



Calstock Parish Council, Tamar Valley Centre, Cemetery Road, Drakewalls, PL18 9FE

Acting Clerk: Clare Bullimore

Tel: 01822 748847 email: clerk@calstockparishcouncil.gov.uk

Minutes of **Full Council Meeting** of the **Calstock Parish Council**

held on **Tuesday 14 November 2023, in the Tamar Valley Centre, at 7.00pm.**

Cllr Wakem started the meeting by thanking Councillors for their attendance at the Remembrance Service and he thanked the Acting Clerk for organising it.

Those present were: -

COUNCILLORS-

Cllr Alford, Cllr Brown, Cllr Greenwood, Cllr Kirk, Cllr Ledger, Cllr Letchford, Cllr Newton Chance, Cllr Polglase, Cllr Spurr, Cllr Tinto, Cllr Trapp, Cllr Wakem (Chair), Cllr Warwick, Cllr Wells, Cllr Wilkes.
Miss Clare Bullimore (Acting Clerk – minutes).

207/23 Apologies for absence

Cllr Ashley, Cllr Beech, Cllr Boreham, Cllr Flashman.

208/23 Declarations and dispensations of members' interests in agenda items

None.

209/23 Public participation

Representatives from the Environment Agency, AONB and the Tamar Community Trust were present and spoke during the agenda item referring to the Footbridge at Calstock.

210/23 Approve minutes of last meeting – 10-10-2023

Proposal/Resolution: to approve the minutes of the last meeting. Proposed: Cllr Wells, seconded: Cllr Polglase. Approved by all those present at the last meeting.

211/23 Note the actions/expenditure/recommendations of the following Committee meetings

Proposal/Resolution: The actions/recommendations and expenditure of the following be approved en bloc:

Proposed: Cllr Polglase, seconded: Cllr Newton Chance – unanimous.

- Personnel Committee: 17-10-2023 and 31-10-2023
- Environment and Climate Change Committee: 24-10-2023
- Planning Committee: 24-10-2023
- F&GP: 07-11-2023

212/23 Matters arising

All covered by agenda items.



213/23 New correspondence

The following items were noted:

- Voneus Broadband – the Acting Clerk has disseminated Voneus Broadband’s information to local community.
- Qwiquk local delivery service – a local delivery service had made contact asking if the Council can advertise their service. Whilst they do appear to offer a low carbon emission service and supply some produce from local sources, it was not felt to be suitable for advertising on the website.

214/23 Clerk’s information

Photobook Project – A member of the Environment Committee was successful in getting a grant to run a photobook project for primary school children and people with dementia to raise awareness of the environment and nature – the ECE is supporting this project and has funded some aspects of the work.

Request for Ward Members to review list of addresses – the ECE Committee would like to disseminate information on training and grant opportunities to working farms in the parish – a list of addresses with the work ‘farm’ has been disseminated, the Committee will be grateful if people could return a list of those they know to be working farms.

Volunteer projects underway – some volunteers have been involved in sowing yellow rattle as part of an environmental initiative and Pete Gadd is overseeing a small team of volunteers who are carrying out some remedial work on the Playboat – all work will be overseen and signed off by Pete who has relevant experience and qualifications and the work will have its usual ROSPA inspection for insurance purposes. Paperwork has been drawn up by the Acting Clerk to support volunteer projects across the parish.

215/23 Recommendation that the Calstock Footbridge’s ownership is transferred to the Parish Council and reserves are put aside for its repair and/or decommissioning

Cllr Tinto led a lengthy discussion as to why he now feels reassured that the Parish Council can take ownership of the bridge at Calstock. He explained that there have been many lengthy and tenacious discussions with stakeholders (EA, AONB, CPC and the TCT) and detailed information has now been forthcoming. Cllr Tinto feels that three areas of concern have now been addressed satisfactorily:

- 1) Maintenance – TCT to carry routine maintenance of the bridge (rails, decking) and the upkeep of the bank and be responsible for inspections at regular intervals (2 yearly with a 6 yearly principle inspection); the Parish Council to take on responsibility for the maintenance of the superstructure but it is not envisaged that large scale maintenance will be required as the rapid scouring has now stabilised.
- 2) Erosion – the EA has carried out photographic monitoring of the scour over a 12 month period and this evidences that the scouring has now stabilised. Vegetation also present which will offer some additional stabilisation. A recent survey shows little lateral defection which was first feared.
- 3) Lifespan – recent surveys and correspondence from the piling contractors and bridge designers suggest a long term design life of 50 years (the service life may well be longer than this).

The council can also enter into a 25 year lease on the Town Farm Field which will also bring community value and environmental benefit.

Proposal/resolution: for the parish council to take ownership of the bridge, enter into a 25 year lease to take responsibility for Town Farm Field and put aside £3000 in reserve as a contingency for



any maintenance in the longer term. Proposed: Cllr Tinto, seconded: Cllr Newton Chance – unanimous.

216/23 Recommendation from Finance and General Purposes Committee that the precept is £333,500 for 2023/2024

Cllr Warwick explained that the F&GP Committee had carefully considered requests from committees about expected spend next year and they had reviewed the spend this year. To allow for rising costs and extra responsibilities (cleansing of the four car parks for instance) and to put aside a contingency fund for playground equipment, it was calculated that the precept would need to be £333,500 for 2023/2024. This works out as an increase to Band D properties of £1.56 per month.

Proposal/resolution: to approve that the Precept is increased to £333,500. Proposed: Cllr Warwick, seconded: Cllr Newton Chance – unanimous.

217/23 Grant requests approved by F&GP: Gunnislake Community Matters, Christmas Lights and Chilsworthy Defibrillator

F&GP had recommended approval for two requests for grants: GCM for Christmas Lights and the Chilsworthy Community for £800 towards a new defibrillator. This would leave £700 in the grant fund. Proposal/resolution: that these recommendations be approved. Proposed: Cllr Warwick, seconded: Cllr Newton Chance – unanimous.

218/23 Recommendation from Personnel Committee to advertise the Clerk/RFO role at band 33-36 before the end of the year

Proposal/resolution: to advertise a permanent, full time post of Clerk/RFO in the 33-36 scale, before the end of the year. Proposed: Cllr Trapp, seconded: Cllr Wells – unanimous.

219/23 Recommendation from Personnel Committee to adopt the Local Government Pension Scheme Discretionary Policy

Proposal/resolution: to adopt the Local Government Pension Scheme Discretionary Policy as approved by the Personnel Committee and disseminated. Proposed: Cllr Trapp, seconded: Cllr Newton Chance – unanimous.

220/23 Recommendation from Personnel Committee that staff are DBS Checked

Proposal/resolution: that staff undergo a DBS check. Proposed: Cllr Trapp, seconded: Cllr Wilkes – unanimous.

221/23 Approval from Personnel Committee that the Council service is closed for three working days from 22-12-2023 until 02-01-2023

This item was noted and agreed.

222/23 Parking issues, The Orchard, Gunnislake

Cllr Wakem expressed concerns with the parking in The Orchard and the faded yellow lines and signage. Some of this has been reported to the Highways Department. Cllr Wells offered to have a meeting with Cllr Wakem to see what he can support with through the Amenities Committee. A meeting will be arranged soon.



223/23 Toilets

The toilets will undergo a deep clean in the next few weeks, otherwise no issues to report.

224/23 A390

Cllr Wells reported that a meeting has been requested with Cornwall Council to agree the remaining spend.

A drone system may be introduced to monitor speeding vehicles such as motorcycles and to guard against vandalism.

