

MINUTES OF THE PORTHCURNO RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION MEETING

Wednesday 24 January 2018, 7:30pm, Clore Learning Centre, Porthcurno Telegraph Museum

Committee Attendees: Sue Wear, Acting Chair (SW), Louise Court, Secretary (LC), Miranda Penhaligon, Membership Secretary (MP), John Wheeler, PKRA rep for CCT (JW).

External representatives: Helen Hawkins, District Councillor (HH)

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1 SW welcomed everyone, especially those attending for the first time, and introduced the new committee to the meeting.
- 1.2 She reminded the meeting that she had been elected at the AGM as interim Chair until a new Chair was appointed, and that there were still vacancies on the Committee, either for a Vice Chair or other co-opted members. She reported that two people had recently expressed an interest in joining the Committee, which was great, but she would like anyone else who thought they might be interested to come forward as soon as possible, even just to have a chat. She reminded everyone that we were also seeking a new representative from the PKRA to represent our members on the CCT. Again, anyone interested in this, please let SW or JW know.
- 1.3 Attendees then introduced themselves.
- 1.4 SW reported the recent sad news about the death of one of our members, Judy Reed, last December. Also, very sadly, Edith Crow died just before Christmas. She was a resident until last year when she moved to Newquay.

2. Apologies for Absence

LC reported apologies received from 21 members, and from four external representatives. Simon Hocking, National Trust, had however sent a report, which was much appreciated, and it was agreed this would be added to the agenda. It was noted that Tim Cooke, Museum Director, would be leaving very soon, and recruitment for his successor was underway.

3. Minutes of last meeting 12 October 2017 – These were agreed.

4. Matters Arising

- a) There were no matters arising.
- b) **NT report** – LC read out the report (attached). Residents raised some questions around the bridleway, and also the general clearance near the beach, which were answered by others. There were concerns, and sadness, expressed about the creation of the Sensory Garden which it was understood would mean the loss of non-native plants, and include the removal of both the gunnera and montbretia. Attendees felt quite strongly that both these, especially the gunnera, were an integral part of the attraction and beauty of the valley and beach, and the gunnera was seen by children as "quite magical". Another resident asked how the removal and clearance of this area would be done, and whether it would be done so organically.

It was agreed that our views should be made known to the NT. Also, JW offered to feed them back to the CCT.

The “closing” of the beach steps, and the related chaining of the area remains a contentious issue for residents. None present expressed support for the action, which seemed unnecessary, and it was pointed out that the alternative route was more difficult for some people.

5. Coastal Community Team

- 5.1 JW reported that most recent meeting of the CCT had been in November 2017. He had however also met with James Hardy twice since then on a one to one basis, so things have been moving along despite lack of actual CCT meetings since then. He apologised for the delay in circulating the summary report by Seraph Communications on the outcomes of the visitor survey from 2016. He said the actual report was very long, 36 pages, but if anyone wanted it, to just ask him. He recognised that the progress report on the Action Plan had been sent at short notice but hoped people had been able to give it a quick look.
- 5.2 He reported on a key action that has been taken in the last few months, i.e. applying for a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). The hope is that this will be agreed to give permission for existing double yellow lines to be refreshed, plus the extension of these lines north to the T-junction with the B3315. Parking restrictions would also be brought in line, so they are all the same and would run from March-Oct 9am to 9pm.
- 5.3 What can actually be achieved will depend on whether Cornwall Council (CC) are able to fund any of the work (and the CCT are arguing that at least they should cover the cost of repainting existing lines), and to what extent the CCT are able and willing to cover the costs given their current remaining funds.
- 5.4 The refreshing of the existing lines and signs would cost £8,528. The additional costs would be:
- Option 1 – infill the gap outside the old post office and Schoolhouse (including signs, lines and posts) north to the end of the current footway = £697
- Option 2 – as above plus extend the lines, signs and posts all the way from the to the T-junction = £5,571.
- 5.5 The other key area JW said he wanted to mention was the beach toilets. After they took legal advice, CC have now accepted that the toilets are on land owned by them; this knowledge will help things in the future. The CCT met with a representative from CC about the car park and been advised that prices will increase in 2018. A small levy has also been proposed, which could then fund the maintenance of the toilets as well as allowing them to be free of charge to users. CCT are waiting to hear the outcome of this.
- 5.6 One resident asked how much the water rates were for the toilets and whether it would not be possible to use rainwater from a tank on top of the toilets for example, or even from the stream. This idea was supported although it was noted it might be expensive to build and drinking water might still be needed or wanted. **Action: JW to check water rates costs**
- 5.7 JW clarified that the total funding received by the CCT to date was £60k.

