

# Porthcurno Residents' Association

[www.pkrassoc.org.uk](http://www.pkrassoc.org.uk)

## Minutes of the meeting on February 9<sup>th</sup> 2017

### 1. Welcome and introductions

The Vice-Chair (Louise Court) welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced committee members, including Linda Rudge (LR, new Secretary) and John Wheeler (JW, co-opted member representing the Coastal Community Team (Porthcurno)).

### 2. Apologies

12 apologies for absence were received, including those from the Chair (Peter Ryder) and Miranda Penhaligon (membership secretary)

### 2. Matters Arising

The Vice-Chair (LC) indicated that most matters arising from the last meeting were to be covered in the main agenda item, and suggested that any other points would be deferred until the next meeting unless anyone felt otherwise. This was agreed.

### 4. Agreement of minutes of last meeting

The notes of the last meeting were proposed and seconded by members as an accurate record.

### 5. Main item - Coastal Community Team (CCT) - update and discussion of action plan (previously circulated)

The Vice-Chair reminded members that papers sent out in advance recapped progress on the CCT (of which the Residents' Association is an active partner) – detail of the allocation of funds is in the second paper. This was sent by e-mail as an update by JW. She noted that the second consultant's report (relating to Passport to Porthcurno project) is still outstanding.

The CCT had requested 'cohesive comments' from the Residents' Association as a partner organisation (one sixth of the team). JW would like to put forward strong resolutions to the CCT steering group next week. The CCT would report outcomes to residents.

The meeting then considered each of the six sections in the action plan.

### **Section A**

As part of this, reference was made to the questionnaire distributed this week to parish residents by the St Levan Parish Council (PC). The new Neighbourhood Plan (if adopted) will give the PC 'more of a say' in relation to the identified themes. The Parish Plan of 2006 had become 'defunct' as the NDP would cover the whole of St Levan, whilst the CCT

action plan and funding covers Porthcurno only. Residents were advised by the committee members to respond to the Neighbourhood Development questionnaire.

**Action** - clarification needed from the PC about the relationship between these initiatives

*Living Churchyards* – agreed this is an interesting idea but no firm recommendations as we need to discuss with the Parochial Church Council or Church Wardens.

**Action** – PKRA to consider whether PCC to be invited to send a representative to RA meetings to get more information on this (LR).

A general consensus was reached that the actions in the section are appropriate.

## **Section B**

### *BI Highways*

A resident presented photos to illustrate that the problem is not just about a ‘pinchpoint’ issue in terms of traffic flow, but with the number of coaches and large camper vans. The main report from the CCT has photos of this kind included, but the residents and some others felt that the detailed list of works, like painting a white line down the middle of the road, were insufficient and would not solve the main problem.

JW and others said that these items on the action plan are proposed as a short term solution or to relieve the situation, and do not detract from the overall aim. A question arose from the residents about the purpose/status of this action plan. JW (CCT rep) said it is a ‘wish list’ as funding is not available for everything. The outcome of the Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) will govern what can be done anyway. JW said that James Hardy (CCT and Cornwall Council) had had a meeting with Head of CC Highways (Mike Peters) and went through all the documentation including the PKRA survey of two years ago, which was positive. Outcome – it was left with Highways department and technical team to say which work could be carried out by the Council. The CCT has agreed to pay for the submission of the TRO to cover whole of St Levan.

**Action** - CCT to find out progress on this matter (JW).

A discussion on the white lines item and signage led to an agreement amongst residents that ‘medium term’ priority is the wrong terminology. Priorities were written from a timescale point of view rather than urgency, but the two are often interchangeable in the plan and it was impressed on the CCT representative that point BI.5 should be made ‘urgent’. There were comments from residents about the general confusion in existing signposts, especially near the car park but also in the different levels of investment by the CC (Cornwall Council) in other hamlets in St Levan.

There was agreement amongst members that both the investigations about the link road and ‘park and ride’ be brought high up the priority list but there was no agreement that

either of these solutions was the best way forward. There was particular concern about the idea of a link (one way?) road and the implications this might have in the long term for Porthcurno.

B2 Car parks – CCT has asked the National Trust to look into the lease to Cornwall Council and whether it is ‘repairing lease’ etc. It was agreed ‘In and out’ signs needed on car park. This should be marked as ‘urgent’ and added to the TRO list in B1 and B1.1g strengthened and clarified.

Residents also recommended that some further ‘joined up thinking’ over car park charges would be helpful between PK Trust and Cornwall Council.

**Action** - Freedom of information request from CCT about the lease and the car park toilets (JW)

**Action** - It would be helpful if statutory bodies told PKRA/CCT when consultations on traffic orders were taking place. The CCT is going to apply and then PKRA (and any resident) can comment. We need to be told when it starts. (LR/JW)

B2.4 Shuttle bus service – residents broadly agreed that as a short term solution this is satisfactory, but that there is more urgency in these actions than is indicated in the plan. There were some differences of opinion about the tensions between coach parking spaces and wider concerns about traffic in The Valley.

B3.1 As a short term solution that might be superseded by other improvements; residents think this is a helpful idea and should be a priority. There was some discussion about which footpath option was preferred, some residents preferred the original route that had already been mapped out, others felt that the option to take a route above the café was better and should be more fully explored before a decision made. It was felt though that some people would still walk up Maunsell’s Hill and so the option of a marked pedestrian path on the road should still be considered as well and as a priority.

**Action** - proceed with TRO and explore the footpath options and pedestrian path marking on the hill.

B.3.2 was in the old Parish Plan – but no funding even though landowners agreed to release the land by the stream for this. Keep this in at medium level (CCT/JW) but all agreed that pedestrian access was dangerous. Residents also requested that that the sign “Pedestrians in Road”, that had been agreed by the Council over five years ago, to be placed near the then Post Office but never installed, be added to the TRO list

**Action** Bring 3.3 up to medium level (CCT/JW) and add sign to the list at B1.1

B4 – pending *Passport to Porthcurno* report – this is a marketing exercise, and to be kept at medium level of priority until the recommendations of this report are public.

B5 Toilets – CCT has part funded this for now – residents do not see this a long term commitment to be funded by the CCT. There was also some concern that Cornwall Council might not be acting equitably in its funding of public conveniences across the county. It was thought that The National Trust owns the Porthcurno toilet building, that the CC has the lease, but that the CC has passed on the costs of upkeep to the Parish Council.

**Action** – find out who pays for others in Cornwall e.g. Falmouth ones (CCT), and how the legal responsibility of upkeep has been passed by a leaseholder to another public body. The point in the plan associated with the upkeep of the toilets has to be a high priority point, not a medium one. (CCT/JW)

(**Section C** of the plan was not discussed in detail)

Overall, residents asked that the plan be clearer in its labelling of priorities and timelines, and suggested two columns rather than the current one, which was confusing.

**6. Next meeting date** of the PKRA – **Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> April** (not as recorded on the agenda) – venue to be confirmed (LR).

Thanks were offered by members to the executive committee, and also by members and the Chair to the Minack Theatre trustee who attended as a resident. Residents were thanked for attending, for engaging so fully, and for providing material to support the discussions. All were encouraged to send further responses about other outstanding matters to the Secretary (LR) or to the CCT Chair (JW).