Cllr Wells has requested regular statistics be published on how many vehicles are caught speeding.

Proposal/resolution: as the price of cameras has dropped, it was agreed that the A390 working group to investigate the installation of a third camera between Asda and the school. Proposed: Cllr Wells, seconded: Cllr Trapp. One objection (Cllr Wakem), all others in favour.

Speedwatch: Cllr Wells reported that two new locations have been approved in the centre of St Ann's because cars are speeding between the two cameras. Two other locations are being assessed (one in Quarry Road and one in Albaston) and Cllr Wells is awaiting news on the Calstock location.

Evidence shows that Speedwatch is definitely working: in recent sessions at various locations no-one was registered travelling at or above the reportable speed, despite averaging between 600-800 vehicles an hour past the monitoring points.

225/23 Fosters Field

The Acting Clerk is waiting for timescales from Cornwall Council and will chase up each month.

226/23 Cornwall Council Report – Cllr Kirk

Cllr Kirk thanked the Acting Clerk for organising the Remembrance Service and reflected that it was good to see councillors in attendance.

Vegetation, Cox Park – thanks to Cllr Wilkes and others for getting some of the vegetation removed from outside Tamar Park.

Cox Park Planning – Cllr Kirk will liaise with Planning Enforcement about a number of properties that are in breach in the Cox Park area.

Community Network – the network has raised concerns about the danger of the Plusha junction on the A30: whilst Cllr Kirk agrees that there is a hazard it would not be beneficial to close that junction for people travelling from the Calstock Parish area.

HGV's – Cllr Kirk asked local ward members to monitor the HGV's that they notice travelling through Gunnislake as she feels there is a marked increase.

Fish Pass, Gunnislake – discussion continue regarding the proposed fish pass and concerns are still evident.

227/23 Reports from other members representing the parish council on the committees or at meetings of other organisations

Cllr Tinto – attended a conference about the Housing Crisis.

228/23 Approve payment list

Proposal/resolution: to approve the payments. Proposed: Cllr Warwick, seconded: Cllr Newton Chance – unanimous.



229/23 Dates of future meetings – all to be held at the Tamar Valley Centre unless otherwise stated

- Planning Committee: 21-11-2023, 1830
- ECE Committee Working Groups: THURSDAY: 30-11-2023, 1900
- Full Council: Tuesday 12 December 2023, 1900

230/23 URGENT INFORMATION

The Acting Clerk has contacted the bank, and a change of mandate is required as it has not been changed since 2014, she was advised to have this minuted in case there are any issues in the future with accessing banking information.

The meeting closed at 2100

Signed: Date:

Supplementary information:

- Calstock Footbridge Report
- Summary of Payments and Receipts



Calstock Parish Council
Tamar Valley Centre, Cemetery Road, Drakewalls, PL18 9FE

clerk@calstockparishcouncil.gov.uk

01822 748847

www.calstockparishcouncil.gov.uk

Calstock Wetlands Partnership: Calstock Bridge Report for Calstock Parish Council meeting on 14 November 2023

1. The working party chaired by Sarah Gibson, manager of the AONB, has met twice. It has addressed the concerns of the Parish Council about maintenance, erosion and the medium and long-term safety and integrity of the bridge. Sufficient progress has been for us to recommend to the Parish Council that we take ownership of the bridge and the footpath.
2. The agreement that Parish Council takes ownership of the bridge, dating back to 2019, was always conditional on the Tamar Community Trust [TCT] being responsible for repair and maintenance. This has been restated on many occasions.
3. However, the Tamar Community Trust clarified at the first meeting of the sub-group on 31 August that they will undertake low level maintenance including painting the bridge, repairing the foot boards, maintaining the decking and rails and cutting the grass but could not take responsibility for the superstructure i.e the main structure including columns and beams. This would be the responsibility of Calstock Parish Council.
4. A bridge of the size that we now have was never envisaged when the original commitments of the TCT and the Parish Council were made. We believe it is entirely reasonable that a community group made up of volunteers with limited funds wants to limit responsibility to what they had always expected. We therefore support the Tamar Community Trust's decision only to be responsible for low level maintenance.
5. This is a significant change to the basis of Council's agreement to take ownership of the bridge. The Parish Council will need to consider whether they still feel bound by the original agreement. Our recommendation is that we should nonetheless take ownership.
6. The riverwalk is the only walk along the riverbank in Calstock Parish and is part of the Tamar Valley Discovery Trail. It is immensely popular. Preserving it has always been a high priority for the community. It is an important community asset which the Parish Council should ensure remains open provided that the Council is able to manage the financial implications and will not be exposed to liabilities in the future that it could not manage.
7. The Environment Agency has always maintained that the bridge is not an asset necessary for the flood defence and that therefore they would not retain ownership. If there is no resolution on ownership they would close the bridge permanently to the great loss to the community. We have not explored whether they are able to close the bridge. However, we believe that we should use our best endeavours to make sure that it is kept open.
8. In assessing whether it would be reasonable for the Parish Council to take ownership of the bridge we have sought and believe we now have clarity on three key issues:-

- The maintenance liabilities in relation to the superstructure.
- The possibility of further erosion (scour) and how that might be dealt with.
- The medium- and long-term viability, safety and integrity of the bridge.

9. **Maintenance of the superstructure**

- 9.1 The bridge is constructed from very durable materials and is designed for minimum maintenance. The timbers are made of greenheart which is an extremely hard timber. No maintenance to the timbers is likely to be required.
- 9.2 The erosion has exposed the pile caps but Bullivant, the designer of the pile caps, say that the structure is safe in the short- to medium-term. The design life of the piles is likely to be reduced to 50 years due to increased corrosion of the pile casings. We accept that a design life of 50 years is a reasonable. We therefore do not have concerns about repair and maintenance liabilities for the piles and the pile caps.
- 9.3 The greenheart timbers are bolted together using brackets and stainless steel bolts located in tolerance holes in the timber members. Bullivant assessed that the effects of the erosion would mean that there was a likelihood that the lateral deflection of the pilecaps will be greater than the 8mm that was originally designed. Sands, the bridge designers, said that if this was a regular significant occurrence the bolts could move in the tolerance holes. This could result in the bolts becoming fixed out of position (snagged or stuck) or potentially to elongate the hole and create a bearing depression in the surface of the timber members. The fixing bolts and nuts could also become loose over time.
- 9.4 However the most recent assessment is that the maximum deflection is only 9mm. This is reassuring and suggests that the likelihood that the bolt holes will move is not great.
- 9.5 Bridge inspections will be need to carried out in accordance with the “Design Manual for Roads and Bridges – CS 450 Inspection of Highway Structures”. There would be a General Inspection every two years and a more detailed Principal Inspection every sixth year. The inspections will highlight any maintenance requirements. The Tamar Community Trust will take responsibility for these inspections.
- 9.6 We recommend that if the Parish Council takes ownership we should develop a contingency reserve to cover possible repair and maintenance. The Council sets aside a contingency reserve for the pontoon of £3,000 per annum. We have discussed an amount like this with the sub-group who indicated that that would be more than adequate.

10. **Scour or erosion of the riverbank**

- 10.1 AECOM’S Geomorphology Assessment, July 2022, estimated that the breach channel will continue to erode vertically so that the channel bed reaches the low tide level in the river and that it will continue to erode laterally. The channel will ultimately settle to a new equilibrium. The Council’s current position is that until the new equilibrium is achieved the Council will not take ownership of the bridge.
- 10.2 The EA has taken photographs of the bank on either side of the bridge at regular intervals over the last year. These demonstrate that erosion has virtually ceased and that equilibrium may have been reached. Moreover it is evident that vegetation is now establishing naturally which is likely to have the effect of binding the bank. Our concerns that the erosion will cause further erosion are allayed.

