

AGENDA ITEM No 3

MINUTES of the Meeting of the **TAVISTOCK TOWN COUNCIL** held on **TUESDAY 28th JULY, 2026 at 6.30pm** at **THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN COUNCIL OFFICES, DRAKE ROAD, TAVISTOCK**

PRESENT Councillor Mrs A Johnson (Mayor)
Councillor J Moody (Deputy Mayor)

Councillors R Edlmann, Ms M Ewings, S Hipsey, A Hutton, A Lewis, N Martin, Mrs B Moody, T Munro, G Parker, B Smith, A Venning, P Ward, Ms S Wood.

IN ATTENDANCE Town Clerk, General Manager, Office and Finance Manager

Prior to the commencement of the Meeting there was opportunity for:
6.25pm - Quiet Reflection led by Dale Sutcliffe, Elder from Abbey Chapel.
The County Councillor was in attendance.

COMMENCEMENT OF MEETING

95. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence had been received.

96. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor J Moody (Deputy Mayor) declared an interest in Minute Number 101 as a Member of the West Devon Borough Council Development Management & Licensing Committee and indicated he would not speak or vote on the matter.

97. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

a) RESOLVED THAT subject to the amendment of Minute No 42a to change "2025" to "2026", the Minutes of the Meeting of Tavistock Town Council held on Tuesday 9th June, 2026 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman (Appendix 1)

Noted That a revised and corrected set of Draft Minutes from that incorrectly tabled with the Agenda had been circulated prior to the Meeting.

98. PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS & QUESTION

The following written question, had been received from a Member of the public, Ms D Giles, which was read to the Meeting by the Town Clerk:

"I strongly support the Development Management & Licensing Committee's recommendation to object to planning application 0887/26/OPA. Given the detailed planning grounds identified by the Committee, together with the objections and concerns raised by specialist consultees including DCC Highways, the Landscape Officer, Tree Officer and Strategic Planning Officer, will Full Council please endorse the Committee's recommendation and formally object to the application?"

The Mayor thanked the questioner for the question and advised that it would be addressed at a later point in debate at the Meeting when the appropriate item arose.

ITEMS REQUIRING A DECISION

99. GENERAL FINANCE

The Council considered the following:-

a) Schedule of Payments

The Council received and considered a copy of the monthly accounts as at 31st May and 30th June, 2026 as listed on the Council Website (Appendix 2).

b) Budget Monitoring Report

The Council received and considered a copy of the Budget Monitoring report as at 30th June 2026 (Appendix 3)

100. BUDGET & POLICY COMMITTEE

The Council considered the Minutes of the Meeting of the Budget & Policy Committee (Appendix 4), held on Tuesday 14th July, 2026, the recommendations being reported by rote.

RESOLVED THAT

- a) subject to the inclusion of an apology for absence from Councillor A Hutton the Recommendations included in the foregoing report of the Budget and Policy Committee (Minute No's 73 – 82(a) and 83-87 refer – as previously amended) be approved and adopted;
- b) pursuant to Minute No 82(b) Councillors Mrs A Johnson and B Smith be added to the list of prospective attendees.

Noted that

- i. Minute No 76 – reference was made to the success of, and background to, the annual Civic Ball;
- ii. Minute No 82 Members were encouraged to attend the DALC Conference 2026 (Councillor Mrs M Ewings would be attending in another capacity);
- iii. Minute 85 – reference was made to a pre-scheduled meeting at which South Hams Officers and Councillors had provided a detailed update on Local Government Reorganisation the previous week to the Mayors and Clerks of larger Councils within that authority's area. A request for same as a matter of urgency in West Devon had been made by both Tavistock and Okehampton Town Councils. A Member who also served on the principal authority reported no meeting to provide equivalent information would be convened for West Devon Town Councils before September at the earliest. In the ensuing discussion reference was made variously to the importance of timely information including prospective consequential impacts on/arrangements for preparation of the new Local Plan.

101. PLANNING MATTERS

a) DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & LICENSING COMMITTEE (DM&L)

The Council considered the following: -

- i) Development Management & Licensing Committee - Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 23rd June , 2026 (Appendix 5) (Minute No's 55 - 62 inclusive) the recommendations being reported by rote:
- ii) Development Management & Licensing Committee – Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 13th July, 2026 (Appendix 6)
 - o (Minute No's 63 – 71 recommendation (a) and 72 inclusive), the recommendations being reported by rote: and
 - o Minute No 101 recommendation b in relation to Application No 0887/26/OPA being determined as set out below;

RESOLVED THAT the Recommendations included in the foregoing reports of the Development Management & Licensing Committee be approved and adopted.

