

MINUTES of the Meeting of the **Annual Town Meeting** held on Thursday 9 March 2017 at 6.00 p.m. in the Shire House Suite, Shire House, Bodmin

PRESENT: The Deputy Mayor, Councillor S H Kinsman, presiding; together with Councillors P T Cooper, J Gammon, J R Gibbs, A M Kerridge, G G C Minors, P L G Skea and K W Stubbs.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr D Kinnair (Executive Support Officer), Mrs A Banks (Responsible Finance Officer) and Miss L Hancock (Executive Assistant).

CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND APOLOGIES:

The Chairman had no announcements and apologies were received from Councillors A J Coppin, L L Frost, J H Hartill, P Hodges, L G J Kennedy, R Solomons and C J M Wilkes.

ATM/2017/001 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 28 April 2016.**

There were no matters arising and these minutes had been before Council and were acknowledged as a true record.

ATM/2017/002 **Questions from Members of the Public**

The ESO advised that a number of questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting by Members of the public and responses would be given to these questions initially before any further questions would be dealt with.

The ESO further advised that some of the questions submitted were not under the remit of Bodmin Town Council and as such these would be forwarded to Cornwall Council for their response. The questions to be referred were as follows:

- 1) ***Will there be lights to help children cross at Priory Park entrance on St Nicholas Street?***
- 2) ***Will pollution levels continue to be monitored after the road scheme has finished?***
- 3) ***Why couldn't road works have been scheduled rather than all done at once?***
- 4) ***Are roads with pot holes from extra traffic going to be fixed?***

Further questions within the remit of Bodmin Town Council were responded to as follows:

- 5) ***Will parking charges be reintroduced in Priory Car Park?***

The RFO advised that the Council will be reintroducing car parking charges following the completion of the Bodmin Growth Deal works as the car park represents one of the main sources of the Council's income and that if this was not reinstated then the precept would need to rise significantly to cover this shortfall. She further advised that Cornwall Council is reimbursing Bodmin Town Council for any loss in revenue due to the three hours free parking whilst the works are ongoing.

6) *Is the Council going to do anything to encourage new businesses to the town?*

The ESO advised that the Council has and does support a number of events and ventures that hopefully do encourage new business to the town. However, this is not really the remit of Bodmin Town Council as the Council is here to support the residents of Bodmin, by providing play areas, green spaces, public toilets, cemetery and events such as the Christmas Lights, Remembrance Day and St Piran's Celebrations rather than business development.

7) *When is CCTV going to be fitted and working and is it 24/7 monitoring as news say 44 hours per week?*

The RFO advised that the new CCTV system is currently being installed with a completion date of 31 March 2017. The system has 12 cameras located throughout the town covering the majority of Council's assets and parks and from the roads from Turf Street to St Lawrence's Church. The RFO added that although the monitoring contract is for 44 hours per week, the recording will be for 24/7.

8) *Why is our precept going up and what is it paying for?*

The RFO reported that the precept for 2017/18 has increased by 8.51% on a Band D property, which equates to 44p per week.

She explained that this increase is due to a number of reasons, which are briefly outlined below:

- Reduction in Council Tax Support grant of 16.65% (£18,500);
- Reinstating the Shire Hall Public Works Loan Board Repayment scheme;
- Following the installation of a new CCTV system, there are monitoring and maintenance costs of £22,794.84 per annum. This is committed for 7 year period;
- Financial support for the future of the Museum;
- Further match funding for a BMX/Skate park facility (£20,000 in 17/18);
- Complete urgent Tree works following a tree report, and to replant areas where trees have been cut down (£10,000);
- Additional Funds for Play Area improvements within the town (Extra £22,000 on 2016/17);
- Project work to improve, drain, clean and repair Priory pond (approximately £10,000);
- Extension on the Parks Department depot to ensure replacement equipment and machinery is protected and kept properly;
- Refurbishment of Priory Car Park Toilets (approximately £25,000);
- Match Funding to help support the replacement of the Coldharbour pavilion for the Bodmin Youth Football Team;
- Review of staffing requirements/allocation from 2016/17;