- 10.3 Regular photographic monitoring needs to continue to assess whether there is any further erosion. It is likely that for the next 5 years the AONB will take responsibility for this.
- 10.4 We are concerned that the Parish Council do not have the technical capacity or expertise to assess what the implications would be for the bridge if further erosion is identified. The EA is considering ways in which they may be able to be used for this should the need arise.
11. **Medium- and long-term safety and integrity of the bridge**
Sands and Bullivant confirm that the bridge is safe in the short to medium term. However, Sands have said that in the medium to long term there may be a reduction in the life of the structure due to the scour unless some mitigation or repair works are carried out. Repair works may be costly and beyond the capacity of the Parish Council to fund. If work was required it is likely that the bridge would need to be closed and decommissioned. The EA provided quotes to show that decommissioning could cost at current prices between £45,000 and £87,000, although a local contractor might be cheaper. We are advised that the design life is likely to be between 25 and 50 years. We believe that such a timescale justifies keeping the bridge and footpath open. The contingency reserve we are recommending could help to build towards decommissioning costs.
12. **Town Farm Field**
If the Parish Council agrees to take ownership of the bridge and footpath a 25 year lease would also be granted to the Parish Council for the use of Town Farm Field so that it can be used for the benefit of the community.
13. **Summary**
i) TCT will take responsibility for the low level repair and maintenance of the bridge and the footpath and for the inspections of the bridge.
ii) The Parish Council will be responsible for maintenance of the bridge, principally for any loosening of the bolts which would be identified in the inspections and which may in any case not occur. Nonetheless, the Parish Council should develop a contingency reserve of £3,000 per annum.
iii) Photographic evidence suggests that the erosion may have reached equilibrium. The AONB is likely to take responsibility for ongoing photographic monitoring for the next 5 year.
iv) The bridge is safe in the short- to medium-term which probably means at least 25 years, in which case keeping the bridge open is well justified.
14. **Recommendation**
We therefore recommend that
i) the Parish Council agrees to take ownership of the bridge and the footpath and takes a 25 year lease for Town Farm Field.
ii) a contingency reserve of £3,000 per annum is created to cover maintenance and other liabilities.

Calstock Parish Council,
Cemetery Road
Drakewalls
Cornwall
PL18 9FE

Our ref:
Your ref:

Date: 31/10/2023

Dear Calstock Parish Council,

RE: TAMAR RIVERWALK: BRIDGE and FOOTPATH – REPAIR and MAINTENANCE ISSUES

In your letter dated 22nd June 2023 you requested the following:

- Q1) Confirmation that there were 'no concerns about the safety and integrity of the footbridge'.
- Q2) 'Assurances as to the likely scope of the repair and maintenance obligations'. This should take the form of a schedule of the maintenance and repair expectations at the 5, 10 and 15-year time horizons.
- Q3) An estimate of the life span of the footbridge.
- Q4) An estimated cost for decommissioning the footbridge at the end of its service life.

These questions (with the exception of item 4) can only be answered by the designer of the footbridge (Sands), who as you know were appointed by Tamar Community Trust with the aim of creating a community asset which would enable continuity of the permissive path on its current alignment.

Tamar Community Trust has met with Sands and have been able to respond to points 1-3 in full. Point 4 is provided by the Environment Agency. Responses follow the same numbering as given above:

R1) The designer has confirmed that there are no safety or integrity issues relating to the footbridge in the short to medium term. The footbridge has been monitored and will need to be regularly inspected in respect by a qualified engineer in accordance with "Design Manual for Roads and Bridges – CS 450 Inspection of Highway Structures".

R2) The likely scope and repair expectations of the footbridge is set out in the 'Calstock Wetlands and Walkway - Inspection and Maintenance Schedule' (attached) and has been compiled in discussions with the bridge designer. The scope of maintenance intervention is extremely limited due to the selection of construction materials and the fact that these are deemed to have a life which exceeds or is equal to the design life of the footbridge (see R3). Very conservatively, a notional annual sum of £250 has been assumed for making good handrailing, with the cost of a general bridge inspection and a principal bridge inspection estimated to be £500 and £1500-2500 respectively.

R3) The current design life of the piles has been determined by the piling contractor/designer to be 50 years, with designer Sands expecting the elements of the superstructure to have a design life equal to this. It is important to note that the design life (the period in which a structure is expected by its designers to work within specified parameters) is not always equal to the actual length of time between placement of a structure and when the structure needs to be decommissioned or replaced. In many cases in civil engineering, we find that the service life considerably exceeds the design life.

R4) We have asked the Environment Agency's framework contractors provide a present-day price for the decommissioning of the footbridge. The first quotation is for the removal of the link spans which connect the footbridge to the banks. Should the Parish Council not feel that preventing unauthorised access to the central structure (which would remain in the first scenario) sufficient, we have also asked for a price for the complete removal of the superstructure (everything other than the piles and pilecaps themselves). These costs are £45,825.00 and £87,480 respectively: the quotations are attached together with a programme for complete removal of the footbridge. Please note that it is likely that a local contractor would provide a significantly lower quotation for this work.

In 2021 the Environment Agency completed works to better protect the community of Calstock from flooding: it did this by building new defences enabled through the creation of a wetland/habitat area (which in turn required the removal of a section of the embankment carrying the permissive path). The Environment Agency has supported the Calstock community in their aim to ensure continued use of the permissive footpath on its current alignment, rather than simply reroute it. This latter option would have been less costly and would not have had any of the complexity of a footbridge. Notwithstanding this and proceeding in good faith, the Environment Agency has worked in partnership to support the construction of a community bridge on the explicit understanding that this asset would be adopted by the community.

The footbridge has now been in operation for 2 years, during this time the bridge has been monitored by the Environment Agency's asset inspectors and has been surveyed for deflection on one of the highest tides of the past 50 years. On this basis and the fact that queries raised have now been addressed, the Environment Agency asks that the Parish Council now implement the adoption of the bridge as previously agreed.

Yours Sincerely,



Daniel Boswell

(Environment Agency Project Manager)

Telephone: 02030252206

E-mail: daniel.boswell@environment-agency.gov.uk

Environment Agency, Manley House, Kestrel Way, Exeter
EX2 7LQ

Calstock Wetlands Bridge Sub Group

Meeting 2, Wednesday 1st November 2023

Attendees: Dan Boswell (Environment Agency); Tony Rago (Environment Agency); Ian Mitchell (Tamar Community Trust); Jane Kiely (Tamar Community Trust); Gill White (Tamar Community Trust); Cllr Alastair Tinto (Calstock Parish Council); Clare Bullimore (Calstock Parish Council); Steven Draper (TVAONB); Sarah Gibson (TVAONB)

Welcome and Introduction (Sarah Gibson)

Thank you to all partners for committing their time and energy in preparing for this meeting. It's crunch time, we collectively need to make a decision together, whether or not to keep the bridge open. If remaining open a solution needs to be found. Thank you for working through the confusion, angst and anger to continue to sit around the table together and find a solution that all parties agree upon.

Partner Updates

Environment Agency (Dan Boswell)

Safety – short to medium term, no issues have been flagged by Sands.

They have suggested that little maintenance will likely be required. Inspection regime has been highlighted and projected fees provided for these inspections.

Design life – pile contractor advised life span as 50 years, Sands has stated they expect it to be similar. However it was noted that service life is not necessarily the same as design life.