Expenses as at November 2017 were:

Landscape and infrastructure report:	£10,600
Grant to Museum for refurbishment of cable hut:	£9,027
Capital works on the toilets:	£890
"Passport to Porthcurno" survey and consultant report:	£2,800
Grant to NT towards new beach steps:	£5,300
Audit fee (paid to Parish Council)	£360

Funds committed but not spent:

Public toilets	£5000 for 2016 + £5000 estimated for 2017
TRO	£4,800 (likely to be increased to £5,500)

- 5.8 Some money was being retained for payment of an outstanding invoice that is in dispute to produce the Economic Plan in 2016 amounting to £2,500.
- 5.9 JW reported that the Museum had asked for a further £973 to complete work on the Cable Hut. Residents questioned whether the work that the earlier grant had been given for had finished, or even started. JW would seek to clarify this. **Action: JW**
- 5.10 This gave a total spend or committed spend of £47,250 leaving a balance at Nov 2017 of £12,750.
- 5.11 Residents expressed disappointment in perceived lack of progress of CCT and outcomes, despite understanding the need for some of the expenditure. SW said she personally felt that to date she has seen no money being spent that had benefitted the community or residents, and this was very disappointing. Others agreed, although it was pointed out that the consultants' surveys and reports, whilst generally not well received by residents, may still prove useful when seeking future funding.
- 5.12 JW asked residents about what they would like the CCT to bid for funding for going forward. Two suggestions were made – a community shop and increasing connectivity (i.e. public Wi-Fi, especially near the beach area and in the valley). LC said the onus is on residents to come up with ideas and let CCT know now so they can fundraise. JW and SW urged residents to get involved and let either of them have their views about these suggestions and any ideas. **Action: PKRA members**
- 5.13 In relation to other items on the Action Plan:
- 5.14 Action Point B1.2 – one resident raised the issue of land ownership relating to the Cyan apartments and said, as an owner of some of the land referred to in this item, no approach had ever been made to them, but they would like to be more involved. JW said he would follow this up. **Action: JW**
- 5.15 Action B1.7 - JW reported that the Minack plan to charge beach users to use the car park. Residents were interested to know how this will be done. **Action: JW will check.** Concerns were raised about the recent agreement by CC to the overflow parking. Some residents felt that the council had ignored the many comments made in the consultation process.
- 5.16 One member wondered what might happen in two years' time if the application was re-submitted and members were still opposed to it. They suggested we should be thinking now about what we could do to ensure we had the necessary evidence to back up any argument

we wanted to make. LC said this was a good point, and one that the Committee had had a similar discussion on recently. They would seek residents' views on ideas for how best to approach this. **Action: Committee**

- 5.17 Action B1.1 e) f) and h) – the comment was made that reduction of speed should be of paramount importance, and disappointment was expressed that this looked like equal priority with creating pseudo crossings/paths. Residents felt that the 20mph speed limit should be pursued, even if we have been told by CC that Porthcurno doesn't don't meet the criteria, or other means of slowing cars down, as a priority. It was asked how much a 20mph speed limit would cost.
- 5.18 HH reported on a recent meeting she had attended about Cornwall Highways, where the feeling was that because this was only a summer problem in Porthcurno, we would not be a priority for Council action or funding, especially given problems in other areas. Residents felt this was a short-sighted view given the Minack was open all year round, and their season was now half the year.
Action: JW to relay this view about 20mph limit on to CCT and report back.
- 5.19 Action 1.5b - LC read out an email from a PKRA member unable to attend the meeting, objecting strongly to this action point, and saying that it needed to be removed as it was highly contentious and inappropriate. They were of the view that removing it would protect the CCT and PKRA whilst still allowing the private parties involved to pursue it, but without any misleading claims of "support". To approve any sort of roadbuilding, even indirectly, would require seriously informing and consulting our members, which the PKRA has not done. They said that the PKRA has been told that in this case roadbuilding would be tied to major property development on-site, which PKRA members needed to understand. The individual said that whilst the PKRA minutes show it has never approved, adopted or accepted a CCT Action Plan, members needed to understand how a report like this is shared with other parties to show "support" and are then told wrongly later that they signed up to something because it was in the action plan. They said that at a previous meeting an attendee had claimed that the CCT Action Plan effectively committed us to a local scheme. LC reported that another member had also written objecting strongly to this item and asking it to be removed. A resident at the meeting said that another member had also written (not yet seen by the Committee) in the same vein.
- 5.20 SW asked for attendees' view and there was some discussion about the item. Attendees understood the concern about how residents' support for the action plan - but not necessarily roadbuilding – could be misinterpreted, and views differed about whether a new road might be the answer, or would be appropriate, for Porthcurno. The general view was, however, that agreeing to this particular action point, (ie. discussions and a looking into the feasibility of such a project) in the plan did not in any way mean that residents supported the building of a new road, or indeed otherwise. It was agreed that the actions listed were ones that could be undertaken by the parties concerned as a private matter even if it was removed from the plan, but SW felt that by having it in the plan, the issue was kept out in the open. For clarity, SW asked for a show of hands, and there was full support in favour of keeping the action in the plan as currently, subject to it being clearly recorded that this implied no support from the residents, or the PKRA, for any road scheme.
- 5.21 HH stressed, as she had mentioned at a previous meeting, the need for residents to get involved in the formulation of the Neighbourhood Plan, as this would be key in any future

developments in Porthcurno. This was noted, and it was agreed the Parish Council be chased again re. Neighbourhood Plan progress. **Action: LC**

Break

6. What Would You Like? – Members' Views

- 6.1 As time was short, LC said this part of the meeting would focus on members' views about what social events they would like to see. A suggested list of events was given to each table and each person had three votes to allocate to three (or just one or two) events, either to those suggested or to ones they would like to suggest themselves. The cards were gathered after 10-15 minutes. LC said she would communicate the result as soon as possible and let those who were not at the meeting have a say too. **Action: LC**

7. Any other Business

8. **Date of next meeting** – to be communicated asap. **Action: LC/Committee**

Meeting closed at 2115hrs.