- Not fill/employ two posts agreed in 2016/17 (Properties Officer and Events Officer);
- To employ an Executive Support Officer to support the Town Clerk and projects related items that the Council wishes to fulfil into the future. This is following the retirement of the previous Town Clerk. No deputy role has been recruited;
- Maternity Cover;
- Further investment following the recommendation of the Parks and Open Spaces Review, one Full-time Gardener and an Apprentice; and
- Rationalisation of a contract to bring in-house the litter picking for the parks and open spaces, to include weekends not currently covered. This will improve the service provided at weekends.

9) Are the Public Rooms still being sold to Merlin?

The ESO advised that the Council is still proceeding with the sale of the Public Rooms to Merlin Cinemas and Solicitors have been instructed from both sides.

10) How much is the Council paying to defend its position against the Bodmin Public Rooms Trust (BPRT)?

The RFO reported that the Council had issued an order on 13 February 2017 for £6,500 plus VAT for the solicitor's fees in relation to this Judicial Review. She further added that the Council has also paid £750 plus VAT for the QC fees in relation to this, bringing a total to £7,250.00 to date and that potentially if the Judicial Review goes ahead, the cost to the ratepayer could be in the region of £20,000.

11) Why didn't BTC sell to Bodmin Public Rooms Trust (BPRT) for a pound?

The RFO responded stating that the BPRT had been given two options to purchase the Public Rooms; one being to purchase the building for £1.00 plus VAT with overages in place to protect the public purse. She added that these offers were rejected by the BPRT.

12) Can BTC be forced not to sell to Merlin?

The ESO responded, stating that if the Judicial Review went ahead and was found in favour of the BPRT then potentially the court could say that the decision to sell to Merlin was ultra vires. However, the Council is unable to comment on this any further at this time due to the pending potential Judicial Review.

13) What steps are being taken to reduce Anti-Social Behaviour in the town?

The RFO advised that Bodmin Town Council works very closely with the Police, and as previously mentioned are in the process of installing a new CCTV system and this will hopefully help with alleviating issues. In the short term the Council have reported all incidents to the police, who have responded by increasing patrols of certain areas. In addition, BTC have instructed Kestrel Guards to perform additional patrols of our sites in the evenings at weekends.

Questions received via email from local resident;

14) In your Best Value Performance Plan published for this meeting you state that the Bodmin Public Rooms "Supports and sustains growth by providing leisure and business meeting facilities and contributes towards a socially inclusive and caring community by providing facilities for community groups to meet. "

The ESO advised that The Best Value Performance Plan was last used in our Annual Report in 2011/2012 and that the Council continues to follow the same tack as it has always taken regarding the sale of the Public Rooms which are outlined on Page 26 of our Annual Report 2016/2017.

The ESO also commented that one of the first tasks of the new Council that will be elected in May will to be look at the Council's Mission Statement and Objectives to ensure that it is fit for the new Council's purpose and vision.

15) Can you please explain to the public present why you have seen fit to sell this community asset notwithstanding the fact that it was poorly managed and even if losing money it was not even 20% of the loss of other buildings which provide far fewer community facilities?

The RFO responded stating that she presumed the local resident was referring to the Shire Hall which comprises the Council's award winning information centre, which promotes Bodmin and the surrounding area as a holiday destination to potential visitors and a user friendly and informed service to members of the local community along with providing gallery space for local artists to exhibit their work. The Information Centre is also the Council's reception.

The RFO explained that the Shire Hall has a deficit of around £46,300 per annum of which £19,000 is paying the loan for this building. The services that are provided from the Shire Hall are as follows:

- Council Reception
- Bodmin Information Centre, this is for visitors and locals and includes services such as Eden tickets, National Express tickets, Accommodation Providers booking service
- Courtroom Experience; and
- Exhibitions and events such as the Christmas Fair

The RFO advised that the Shire House Complex has a deficit of around £45,878 per annum. The services that are provided from the Shire House Complex are as follows:

- Room hire for local community groups such as Age Concern, Blood Donors and Bodmin Fine Arts Society; and
- The Council Offices

The RFO added that all of the Council's properties and services will be reviewed following the elections in line with the new Council's aims and objectives.