Decommissioning – costs have been provided by Environment Agency framework contractors for two scenarios, neither are insignificant costs. Both quotations offer options. Locally a more competitive price may be possible. NB Ian (TCT) has begun to explore these and indications are that the costs may indeed be lower than estimated.

Photographs of the past 12 months of both down river bank, up river bank and pile cap area on up river bank were shared by Dan. Comparison photos show very little change in the banks and pile cap area, suggesting that the scour is not causing deterioration as rapidly as once feared. Agreed that these photos will be shared with the inspectors going forward.

ACTION: Dan to share photos with inspectors and Cornwall Parish Council.

Plant life has not had much time to establish as yet, experience in other locations and projections anticipate that plant roots will assist in stabilising the banks. Those plants that establish themselves naturally is most likely to be the best way forward, leave it to Nature. Recolonisation is what the Environment Agency tends to favour. Reeds may establish themselves in time.

Commentary:

Clearly the scour is stabilising. The question was raised of how to monitor ongoing scour going forward? Monthly photos should be added to ongoing inspections and monitoring.

Citizen science could be applied, asking a volunteer(s) to assist.

TV AONB will be securing (monthly/seasonal) photography from across the TV AONB area for its new management plan (2025-30), if budget allows the bridge will be included and imagery shared with all partners.

Tamar Community Trust (Ian Mitchell)

Environment Agency lidar survey of wetlands and Aecom produced their report. Velocity of water through the breach was higher than assumed originally. So Sands requested to re-evaluate water around the piles. Pile loads were given to Bullivant (piling contractor) who stated they were fine. Corrosion checked and casing checked. Bullivant continue to be happy to project a 50 year design life. Bullivant identified that if the scour went to Aecom's anticipated depth, the deflection on the piles will be greater than the original design. Theoretical deflection increased from 8mm to 31mm, at pile cap surface to height at maximum scour. Sands have reviewed and stated structure is absolutely fine but possibility the structure will flex. Possible future problem with bolts. Suggestion that the inspections continue monitoring this.

Inspections – in addition to the Environment Agency's quotes, Cormac have also quoted.

Question: Could CCC take bridge on to their bridge inspection list?

Sarah is exploring and the indication so far is this will be unlikely.

The rule of 12ths should be considered – how much water flowing at a particular state of tide, almost mid way of tidal cycle. No major flags from Sands. Sands have suggested that the bolts and bolt holes may need monitoring.

Three types of inspection recommended for deflection:

- 1 – general – 2 year cycles
- 2 – principle – 6 year cycles
- 3 – special – triggered if designer flags a concern

If no deflection, suggests no movement on the bolts.

NB Insurance needs consideration.

ACTION: Currently awaiting survey results – Ian will send this to Sands for final review once received.

ACTION: Insurance needs consideration by the Tamar Community Trust and Calstock Parish Council.

Calstock Parish Council (Alastair Tinto)

The Council recognises this is crunch time, wants to be cooperative and wants to see a solution. Finding a way to keep bridge open is important to the Council. Recognise and understand where the Environment Agency is coming from and that Calstock Parish Council wish to be helpful.

The next Calstock Parish Council meeting is 14th November and partners need to report to them. Helpful if Dan could attend on 14th November – agreed.

ACTION: Dan to attend the Calstock Parish Council meeting on 14th Nov 7pm

There are potential repair and maintenance issues for Calstock Parish council for the superstructure.

Gill explained that, historically, it was intended that the maintenance and repair by Tamar Community Trust was to be funded from revenue generated from Town Farm Field. Calstock Parish Council would take on ownership of footpath and bridge, Tamar Community Trust would maintain rails, replace the decking, upkeep of the bank (gravel, strimming). Tamar Community Trust to be responsible for costs of inspections. This was level of maintenance always contemplated by the Tamar Community Trust.

Maintenance schedule does not envisage large scale maintenance requirements.

Calstock Parish Council has no beef with Tamar Community Trust. Calstock Parish Council has always understood that Tamar Community Trust would maintain the bridge.

Tamar Community Trust will be doing the envisaged maintenance, and is not committing to what is far beyond envisaged. At this time, there is no maintenance gap.

50 year design life – routine maintenance schedule covered by Tamar Community Trust, if needs decommissioning in 50 years, that may become a cost for Calstock Parish Council.

Affirmed that owners of the bridge have no legal obligations to carry out maintenance.

Tamar Community Trust are happy to carry out maintenance under a legal obligation (for rails, decking), if something higher was required, the Calstock Parish Council may be required to decommission the bridge.

Environment Agency operates under permissive powers. E.g. Thames Barrier - no legal obligation upon them to maintain it, though they care for it regardless.

Alastair intends to recommend that Calstock Parish Council should create a contingency reserve of £3k per year for next 5 years. He would also be looking to the Environment Agency, Tamar Community Trust and the TVAONB to contribute toward future large scale maintenance.

Questions: In terms of monitoring photography, who would interpret those images?

Questions: Could Environment Agency be a partner with Calstock Parish Council to provide the technical expertise in monitoring the scour?

Tamar Community Trust would not have the expertise within their group to interpret/monitor the scour.

Part of intertidal habitat, though bank takes away habitat. The bank provides a route for the permissive path and serves no other function. Difficult for Environment Agency to justify funding ongoing monitoring work.

TVAONB would be a partner for future explorations for funding solutions with Calstock Parish Council and Tamar Community Trust should there become a problem and this will be raised with the Executive on 6th December. A written agreement/commitment will be required.

Question: what was the AECOM report cost? For note the full comprehensive cost including data collection review, site visit, report writing, travel & accommodation, was £9,900.

Decommissioning:

Full scale decommissioning costs are a significant proportion of Calstock Parish Council's current annual budget.

Assumption that medium term projection is around 25 years. The bridge construction is from Greenheart wood and marine grade stainless steel and suggests a 50 year design life.

Calstock Parish Council is asked to take ownership of the bridge and bank, and the Environment Agency must be risk averse. The lease for Town Farm Field may be progressed if Calstock Parish Council are able to move on the bridge and bank.

Next Steps

1. Calstock Parish Council

Action: Alastair and Clare will consult with Chair and Treasurer and they will prepare a report for full council, circulation to this group first. Presented on 14th November.

Note: Environment Agency letter, decommissioning costs, and Sands report will all be shared for the 14th November Council meeting.

Note: Alastair is prepared to propose that Calstock Parish Council should take on ownership of the bridge and bank.

Note: Scour position remains a question.

Note: Deadline is Wed 8th November for circulation of Council papers.

2. Environment Agency

Action: Dan to reply to Alastair via email

Action: Dan to share photos from last twelve months with all partners.

3. Tamar Community Trust

Action: Ian to pursue survey and feedback from Sands by the 14th November.

4. Media

Two press release will be prepared. The first will announce the Calstock Parish Council taking on ownership of the Calstock Wetlands bridge and bank, and the second will announce that the Calstock Parish Council will not be taking on ownership of the Calstock Wetlands bridge and bank. All to approve prior to the 14th November.

ACTION: Sarah to prepare two press releases and circulate to all partners for approval.

Report from TCT on Calstock Wetlands Bridge

We are writing to bring everybody up to date on the work carried out by TCT since the last meeting of the bridge subgroup.

Two documents below have been discussed and agreed with Sands. Below is a summary; for greater detail refer to the actual documents.

1. Inspection and Maintenance Schedule

1.1. TCT has met with Sands to discuss inspections, maintenance and mitigation of scour.

Notes of that meeting are attached. Comments are as follows:-

1.2. Details of the inspections and maintenance required have been incorporated into the draft Maintenance Schedule being produced in cooperation with the EA.

