

**ST JUST PENDEEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**  
**NOTE OF TEAM MEETINGS 22 and 26 May 2020**  
**via Zoom**

**22 May 10.30am**

*Present:* Debbie Shephard (Chairing), Kate Beckly, Sue James, Adam Sharpe, Dave Stevens, Dot Stevens, Judith Summers (Secretary), Jill Taylor, Neil Taylor, Sarah Tieken, Tim Wotton  
*Apologies:* Steve Hall, Dave Munday, David Osborne-Broad, Jo Forsyth

**1. Declarations of interest**

Sarah Tieken and Tim Wotton each declared an interest in respect of draft policy AD3 Open Spaces between Settlements.

**2. Concerns expressed by Tim Wotton**

- Following a Facebook post by TW, in which he expressed serious concerns about the Plan, TW was invited to explain these concerns.
- TW's concerns were: (1) that the process of engagement with the community should involve more than a single survey, and that proposals should be tested with them, rather than their being presented with a polished piece of work signed off by the local authority (Cornwall Council); (2) the omission of policies on second homes and the identification of development sites; (3) too great a focus on conservation rather than what the Plan should achieve by way of enabling opportunities for the community.
- Members of the team challenged TW's comments as follows: the process did not involve 'signing off' by Cornwall Council but an informal, technical check, and required approval by the Town Council following which there would be a six week public consultation with a budget for a range of engagement activities; the Household Survey responses did not require a principal residence policy, and the Survey feedback on where sites might be allocated was inconclusive; both of these points had been extensively discussed by the team before a conclusion was reached; it would be wrong to offer the public policies which would be rejected because they failed to pass independent assessment.  
[Dot Stevens left the meeting as she took exception to remarks by TW. TW apologised.]
- JT referred to comments by TW in his letter of 28 April (circulated to the team), which were disrespectful, and in his Facebook post, which she considered undermined trust and the integrity of the group: it was inappropriate for a group member to do this. TW apologised if anyone had taken personal offence. He referred again to his concerns (above) and stated that he considered the decision not to designate sites alongside policy AD3 to be hypocritical. Views were expressed that opinions about the functioning of the group should not be voiced publicly by members.
- The following points were noted:
  - to consider reactivating the community engagement group
  - all members were asked to revisit the Cornwall Council Code of Conduct, which the Steering Group had agreed to adopt, and is on the website
  - an explanation would need to be provided in the Plan of the decision not to adopt a principal residence policy[Dot Stevens returned to the meeting.]

3. The note of the meeting of 14 May was approved.

4. **Review of amendments to the policies document**

- An overarching objective on climate change was agreed and amendments were agreed to the vision strategic objectives. It was agreed that the draft vision, aims and strategic objectives section should be published on the website.
- The team worked through the document and extensive, detailed amendments were made, considering all comments submitted. (This minute notes only major points.)
- Details of the percentage breakdown from the Household Survey to be given throughout. The 'middle' percentage should not be described as 'undecided'. [DSh left the meeting and KB took the role of chairing.]
- Policy AD3 (Open Spaces between Settlements): it was noted that the policy was based on defined settlements, relating to conservation areas, as previously agreed by the group; this and the mapping process would be made clear in the justification and intent sections. In the policy, 'generally' would be inserted before 'supported'. It was noted that landowners would be consulted. The question of encroachment on unoccupied land by extending gardens would be addressed in an amendment (Dave S to supply). [TW left the meeting after consideration of policy LE1].
- Policy LE5 (Panoramas, Vistas and Views): references to named artists and examples of panoramas etc would be deleted.
- Policy BD1 (Building Design): after a review of the evidence from the Household Survey it was agreed that this should be redrafted by JT to state positively what finishes would be supported.
- Policy BD6: suggested alterations were not accepted.

5. Next meeting: Tuesday 26 May, 10.30 am: to continue the review of amendments (Dot St to convene).

**26 May 7.30 pm**

*Present:* Dot Stevens (Chairing), Kate Beckly, Sue James, Adam Sharpe, Dave Stevens, Judith Summers (Secretary), Jill Taylor, Neil Taylor, Sarah Ticken

*Apologies:* Steve Hall, Dave Munday, David Osborne-Broad, Jo Forsyth, Debbie Shephard

1. No interests were declared.

2. **Continuation of review of amendments to the policies document (note of major points)**

- BD9 (Dark Skies): the figure in .1 to be changed to 4000 kelvins; .2 would be shortened to state 'there is provision to reduce light spill'.
- New texts for policies RE1, RE2 RE3 (Renewable energy) were approved. AS was requested to add keys to the maps and alter their opacity.
- Proposed alterations to policy CD1 (Commercial development) and CD3 (Conversion of commercial premises) were rejected.
- CD5 (Employment Opportunities): it was agreed to add references to minimising the need to travel to work (in the justification), and to minimising landscape, visual, heritage and environmental impact (at the end of the policy).

3. **Next steps**

- The revised draft document would be circulated to the team to review. It was agreed that this should not lead to re-opening discussions on points of substance. Once any final amendments were incorporated, paragraphs would be numbered and references re-organised to meet CC requirements. The document would be proofread and sent to Cornwall Council for informal(technical) review and SEA screening.
- The team would then continue work on the main text of the document; a contents list would be circulated and volunteers sought to write remaining sections.
- A renewed Community Engagement team would need to consider an action plan for public consultation, when the likely time scale was clearer. The budget would be circulated so that everyone understood the resources available.
- The next team meeting would discuss the above points, date to be determined.