Questions received via email from local resident:

16) *Following all the secrecy around selling off the Public Rooms and possible sale of Hillside Park to Bodmin Jail and the related outcry, does the Council intend to be more open in the future in its dealings with the Public about controversial matters that affect the people of Bodmin especially in public meetings, where all controversial matters seem to be dealt with in secret session.*

The ESO responded by stating that the Council always aims to be as open and transparent as it can. However, there will always be items which must be dealt with under the confidential section. These relate to the following areas;

- Staffing;
- Contracts to include financial discussions; and
- Third Party negotiation and involvement

17) *Could the Council please inform the meeting what their policy regarding the sale/leasing of the Public land bordering the Jail is, now that the Jail has put in planning permission for this site?*

The RFO reported that, to date, the Council has not received any proposal from Bodmin Jail with regards to the sale or lease of the land at Hillside. The planning application was submitted to Cornwall Council and Bodmin Town Council have made a representation which included that it reserves the right to comment further on the parking element of the application when any proposal has been received.

Since then Councillors have been invited to a site visit to discuss some of their concerns, however this was purely in relation to the redevelopment/refurbishment of the jail buildings and Hillside Park was not discussed.

18) *Could the Council explain to the meeting whether it is Council policy to sell off public assets without first agreeing related financial matters, e.g. selling off the Public Rooms without first agreeing a rent for the museum with Merlin?*

The ESO advised that the Council received the information from Merlin at the point that it agreed the sale of the Public Rooms. This was part of the proposal

document. However, there was a requirement to seek VAT and legal advice before agreeing the final Head of terms in light of the terms of the leaseback to the Museum.

Merlin's offer for the retention of the Museum, which the Council has accepted and which the Museum volunteers are very pleased with, are as follows;

- 25 year lease term;
- to include a larger area for expansion of the Museum;
- three years rent free (due to the disruption from the building works);
- rent reviews (5 years);
- rental of £4,500 per annum (after the free rent period has lapsed)

The following questions from members of the electorate were received via Councillor Jacquie Gammon:

19) What are the plans for the toilets beside the Public Rooms?

The RFO advised that the Council has instructed solicitors with regard to the sale of these toilets and there are currently contract negotiations progressing with the successful bidder's legal representatives.

20) Do BTC plan to provide recreational facilities for young people in the town?

The ESO confirmed that the Council is currently exploring options for recreational facilities and is always looking to improve play facilities throughout the town.

The ESO added that feasibility study would need to be undertaken in conjunction with a skate park company to provide options as to an area where a new skate park can be situated, the size of that skate park and what materials, equipment could be included. It was envisaged that a skate company would run a series of workshops with young people to lead to a design to then explore grants to match fund monies that the Council has set aside in reserves to build a new skate park complex.

The Chair then opened the floor to additional questions which had not been received in advance of the meeting.

A member of the public enquired whether the Section 106 monies obtained from St Piran's Homes during the construction of the Dymond Court development could be allocated to the Hillside Park green space.

The ESO responded and advised that Section 106 monies were paid directly to Cornwall Council, not to BTC and therefore it would be Cornwall Council's responsibility to decide where the monies are allocated. He also added that the system would soon be changed to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

A local resident requested detail regarding the proportion of the BTC Budget spent on salaries.

The RFO advised that she did not have this information to hand but would be pleased to respond to the local resident following the meeting.

A member of the public enquired whether fish should be added to Priory Pond given it is a tributary of the River Camel.

The ESO provided the following response which had been prepared by Richard Davies, Parks & Open Spaces Manager:

Priory Pond requires some considerable works as there are currently no fish, plants and an ecosystem I need of a helping hand. The introduction of water plants over time would provide more oxygen to the water and help to encourage invertebrates. A range of options for works to improve the pond would be explored with liaison with the Environment Agency regarding any proposed works.