1.3. Item 2.1.7. contains the phrase “fairly confident”. It has been pointed out that this is ambiguous. It should be read from a positive, not negative, point of view.

1.4. Item 2.1.4.1 asks for “monitoring of the tops of the columns to measure lateral deflection....”. TCT have commissioned a survey of the tops of the columns to be carried out over two high spring tides between 26th and 31th October 2023. The results are expected in the following week, and will be discussed with Sands.

2. “TCTs Interpretation of Sands’ Comments Following Bullivant Statement Regarding Potential Lateral Movement of Pilecaps – Revision 1 29/09/23”

2.1. The above document is attached.

2.2. The document clarifies a number of points:-

2.2.1. In some other documents that have been produced, there is a misinterpretation of earlier reports, partly because there is an assumption that the worst case scenarios will always actually happen. Engineering reports always have to consider the worst case, but particularly where there are a large number of unknowns, and because assumptions have to be made, there is a high probability that the worst case will not happen.

2.2.2. It is recognized that possible issues with the bolts are not immediate but may develop over time if the significant deflections of the structure actually occur. There is some flexibility in the structure in any case which would allow for some movement at the bolts without any detriment. The timber is of greenheart which is hard and would be resistant to deformation of the bolt holes. The intention of the statement was just to alert TCT of the need to inform the bridge inspectors that these issues may arise. (See the Inspection and Maintenance Schedule). TCT had always anticipated that the bridge would be inspected in accordance with the “Design Manual for Roads and Bridges – CS450 Inspection of Highway Structures”.

2.2.3. Sands have confirmed that the bridge is strong enough to withstand the increased lateral loads, and can accept the possible increased horizontal movement of the pilecaps due to both the increased lateral loads and the maximum scour anticipated by AECOM.

2.2.4. The design life of the piles has only been reduced (from a longer life) to 50 years by the scour. A design life of 50 years is thought to be a reasonable design life for the bridge. The actual service life may be longer.

2.2.5. The structure is safe in the short to medium term, but in the medium to long term there may be a reduction in the life of the structure due to the scour.

TCT's Interpretation of Sands' Comments Following Bullivant Statement Regarding Potential Lateral Movement of Pilecaps – Revision 1 29/09/23

Introduction and Background

Bullivant have said that under the increased lateral hydraulic load and with the depth of maximum depth of scour given by the Environment Agency (EA), the piles are structurally adequate, but that the maximum theoretical lateral deflection of the pilecaps will increase to 31mm from the original 8mm if the pilecaps had remained buried. Bullivant also said that the design life of the pile would be reduced to 50 years.

TCT understand that:-

- The maximum depth of scour given by the EA from AECOM's model and report has not been reached, and may in fact never be reached. AECOM have followed standard engineering practice and have assumed the worst case in their analysis.
- AECOM were unable to give any timescale over which the maximum depth of scour could be reached, if it is reached at all.
- In the case where the maximum depth of scour is reached, the maximum lateral deflection will only be reached on high spring tides with very high fluvial flows. At other times the deflection will be less.
- The movement will be cyclic on each tide, and will vary between zero and the maximum for that tide.

1. Sands' Statement

"The bridge structure is manufactured as a set of individual components bolted together using brackets and stainless steel bolts located in tolerance holes in the timber members. This allows for a structure that can flex to a certain degree. The issue will be that if this becomes a regular significant occurrence and then there is a possibility that bolts could move in the tolerance holes. This action could result in the bolts becoming fixed out of position (snagged or stuck) or potentially to elongate the hole and create a bearing depression in the surface of the timber members. The fixing bolts and nuts could also become loose over time."

TCT Understanding

- 1.1. The bolts are likely to have been inserted in tolerance holes, which we believe can be up to 2mm greater diameter than the bolts, and which could allow some flexibility of the joints which would reduce the likelihood of the issues mentioned. The TCT accept that the bolts may also be tight in the holes, which could result in the issues mentioned.
- 1.2. The issues mentioned are not an immediate issue, but may develop over time. The intention of the statement was to alert the TCT for the need to inform the bridge inspector that these issues may arise, and that they should be included in the inspections, which TCT understand, should be carried out every two years for a highway bridge. See Sand's Statement 4.
- 1.3. The timbers that would be affected by movement of the bolts are of greenheart, which is an extremely hard timber, and would be resistant to deformation of the hole.

2. Sands' Statement

"The analysis of the structure shows that the bridge can accept horizontal movement in the order of the lateral displacements suggested by Roger Bullivant Limited without overstressing the components of the bridge including the cross bracing."

TCT Understanding

From this statement, and previous statements, TCT understand that the bridge is strong enough to withstand the increased lateral loads, and can accept the increased horizontal movement of the pilecaps due to both the increased lateral loads and the scour around the pilecaps and piles anticipated by AECOM.

3. Sands' Statement

"We are also concerned that the original design intent for the bridge foundations has been compromised by the scouring to the pile and pile cap foundations and that this is not an acceptable situation for the medium to long term. We consider that despite the statement from Roger Bullivant Limited regarding the reduced 50 year design life and the installed capacity of the piles under the new scouring regime, that some mitigation/repair works will need to be implemented to reinstate the original ground profile around the installed piles and pile caps."

TCT Understanding

- 3.1. Bullivant consider that the design life of the piles is likely to be reduced to 50 years due to increased corrosion of the pile casings due to the scour. A design life of 50 years is thought to be a reasonable design life for a structure of this type, and it was not originally designed for a greater life than this.
- 3.2. The structure should be safe in the short to medium term.
- 3.3. In the medium to long term there may be a reduction in the life of the structure due to the scour unless some mitigation or repair works are carried out.
- 3.4. Remedial works would have to be carried out by the EA, as they are responsible for the design of the breach, and nobody else could do remedial works without incurring all of the liabilities for the breach.

4. Sands' Statement

"It is suggested that the timber bridge is subject to a periodic structural inspection regime to monitor the condition of the bridge structure, the line and level of the structure and the tightness of the connection bolts over the whole structure."

TCT Understanding

- 4.1. TCT had always anticipated that periodic structural inspections would be required to monitor the condition of the bridge structure. TCT can ensure that the inspector is instructed to incorporate the recommended elements.

Calstock Wetlands and Walkway Project
Notes on Meeting Between TCT and Sands on 27/09/23 Issue 1

Present:-

Ian Mitchell – TCT

Julian Brooke-Houghton – TCT

Matthew Cridge – Sands

Tim Green – Sands

1. TCT's Interpretation of Sands' Comments Following Bullivant Statement Regarding Potential Lateral Movement of Pilecaps

- 1.1. It was agreed that TCT's interpretation was correct as amended in Revision 1.

2. Inspections and Maintenance Schedule

2.1. Inspections

- 2.1.1. Bridge inspections will be carried out by suitably experienced personnel in accordance with the "Design Manual for Roads and Bridges – CS 450 Inspection of Highway Structures". CS 450 identifies "General Inspections" to be carried out every two years, more detailed "Principal Inspections" to be carried out every six years, and "Special Inspections" to be carried out if particular concerns have been raised.
- 2.1.2. The effects of the erosion of the breach have lead to Bullivant's subsequent assessment that there is a likelihood that the lateral deflection of the pilecaps will be greater than that originally designed. Sands have raised concerns that it was possible that this could cause unexpected lateral deflections of the superstructure. It was felt that these concerns warranted Special Inspections.
- 2.1.3. The "Special Inspection" would be annually for two years; future intervals would be determined following assessment of these inspections once confidence in the normal behaviour had been achieved.
- 2.1.4. It was agreed that the Special Inspection should include:-
- 2.1.4.1. Monitoring of the tops of the columns to measure lateral deflection of the bridge over two high spring tides to understand the "normal behaviour" of the bridge under tidal loads.
 - 2.1.4.2. Inspection of a representative number of bolts to find whether they have become unacceptably tight or loose.
- 2.1.5. TCT are in the process of commissioning the survey of the tops of the columns.
- 2.1.6. Although it would have been desirable to survey the lateral movement of the pilecaps, it was agreed that this was impractical.
- 2.1.7. Sands and TCT are fairly confident that the bridge structure would tolerate more movement than might actually occur.

