed that he had prepared an op order and that has been circulated to all concerned.

There are however some key issues.

1. The organisers have asked whether it would be possible for the Heritage Committee to park a caravan in Priory Car Park as the costumes are stored in this vehicle – this would be from Wednesday 29 June to and including the event date (2 July). This would save the Committee from regular trips to and from the caravan's permanent base each and every day. However, this could attract vandalism to that caravan and the perceived issue of travellers.
2. The other point is that there have been some murmurings amongst some of the people associated with Heritage Day in connection with the potential return of the 'hanging of the mayor' and Paul Ellis has kindly

advised of this as a potential future request. Whilst this is likely to be Pam and Paul's final year organising Heritage Day they have asked for a view on this and whether the Council would support the event as it has done to date.

The Town Clerk assumed that given the numerous issues with this type of activity that Bodmin Town Council would not support this from taking place on its land but sought clarification.

3. On a final note, there was a query being raised regarding the ongoing need for the Riding Sunday to continue to be a civic, robed event as this seemed outdated and harked back to a time when the Riding was an integral part of the Heritage Day event. The Town Clerk therefore sought clarification as to whether this event remained as a civic diary event.

Following discussion, it was **AGREED** to **RECOMMEND** the following;

1. That the Heritage Committee be granted permission to park the caravan in an appropriate area of the car park at their own risk as Members could appreciate the logistical issues being faced by the event organisers;
2. Any resurrection of this aspect of the event would need rigorous risk assessment and that there would need to be detailed conversations with the appropriate authorities on the resurrection of this aspect of the event. In particular liaison with the Police given the wide ranging safety implications. This advice did not give the Town Council's tacit support but merely outlined that this was less than straightforward;
3. Sunday 3 July should remain a civic event, with full robes and regalia as it was important for the Mayoral Chain to be on display as many times as possible at these sorts of civic event. It was considered that this was an important part of the town's heritage. It was further **AGREED** that as there was a new incumbent coming into the Church in July it would seem prudent to assess once they have been in post as they may have a view about the longer-term aspect of this element of the Heritage event which might prove useful.

PP/2016/052

### **St. Petroc's Churchyard**

The Town Clerk reported that the Parks & Open Spaces Manager and he met with Mr Bryan Hammond on 25 May to discuss general churchyard maintenance issues. Whilst most of these issues were day-to-day matters there is one which is an item which will require further investigation.

The boundary wall to the west of the Church is in a fairly poor state and Bryan Hammond has advised that in accordance with the churchyard being a closed churchyard, maintenance responsibility rests with Bodmin Town Council. The Town Clerk advised that the Town Council assumed maintenance responsibility for the closed churchyard at St. Petroc's following the serving of a notice by the PCC under section 215 of the Local Government Act (LGA) 1972 – Full Council item C/2004/136 refers.

Section 215 of the LGA 1972 act refers to maintenance of the churchyard 'by

keeping it in decent order' and includes 'its walls and fences in good repair.' There is of course no legal definition to define 'decent order.'

The extent of the Council's responsibility does not include the ordinary maintenance of monuments and tombstones, which remains that of the owners, who are usually the heirs of the persons commemorated; and does not include responsibility for any church, chapel, or other building such as a shed or bier house, in or adjacent a closed churchyard.

The boundary wall appears to be a joint boundary wall with the neighbouring residential property and the Town Clerk assumed Committee would instruct him to obtain a fee quote from a suitably qualified Surveyor to assess the wall and to advise on the detail and extent of any repair. This should also determine whether the neighbour should also contribute to that maintenance as it was not uncommon for a line to be drawn down the centre of the wall subject to detail in any deeds. The Town Clerk advised that he could then report back to Committee with further information. From an initial quick observation the wall appears to have been subject to limited or no maintenance plan compounded by tree root and general weather damage. The neighbour has contacted the church given issues from their side of the property so there is clearly a view needed.

There would also be a need to ascertain any conservation area / planning issues or Faculty Church approval as the Church is Grade I listed.

In the future, the Town Clerk recommended that the Chairman of this Committee attend these round table meetings.

Following discussion, it was **AGREED** to **RECOMMEND** that the Town Clerk obtains fee quotations from suitably qualified surveyors to carry out an assessment of this churchyard wall with any scope of works identified and to include indicative budget costs for remedial work.

PP/2016/053

### **BTC Summer 2016 Bedding Plant Proposal**

A copy of the Summer planting scheme for the town's flowerbeds had been circulated with the agenda.

The Committee was very pleased with this report and considered that the planting schemes as set out were excellent.

The Parks & Open Spaces Manager advised that the Horticulturalist had planted two beds in Priory Park in line with the designs as set out in the report.

This report was noted by Committee with thanks.

PP/2016/054

**Risk Management Update** a report from the Accounts Technician (CA) was circulated with the Agenda and was noted.

The Town Clerk advised that the key item of work now taking priority was the work associated with the Public rooms and that a more detailed update would take place under item 23 on the agenda.

Due to the confidential nature of the next business, it was **RESOLVED** to go into Committee. Please see separate page