A local resident also queried whether BTC has a policy allowing Non-Native Tree Species to be planted in its parks and open spaces.

The Parks and Open Spaces Manager (POSM) had prepared a report which set out the proposed tree works for 2017. He commented that Bodmin has some excellent examples of mature and veteran trees scattered across BTC sites.

He advised that with older trees come problems including rot, storm damage and poor maintenance which has resulted with BTC being in a position whereby major care and maintenance work is now required to keep these trees healthy and ultimately safe given publicly accessible land. As a large proportion of these trees are located in some of the busiest parks and close to busy access roads, this work is now essential.

The POSM reported that the Parks Team are passionate about the trees they manage and would endeavour to ensure that they get the care they require. Correct management can lead to a reduction in long term costs and the team have begun to plant seeds from more mature trees so replacement can be sourced from local stock at minimal cost.

Councillor P T Cooper questioned why BTC lacks any three or five year budget plans.

A local resident concurred with this view and commented that whilst on the Council he had tried to implement quinquennial surveys and that the Council tends to deal with things reactively, rather than proactively.

Councillor S H Kinsman responded to these comments and advised that there is a great deal of planned maintenance work programmed and undertaken by BTC.

A member of the public then enquired as to why BTC continue to occupy the Shire House building when only five offices are occupied in the entire

building and why were market rents not being investigated.

The ESO responded and advised that Officers have taken steps to explore a number of options for the future of the Shire House building, although he added that this task would form part of the new Council's Aims and Objectives for the next three years.

The ESO further advised that Council Tax contributions received by BTC would diminish over time and therefore it was extremely important to look at alternative revenue streams into the future.

A member of the public questioned what input the general public have in the budget setting process of BTC.

The ESO responded and advised that the Council is comprised of 16 Members, all of which can be approached by members of the public to consider suggestions for the Council's future spending within Bodmin. He also added that the Elections on 4 May 2017 were imminent and may present an opportunity for change within the Council.

A local resident commented that the Council should be putting a new mechanism in place to consult with the public.

Councillor S H Kinsman responded and considered that there are already existing systems in place whereby members of the public can attend open sessions of Council, arrange individual meetings with their local Councillors or contact the Council Offices directly with any enquiries or concerns.

Mr J Cooper considered that there is a total lack of engagement with the electorate and he has no confidence in the Mayor and Town Clerk. He referred to an unspecified set of minutes which he claimed were incorrect.

A local resident advised that she was aware of a number of letters which had been sent to Councillors from local residents regarding the sale of the Public Rooms, which were not responded to and she considered that this lack of communication did not put the Council in a good light.

Another local resident added that the Bodmin Public Rooms Trust (BPRT) had asked for the meetings regarding the decision to sell the Public Rooms to be held in public, which had not been abided by.

Councillor S H Kinsman advised that where matters relating to contractual issues are concerned, there are some limitations to what the Council can discuss in the open session.

Mr J Cooper enquired how much the Council had spent, to date, on Solicitors fees in relation to the sale of the Public Rooms and what the likely costs of a Judicial Review would be. He also asked how much it would cost to withdraw from the sale at this stage.

The RFO advised that, to date, the total spent on Solicitors fees was £8,450

and it was estimated that if it were to go ahead, the cost of the Judicial Review would be somewhere in the region of £40-50k in costs with a further £10-15k for counsel. The RFO added that she did not know the estimated costs to the Council for withdrawing from the sale, however the Solicitors had advised strongly against this course of action as there may be further claims of compensation from the purchaser.

A local resident outlined the BPRT's position whereby they had offered a nominal £1 plus VAT for the Public Rooms, a draft contract had been shared between the two parties and overages were in place. He then questioned why the original contract was withdrawn.

The RFO responded and advised that there were VAT implications of selling the building which needed to be further explored in conjunction with the Solicitors.

A local resident enquired how the concept of the £1 offer for the Public Rooms had come about.