2.2. Maintenance

- 2.2.1. The bridge is constructed from very durable materials, and is designed for minimum maintenance. Sands revised their assessment of the likely annual maintenance

Calstock Wetlands and Walkway Project

Notes on Meeting Between TCT and Sands on 27/09/23 Issue 1

requirements, due to all the fixings being of stainless steel, and the decking being of industrial grade composite grating. It was considered that annual maintenance would probably be limited to rectifying any misalignment of the handrail components together with addressing any concerns raised by the inspection regime.

2.2.2. It is considered that the bridge inspections would be sufficient to identify any significant maintenance requirements in the superstructure. No further maintenance schedule is required.

2.2.3. With regard to the handrails, side rails, and handrail posts, any issues requiring maintenance will be obvious to any users. Any adjustments necessary will be flagged up to the TCT, and can be addressed by them. These adjustments are very likely to be simple.

3. Mitigation of Scour

3.1. It was agreed that it would have been preferable if the piles and pilecaps were restrained by the soil and not exposed to the water flow. However, it was understood that the Environment Agency did not intend to modify the breach channel to achieve this, and had said that they did not have the money to do so in any case.

3.2. Bullivant had confirmed that the piles had a design life of 50 years. Both Sands and TCT considered that this was a reasonable design life for the bridge structure. It was noted that the design life does not define the service life, which may exceed it.

3.3. Sands and Bullivant had confirmed that the bridge was safe in the short to medium term.

**Calstock Wetlands and Walkway
Calstock Bridge**

Statement Following Survey of Bridge Structure Lateral Deflections on 27th and 28th October 2023.

The survey was carried out over two high spring tides and recorded lateral deflections of the tops of the bridge columns including at times of maximum ebb and flow through the breach. The maximum measured deflection was 9mm.

9mm is well within the expected combined lateral deflection of the pilecaps, as calculated assuming the maximum scour in AECOM's report, and that calculated for the superstructure.

It is considered therefore, that there is no requirement to carry out any further lateral deflection surveys, or special inspections of the bolts, unless deemed necessary during a General Inspection or Principal Inspection carried out in accordance with "Design Manual for Roads and Bridges – CS 450 Inspection of Highway Structures".

Hi Ian,

Further to our telephone conversation this morning we are in agreement with the prepared statement.

We envisage that a typical maintenance inspection will consider the whole bridge as stated in CS450 and may consider the following aspects - bolts, brackets, timber members/handrailing, decking and support, timber columns, steel cross-bracing, foundation bolts/brackets and pile caps. The level of the maintenance inspection will be determined by the inspection team to reflect the type of survey being undertaken under the relevant bridge maintenance schedule.

Kind regards

Tim

Tim Green

BSc(Hons) CEng MICE
Principal Engineer
tim@sands-consultants.co.uk

Calstock Parish Council

PAYMENTS LIST OCTOBER 2023

Voucher	Cheque	Name	Description	Amount
335		Vincent Tractors & Plant	Tractor part	202.97
336		SeaDog IT	Web Site Service	29.95
337		Tamar Valley Electrical Ltd	Food Action	470.00
338		task-it.com	Consultancy Support	650.00
339		Salaries	Salary	5,041.85
340		Ray Stephens & Son	Water Calstock toilets	2,700.00
341		Mole Valley Farmers	Materials for Workmen	40.00
342		EDF Energy	Electric Workshop	19.06
343		Peter Gadd	STAFF MILEAGE	94.50
344		Google	Google G Suite	9.20
345		Google	Google G Suite	100.00
346		Google	Google G Suite	86.40
347		Allstar	Vehicle Fuel	140.16
348		South West Play	Repairs to play ground equipment	2,121.00
349		Cornwall ALC Ltd	Training Course	72.00
350		Impact Laundry & Cleaning Ltd	Toilet Hygiene	141.54
351		Callington Garden Machinery	Equipment Service & repair	181.00
355		Cornwall Council	Pensions	1,560.47
357		Pozitive Energy	Electric Gunnislake Pavilion	36.06
358		Corona Energy	Electric Calstock Toilets	49.37
359		Corona Energy	Electric Gunnislake Toilets	25.60
360		Ford Lease	Van Leases	390.15
361		South West Water	Water Gunnislake Toilets	156.75
362		PHS Group	Toilet Hygiene	1,979.34
363		EDF Energy	Public Lighting Gunnislake	255.55
364		Allstar	Vehicle Fuel	150.42
365		Simon Brown	Consultancy Support	231.25
366		Ray Stephens & Son	Water Calstock toilets	2,248.80
367		Trewartha, Gregory and Doidge Ltd	Materials for Workmen	318.02
368		NSALG	Consultancy Support	67.00
369		timberstore	Materials for Workmen	55.87
370		Impact Laundry & Cleaning Ltd	Toilet Hygiene	1,912.63
371		EDF Energy	Public Lighting Calstock	858.92
372		FastSpring	IT running costs	63.23
373		Rainbow Professions Ltd	Materials for Workmen	1,991.40
374		Cartridge People	Printer toner	296.91
375		HMRC	Tax & NI	2,202.46
376		timberstore	Materials for Workmen	936.48
377		Biffa	Waste Collection	162.77
378		SeaDog IT	Web Site Service	29.95
379		Voipfone	Voip Phone Top-up	72.00
380		Kingfisher Direct Ltd	Salt Bin	179.99
381		Alastair Tinto	Councillor Expenses	32.70
382		Tavistock Taskforce	Ground Works	700.00
383		South West Water	Water St Annes PF	0.17
384		EDF Energy	Electric Workshop	21.12
385		Cornwall Council	Rent TVC	2,750.00
389		Cornwall Council	Car Parking Patrols	94.00
390		Cornwall Council	Rates TVC	84.00
391		Cornwall Council	Rates Harrowbarrow CP	142.00
392		Cornwall Council	Car Parking Fees General	94.00
393		Cornwall Council	Car Parking Fees Gunnislake	119.00
394		South West Water	Water Calstock toilets	470.84

TOTAL

33,000.11

Accounts Summary 31 October 2023

Current Account	£105,635.48
Petty Cash	£22.43
General Reserves Account	£89,166.92
Earmarked Reserves Account	£65,000.00
<i>Calstock Village Pontoon</i>	£3,000.00
<i>Fosters Field Playground Equipment</i>	£15,000.00
<i>Calstock Cemetery Extension</i>	£15,000.00
<i>Skateboard Park</i>	£9,000.00
<i>Capital Works</i>	£23,000.00
CIL (in current account)	£1,724.09
106 (to apply for from CC)	£7,836.28
Forecast Expenditure for year remaining	£124,957
Forecast Income for year remaining	£16,096
Estimated end of year General Reserves	£85,964
Recommended Minimum General Reserve	£82,635
<i>(25% of total income)</i>	

Calstock Parish Council
06 November 2023-2024
Summary of Receipts and Payments
All Cost Centres and Codes

Amenities

Code Title	Receipts			Payments		
	Budgeted	Actual	Variance	Budgeted	Actual	Variance
1 Precept	47,000.00	47,000.00				
2 Parking Charges & Permits	6,000.00	3,508.80	-2,491.20	1,000.00	410.86	589.14
3 Pontoon & Moorings	3,000.00	3,462.00	462.00	1,500.00	330.95	1,169.05
12 General Equipment Purchse				2,000.00	662.41	1,337.59
13 General Repairs & Maintenance		200.00	200.00	1,500.00	726.88	773.12
14 Toilets Equipment & Consumables				3,000.00	3,349.67	-349.67
15 Toilets Repairs & Maintenance				10,000.00	13,211.07	-3,211.07
16 Toilets Utilities - Water				1,750.00	2,814.75	-1,064.75
17 Toilets Utilities - Electric				950.00	523.76	426.24
18 Toilets Business Rates						
19 Car Parks Equipment & Consumables				1,100.00	249.33	850.67
20 Car Parks Repairs & Maintenance				2,000.00	1,645.38	354.62
21 Car Parks Business Rates				4,100.00	2,477.91	1,622.09
22 Street Lighting				5,600.00	3,230.59	2,369.41
23 Bins				4,000.00	312.09	3,687.91
59 Calstock Car Park Ground Works				7,000.00	6,000.00	1,000.00
64 Pontoon Repairs						
SUB TOTAL	56,000.00	54,170.80	-1,829.20	45,500.00	35,945.65	9,554.35

Burial

Code Title	Receipts			Payments		
	Budgeted	Actual	Variance	Budgeted	Actual	Variance
24 Consumables & Maintenance				5,500.00	824.70	4,675.30
25 Utilities - Water				150.00	125.01	24.99
26 Utilities - Electric				100.00	93.88	6.12
27 Precept	6,000.00	6,000.00				
28 Fees	17,000.00	7,585.00	-9,415.00	200.00		200.00
SUB TOTAL	23,000.00	13,585.00	-9,415.00	5,950.00	1,043.59	4,906.41

Environment & Climate Emergenc

Code Title	Receipts			Payments		
	Budgeted	Actual	Variance	Budgeted	Actual	Variance
57 Forest for Calstock Parish						
60 Public engagement, publicity & research		897.30	897.30	2,000.00	431.25	1,568.75
62 Precept	2,000.00	2,000.00				
68 Food Action					470.00	-470.00
SUB TOTAL	2,000.00	2,897.30	897.30	2,000.00	901.25	1,098.75

Finance

Code Title	Receipts			Payments		
	Budgeted	Actual	Variance	Budgeted	Actual	Variance

38 TVC Rent & Rates				7,000.00	415.83	6,584.17
39 Tools, Equipment, Consumables & Posta				2,000.00	813.05	1,186.95
40 IT Equipment				1,000.00	860.27	139.73
41 IT Running Costs				6,000.00	2,969.75	3,030.25
42 Insurance				7,200.00	6,310.60	889.40
43 Grants Given				5,000.00	3,240.00	1,760.00
44 Vehicles Leases & Purchase				4,500.00	3,652.82	847.18
45 Vehicle Running Costs				4,300.00	2,908.04	1,391.96
46 Subscriptions & Fees				3,500.00	4,102.83	-602.83
47 Waste Removal				1,500.00	4,630.30	-3,130.30
48 Miscellaneous Expenses				1,900.00	446.94	1,453.06
49 Precept	48,000.00	48,000.00				
50 Council Tax Rebate	2,404.00		-2,404.00			
51 Donations & Grants Received	10,000.00		-10,000.00			
52 Rents Miscellaneous		16.00	16.00		5,500.00	-5,500.00
53 Refunds						
54 VAT Refund	22,421.00		-22,421.00			
55 Miscellaneous Income	130.00	97.06	-32.94	250.00		250.00
56 Covid-19 Shopping						
66 CIL FUND		8,488.48	8,488.48		14,064.00	-14,064.00
67 Bank Interest		1,321.92	1,321.92			
SUB TOTAL	82,955.00	57,923.46	-25,031.54	44,150.00	49,914.43	-5,764.43

Neighbourhood Development Plan

		Receipts			Payments		
Code	Title	Budgeted	Actual	Variance	Budgeted	Actual	Variance
35	Admin Costs						
36	Consultancy						
37	Production Costs						
	SUB TOTAL						

Personnel

		Receipts			Payments		
Code	Title	Budgeted	Actual	Variance	Budgeted	Actual	Variance
4	Precept	151,000.00	151,000.00				
5	Salaries				106,000.00	46,706.34	59,293.66
6	Pensions				19,426.00	13,219.35	6,206.65
7	Tax & NI				21,287.00	15,958.57	5,328.43
8	Staff Clothing & PPE				300.00	583.68	-283.68
9	Staff Training, Expenses & Mileage				600.00	876.99	-276.99
10	Councillor Costs & Allowances				300.00	31.15	268.85
11	Consultancy General				4,300.00	2,628.75	1,671.25
65	Recruitment				500.00		500.00
	SUB TOTAL	151,000.00	151,000.00		152,713.00	80,004.83	72,708.17

Recreation

		Receipts			Payments		
Code	Title	Budgeted	Actual	Variance	Budgeted	Actual	Variance
29	Capital Costs					1,767.50	-1,767.50
30	Consumables & Maintenance				9,300.00	10,710.02	-1,410.02
31	Utilities - Water				150.00	226.03	-76.03
32	Utilities - Electric		168.00	168.00	2,500.00	-42.74	2,542.74
33	Precept	32,000.00	32,000.00				
34	Fees & Rents	2,500.00	25.00	-2,475.00		105.83	-105.83

58 2023 Improvement Schemes				4,550.00		4,550.00
63 2023 Footpath Improvements		2,382.57	2,382.57	12,000.00	2,218.00	9,782.00
SUB TOTAL	34,500.00	34,575.57	75.57	28,500.00	14,984.64	13,515.36

Summary

NET TOTAL	349,455.00	314,152.13	-35,302.87	278,813.00	182,794.39	96,018.61
V.A.T.		22,743.31			12,349.81	
GROSS TOTAL		336,895.44			195,144.20	



Summary of Receipts and Payments for October 2023 - Notes

Ray Stephens

£2700 and £2248 – for the water leak at Calstock.

Minute ref: 192/23, 10-10-2023

South West Play

£2121.00 - balance due for installation of new swing at Harrowbarrow.

Minute ref: 132/23 – 11-07-2023

PHS

£1979.34 – balance to end contract for soap and hand sanitisers no longer required.

Minutes ref: Amenities Committee 03-10-2023

Rainbow Professions Ltd

£1991.40 – for pavers to improve access into St Ann's Playing Field.

Minute ref: 194/23 – 10-10-2023

Timberstore

£936.48 – materials for playground refurbishment

Minute ref: 194/23 and Recreations Committee 03-10-2023, agenda item 4.

South West Water

£470.84 – Calstock Toilets (water leak)

Claim has been submitted for water leak allowance.

Total: £12,447.06



Calstock Parish Council, Tamar Valley Centre, Cemetery Road, Drakewalls, PL18 9FE

Acting Clerk: Clare Bullimore

Tel: 01822 748847 email: clerk@calstockparishcouncil.gov.uk

Minutes of a meeting of the Calstock Parish Council, PLANNING COMMITTEE

held on **Tuesday 21 November 2023**, in the Tamar Valley Centre at 1830.