A representative of the B.P.R.T advised that this had been the advice of Councillor R Solomons, the Chairman of BTC's Finance, Staffing & Performance Management Committee.

Councillor P T Cooper considered that best practice had not been followed in this case.

A local resident commented that in his view, BTC should withdraw from the sale of the Public Rooms to Merlin and get best value for the building from another buyer. He added that it was a moral decision to protect the public from increased costs as a result of the Judicial Review.

Councillor S H Kinsman responded and considered that by selling the building to Merlin, the Council would be obtaining best value. She added that the undue expense was due to the legal challenge from the Public Rooms Trust.

Councillor Kinsman considered that the rest of the communities' views should also be respected i.e. not only those of a minority group.

Councillor G G C Minors commented that in his view, it would be morally appropriate for the B.P.R.T to withdraw from the Judicial Review.

A local resident responded to this comment and reiterated that BTC has a moral obligation to protect the public purse and he did not wish to see costs increased to pay for a 'legal circus'.

A member of the public enquired whether any legal proceedings could take place given that Merlin's offer was still subject to contract.

The ESO advised that a Council decision can be overturned after a period of at least six months or in the case of nine or more Councillors supporting a motion to reverse the original decision.

A local resident enquired whether BTC Officers would be permitted to continue with legal instructions during the purdah period.

The ESO confirmed that BTC Officers could continue with this work during the purdah period.

The member of the public considered that the whole process was an 'absolute fiasco' and added that a diligent Council would not have been in this situation and requested that BTC 'put the brake on the legal situation'.

The ESO advised that he could not offer any assurances that the issue would be revisited as these decisions had been made prior to purdah.

The member of the public asked for clarification that if by 20 March, nine or more Councillors came forward and supported a motion to oppose the sale, it could be discussed at the Full Council Meeting on that date.

The ESO confirmed that this was correct.

A member of the public asked what makes people think this is what people want? She then referred to a petition which had been submitted to BTC which local residents had signed in support of the BPRT's plans for the Public Rooms.

A local resident considered that the petition was not a fair poll and the cinema would have been a more popular choice if those plans were made public at the same time.

Councillor P Cooper enquired why a full review of all the Council's properties had not taken place prior to the decision being made to sell the Public Rooms and he commented that BTC are not making assets work.

Councillor J Gammon responded and advised as a Councillor she had found fulfilling her duties to be a steep learning curve, despite being used to working within governance she still felt it had taken at least 18 months to get used to the processes and systems adopted by the Council.

Councillor Gammon considered that the current Council was handicapped by some of the decisions made by the previous Council. She agreed that the property portfolio of BTC required careful consideration but staff implications, overheads and security were also key points to examine to ensure that each building was viable.

A local resident referred Members to the Precept forms which reported a £14k loss every year on the Public Rooms versus a £79.5k loss on both the Shire House and Shire Hall. He enquired whether the Public Rooms was actively marketed for hire.

A member of the public commented that none of BTC's properties are marketed

properly as there are not the staff available to do this. He added that there is some information regarding room hire facilities on the website but in his opinion you would only look there if you knew it was there and the likelihood was that new users would not be attracted to make any bookings.

A local resident considered that public engagement is a two way street and particularly in the run up to the elections, you would expect the Council to engage with the public.

A member of the public commented that residents can either accept the decisions made or lobby their Councillor if they are dissatisfied. He added that putting yourself up for election is very different to voting.

A local resident suggested that the next Council must look closely at how it engages with public and offer surgeries with Councillors.

Councillor S H Kinsman commented that she was supportive of this suggestion and added that the Council wants to see Bodmin grow as a community.

The ESO advised that although the Council could offer surgeries for the public, there are over 50 Council meetings each year and every one had a public representation session at the outset.

A member of the public commented that usually there is very little or no dialogue during the public representation and the format of this meeting was much better in generating discussion.

Councillor S H Kinsman surmised that during the last year, much more interest has been generated due to the Council's involvement in some fairly contentious issues. She acknowledged that this resulted in Councillors and Officers thinking more about improving engagement with the public and has provided a platform to look at things differently.