Those present were: -

COUNCILLORS: Cllr Alford, Cllr Flashman, Cllr Greenwood (Chair), Cllr Kirk, Cllr Letchford, Cllr Newton Chance, Cllr Tinto, Cllr Spurr

Miss Clare Bullimore (Acting Clerk – *minutes*).

1. Apologies

Apologies were accepted from Cllrs Ashley, Beech, Trapp, Wakem and Warwick.

2. Declarations and Dispensations in Members' Interests

Cllr Spurr did not vote on PA23/08968 as he is on the Village Hall Committee.

3. Public Participation

Members of the public answered questions on PA23/08968

4. Approve Minutes of the last meeting, 24-10-2023

Proposal/resolution: the minutes be approved. Proposed: Cllr Alford; seconded: Cllr Letchford – agreed by all those present at the last meeting.

5. 5-day Planning Consultation

None

6. New Correspondence

An email had been received from Davina Pritchard to ask whether the Parish Council will reconsider their stock objections to new developments needing to be connected to the sewage system as it will be burdensome to all involved. She has suggested a response such as “no objection subject to there being no objections from SWW from the proposed connection to the foul drainage”. This was agreed but with a request to ask Davina if the local planning authority can do anything to support our campaign to raise awareness of the poor sewage infrastructure and subsequent spills into the River.

7. Planning Applications

Application PA23/08610 HARROWBARROW

Proposal: Proposed extension



Location: Cully Park, Lower Metherell,

Applicant: Mr T Bunton

Proposal/resolution: to support this application. Proposed: Cllr Flashman, seconded: Cllr Letchford – unanimous.

Application PA23/08749 HARROWBARROW

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the construction of single-storey dwelling, garage and vehicular access onto public highway.

Location: Land East Of Glenmoor, St Anns Chapel, PL18 9HP

Applicant: Mr Christopher Richardson

There was discussion about this application as Cllr Flashman feels it was a brownfield site and the applicants have extenuating circumstances which require them to need a single storey dwelling, however it is clearly outside of the Settlement Development Boundary in the Neighbourhood Development Plan and would not fit any exemptions to this policy.

Proposal/resolution: to object to this application as it does not confirm to HP1 of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and is outside the SDB and is not in accordance with any exemptions or the Cornwall Local Plan policy of CLP7. Proposed: Cllr Newton Chance, seconded: Cllr Tinto. 5 in favour of objecting, 3 objections to the proposal (Cllr Alford, Cllr Kirk and Cllr Flashman). Motion to object carried.

Enquiry reference PA23/08597 CALSTOCK

Proposal: Non material amendment in relation to PA18/03770: Installation of 3 no. conservation roof lights instead of the approved curved roof dormer windows.

Location: The Old Post Office Fore Street Calstock Cornwall PL18 9RN

Applicant: Mrs Claire Bissell

THIS APPLICATION HAD BEEN WITHDRAWN SO WAS NOT DISCUSSED.

Application PA23/08968 CALSTOCK

Proposal: Alterations to the existing hall layout, installation of new bi-fold doors, conversion of the roof space to provide small business space and meeting rooms for general hire. Construction of new pitched roof dormer windows.

Location: Calstock Village Hall Calstock Cornwall PL18 9QA

Applicant: Mr Matt Taylor

Proposal/resolution: to support this application as it conforms to and supports LISF1 (enhancing existing community facilities and social infrastructure); LISF2 (development infrastructure for growth) and LET1 (small business unit development) of the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Proposed: Cllr Tinto, seconded: Cllr Newton Chance all in favour apart from Cllr Kirk who abstained as she felt the constitution of the Village Hall should be checked to see if this would be classed as a change of use. Motion to support carried.

Application PA23/08635 CHILSWORTHY

Proposal: Proposed change of use of agricultural land to turnout area

Location: Longridge Coxpark Gunnislake



Applicant: Mr And Ms N And N Norton And Humphrey

Proposal/resolution: to object to this application and support the AONB's statement. It is also a prominent field which would have a detrimental impact on the local landscape as cited in LA1 of the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Proposed: Cllr Newton Chance, seconded: Cllr Kirk – 5 in favour; 2 objections (Cllr Flashman and Cllr Alford) and one abstention (Cllr Greenwood). Motion to object carried.

Application PA23/08849 GUNNISLAKE

Proposal: Submission for Hedgerow removal to enable larger gateway access for modern machinery

Location: Land Rear Of Duntreva Stony Lane Drakewalls Gunnislake

Applicant: Mr Christopher Morgan

Proposal/resolution: to support the application on the condition that the Cornish Hedgerow cited on the plan is made a condition of approval and that a Forestry Officer oversees the work. Proposed: Cllr Tinto, seconded: Cllr Alford – all in favour apart from one abstention (Cllr Kirk). Motion to support with conditions carried.

The Applications for the renewal of Street Trading Consent LI23_006687 for Lil Pizza Heaven at the following sites were noted with support:

- Calstock Village Hall Car Park, The Quay, Calstock, PL18 9Q,
- Harrowbarrow Village Hall Car Park, School Road, Harrowbarrow, PL17 8BQ
- Layby outside Delaware Primary Academy, Albaston

The meeting ended at 1930

Signed..... Date.....



Calstock Parish Council, Tamar Valley Centre, Cemetery Road, Drakewalls, PL18 9FE

Acting Clerk: Clare Bullimore

Tel: 01822 748847 email: clerk@calstockparishcouncil.gov.uk

Notes from the Environment and Climate Change Working Groups

held on **Thursday 30 November 2023**, in the Tamar Valley Centre at 1900.

Those present were: - Richard Newton Chance (Chair), Andrew Brown, Alex Polglase, Jim Wakem, Judith Robinson, Gill Court, Pete Thompson, Peter Bloomfield

Recovering Nature

- Wild About Nature – photobook project, underway with one walk completed.
- Yellow rattle – sown in Calstock Churchyard and Calstock playing field – Pete Gadd (CPC) and Jane Weatherby (Living Churchyards) and Calstock in Bloom involved and on Gunnislake Playing Field by Gunnislake Community Matters members.
- Willow tit boxes made by REACH.
- Hedgehogs – Pete Thompson developing links to monitor hedgehogs and offer strategies to help them.
- Hedgerows – Pete Bloomfield working with Becky Buckland to raise awareness of hedge management with local landowners.
- Environment talks at Calstock Arts: 25-01-2024, Mark Avery, Wild Justice; 22-02-24, Fiona Matthews and Tim Kendell, Black Ops and Beaver Bombing; 15-03-2023, Stephen Moss, Ten Birds That Changed The World.
- Oak may be donated for the large replacement pieces of the boatyard.

Reducing Impact

- Sewage – the EA will monitor any sightings of sewage – photos to be taken and reported and smells to be reports to the EA Hotline. Citizen Science also important and volunteers will try to be recruited for this. CPC made the point to the Planning Department by refusing applications that required connection to the sewage system – CC have noted this but pointed out we have no material grounds to object, however in a supporting statement it will be reference that CPC will support subject to SWW having no objections.
- Local power schemes – awaiting further information.
- Designated bathing water status is a non-starter as the criterion have changed to almost impossible levels.
- EV charging points – an opportunity may have been missed, there is an online survey but it is not particularly helpful to our needs.
- CPC approved a policy whereby members of the public can complete a form and return it to the Planning Committee when they feel a breach of planning has occurred – this should reduce the environmental impact caused by the construction of buildings.



Improving Health and Wellbeing

- Food Action initiative keeps on growing with over 50 households signed up to the December delivery.
- Will look into 'lost footpaths' and monitor.