A member of the public considered that the format of the Annual Town Meeting had been a much better system for members of the public to address the Council directly. She commented that during other Public Representation sessions she had attended, there had been no response at all given by the Council which had been very disappointing and she felt it may deter people from attending future meetings.

Councillor P Cooper suggested that there needs to be an appreciation that some people have a lack of courage when it comes to public speaking and he expressed his disappointment in how some members of the public had been treated at previous meetings, in some cases a dismissive attitude had been apparent from the Chair.

With regard to Hillside Park, a local resident enquired whether Councillor Wilkes had declared his interest relating to Bodmin Jail on his declaration form.

A member of the public commented that BTC could enter into a legal

agreement to protect all its green spaces into the future via the Fields in Trust Scheme.

The ESO advised that due to the anticipated timescales, it would be unlikely that the current Council would be making decisions on this area of land. No formal approach to the Council had been made from the Jail to date.

A member of the public responded and commented that the Council does not have to enter into any agreement in relation to the land at Hillside Park as it is a town asset. He added that the funding secured from St Piran's Homes should be pursued by BTC and used to revamp the area local to the development.

A local resident then referred to Strategic Type 1 Open Space as identified by Cornwall Council. The highlighted that the maps were approximately ten years old, however emphasised that access to play areas is an extremely important issue and some of the other areas are of a far inferior quality to Hillside Park.

Another local resident reported that work was being undertaken to secure a Junior Parkrun in Hillside Park which would be taking place every Sunday morning from 9.00 a.m. over a 2 kilometre distance. He considered that this would demonstrate to the Council that children do use this area regularly and therefore it should be protected.

The same local resident added that the public consultation period for the planning application for the development at Bodmin Jail would be closing on 2 April 2017 and he hoped that local people would lobby their local Members on this issue as it would be considered at the Cornwall Council East Area Planning Sub-Committee.

Referring back to the sale of the Public Rooms, with specific reference to the Bodmin Town Museum, Councillor P Cooper enquired about the removal of the flying freehold which was previously advertised when the building was first put up for sale. He commented that if BTC wished to protect the Museum, he did not understand why the flying freehold was removed.

The RFO advised that the tenders received had specified terms whereby they wished to acquire the whole building. In relation to the timescales, the RFO reported that BTC had been unable to progress the sale of the Public Rooms due to a complex party wall issue which had taken approximately three years to resolve.

A member of the public referred to an interview the Mayor, Councillor L G J Kennedy had participated in on Radio Cornwall, during which he suggested that BTC would provide £200k in match funding for a new community building within Bodmin. She enquired whether the Council had discussed and agreed this previously.

The ESO confirmed that, to date, this proposal had not been discussed nor agreed by the Council and that this comment had been the Mayor's personal view.

A local resident expressed his frustrations that BTC had recently refused to discuss any matters with the B.P.R.T. due to the pending Judicial Review.

Another member of the public referred to previous public representations he had attended where the Councillors had remained silent and unresponsive to comments and issues raised by members of the public. He enquired whether it is standard practice for only the Mayor to respond on behalf of the Council.

The ESO advised that in the formal committee setting, Councillors are free to speak in session however formality dictates that they 'go through' the Chairman.

A local resident clarified that any Councillor can make a motion to extend the Public Representation Session to allow additional time for members of the public to express their views and in his opinion, formalities are not helping to facilitate this.

The ESO concurred with the points made but considered that it is necessary to limit the Public Representation Session to a reasonable amount of time; otherwise the remainder of the business of the meeting would not be dealt with before the close of the meeting.

Councillor J Gammon referred to the Code of Conduct which is adhered to by all serving Councillors and considered that all Members must ensure they are not pre-determined, i.e. entering into discussions with a closed mind.

A local resident commented that the Code of Conduct has no enforceable powers and is the equivalent of a 'slap on the wrist'. He enquired whether BTC publishes the outcomes of complaints made and considered it would be helpful to have this information prior to the election.

The ESO advised that since the abolition of the Standards Board, BTC abdicate the responsibility for standards to Cornwall Council, who receive the complaint and subsequently they decide whether or not a breach has occurred and propose sanctions in respect of any breaches of the Code. He added that BTC has no powers to suspend or remove a Councillor from office.

A local resident enquired whether there is a reason that the Council do not publish non-approved minutes in advance.

The ESO responded and advised that BTC could issue draft minutes. However due to the committee cycle and volume of other work it is not always possible to be in a position to achieve this aim.

Another local resident commented that minutes produced by BTC should only include decisions and considered that the Council goes over and above the requirements for minutes which delay the publication.

The ESO advised that a decision had been made to include a greater level of detail, including general discussion to help explain the rationale behind decisions at a later date. If Minutes only included the decision, the public and

auditors would not be able to appreciate the rationale behind the decision making process and would likely lead to more questions being raised.

A local resident referred to Chapter 11 (Bodmin Strategic Plan) of the Cornwall Council Planning Document and commented that he had examined the paperwork in some detail and noted that it referred to 3,200 new homes and 500 (extant) to balance employment land. He referred specifically to a planning application for land opposite Tulip, on the Newtons Margate Industrial Estate which had been granted for eighty new houses.

Councillor J R Gibbs commented the area in question was allocated as an Industrial area and that Cornwall Council get their own way and the town is 'ridden roughshot over' and BTC should be holding them to account and complaining to Parliament.

The ESO responded and advised that BTC had submitted some strong representations with reference to this matter as the area in question was allocated as industrial under the Site Allocations Plan for Bodmin. He added that BTC is only a consultee in the planning system and can only make representations on matters. If the matter went to appeal then it would be a Planning Inspectorate/Secretary of State matter.

A local resident also addressed the meeting with regard to the new Callywith College and his concerns over road safety in the area. He considered that there were inadequate footpaths and safety measures in the locality for the safe passage of pedestrians in this area. Cornwall Councillors Rogerson and Batters had been approached regarding this matter but he felt it was not carefully considered as the footpaths in Castle Street are not adequate nor fit for purpose.

Councillor J Gammon commented that she had spoken to a number of local residents with reference to this matter in recent weeks and confirmed that Cornwall Councillor Steve Rogerson had arranged a meeting with representatives from Highways the following week to consider and discuss the issues raised.

Another local resident also expressed concerns about the number of potholes in Barn Lane, Rhind Street, Castle Street and Pound Lane. He advised that he had called into the Pop-up Shop in town two weeks ago to report these problem areas, but to date, no remedial works had been undertaken and he was concerned that anyone visiting the town would not be anticipating this problem and may inflict damage to their vehicle.

The ESO confirmed that he would feed this information back at the next Project Group Meeting led by Cornwall Council.

Another local resident added that it may also be helpful to log the affected areas using fixmystreet.com

A member of the public enquired whether there is any monitoring of the one way system taking place.

The ESO advised that BTC had received a number of positive comments concerning some of the newly implemented one way systems in the town and it was anticipated by Cornwall Council Officers that some of these systems may remain in place following the completion of the Bodmin Growth Deal Works.

A local resident enquired whether there was any suggestion for BTC to dispose of the Dennison Road toilets.

The RFO advised that BTC had no plans currently to dispose of the Dennison Road toilets.

A member of the public requested a comparison of expenditure at Hillside Park and Priory Park.

The RFO advised that she did not have this information to hand but confirmed that she would respond in due course.

A local resident commented that the meeting had been extremely useful and requested that BTC hold more meetings in this format into the future.

Another local resident advised that six members of the public can call a parish meeting at any time and then enquired why street cleaning in the town was not being carried out.

Councillor S H Kinsman advised that BTC would raise this issue with Cornwall Council.

ATM/2017/003

Any other Urgent / Relevant Items which the Chairman Considers Appropriate

There being no other items, the meeting closed at 8.41 p.m.