Noted that a Member drew attention to the Development Management and Licensing Committee Meeting on the 4th August 2026 with particular reference to Applications Nos 1525/26/LBC and 1524/26/FUL.

b) MAJOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Council considered the following applications for Planning Permission that were categorised as 'major' and thereby fell to determination by Council:

- i) **Application No 0887/26/OPA** (Minute No 71(b) refers (Violet Lane)) along with the Recommendation from the Development Management & Licensing Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 13th July, 2026.

RESOLVED THAT an objection be raised to the application for the following reasons:

A

- 1 *As set out in Chapter 2 of the report, the Town Council believes that policies TTV26 and TTV27 of the Joint Local Plan apply, with full weight, to this proposal. The Town Council believes that the proposal conflicts fundamentally with Policy TTV27, a policy designed to enable (not 'restrict' as the applicant argues) the provision of homes in locations where, otherwise, they would be restricted. Contrary to Section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, the applicants have not shown any material consideration to indicate why TTV27 should not be given full weight.*
- 2 *The proposal does not constitute sustainable development for the 3 reasons below and set out in detail in Chapter 3 of the report . It follows that neither the presumption in favour of sustainable development nor the 'tilted balance' applies and, since the applicant has shown no material considerations why the conflict with JLP policies DEV10 and TTV27 should be set aside, the application should be refused:*
 - *The site is in an unsustainable location which encourages the use of the private car. There is no safe and easy pedestrian or cycle access between the site and the services of Tavistock Town Centre, schools and other community facilities and services and the application contains no measures to mitigate this. The proposal also makes it difficult for bus services to operate. It is, therefore in conflict with policy DEV10 of the JLP and with the policies and principles of the NPPF, especially para 110.*
 - *The proposal does not incorporate the housing mix set out in policy TTV27 of the JLP. The applicants have not demonstrated why, in the context of an affordable housing crisis recognised and evidenced at National, County, Borough and Town levels, 70% Open Market Housing is preferable to the maximum of 40% Open Market Housing required by the JLP policy TTV27. It does not, therefore, meet the requirements of both policy TTV27*

of the JLP and the NPPF to meet identified local housing needs – a prerequisite for any sustainable housing proposal.

- All matters other than means of access are reserved, and no mechanism exists to bind a permission to the principles and 'promises' made in the illustrative drawings and the Design and Access Statement. Therefore, the local planning authority cannot be confident that the proposal will deliver sustainably designed development*

3 For the reasons set out in Section 4 of the report, cumulatively with other committed developments at Callington Road and Plymouth Road and other potential developments coming forward, the development is likely to have adverse impacts on the transport network, especially in the following locations:

- a) Godolphin (Abbey Bridge) junction*
- b) Bedford Square junction*
- c) Drakes Statue junction*
- d) Pixon Lane/ A386 junction*
- e) Morrisons Junction*
- f) Tiddy Brook junction*
- g) Anderton Lane/A386 junction*
- h) Pixon Lane/Whitchurch Road junction*
- i) Anderton Lane/Whitchurch Road junction*
- j) Whitchurch Road which, practically, operates as a single lane road with passing places.*

The applicant has not carried out any assessment at all of b-j above, despite demonstrating that significant amounts of the development's traffic will pass along these routes and through these junctions. It should be noted that the Town Council believes that the applicants have severely underestimated the amount of traffic generated by the development (115 vehicles per hour rather than the applicants' 75 vph). Consequently, the application contains no proposals to mitigate the impact on these junctions, including potentially 'severe' impacts on junction a) above and on the Mount Tavy Road/Stannary Road junction. It is, therefore, contrary to paragraph 116 of the 2024 NPPF, Policy TR6 of the draft NPPF (December 2025) and policy DEV29 of the JLP.

The Town Council requests the County Council to require the applicant to reassess their trip generation rates and to prepare full assessments of the impact of their development (along with other committed and potential developments) on the junctions set out above.

4 The applicants seriously underestimate the impact of the development on the highway network in a number of ways.

- *The Transport Assessment grossly overestimates the potential for pedestrian movements during the peak hours – these should be reassigned to other modes*
- *The bus service is less than adequate and the proposal to reroute the service through roads 5.5 metres in width (rather than 6 metres) is unacceptable*
- *The Transport Assessment erroneously assigns considerable movements to Vigo Bridge Road. These should be reassigned to the A386(S)*
- *The traffic surveys were carried out in an atypical month - November*
- *The TEMPro Model does not take account of the level of growth required by the NPPF*
- *The TRICS vehicle trip rates used are seriously underestimated and should be closer to 0.8 rather than 0.5.*

Thus, the Town Council believes that the Transport Assessment's conclusions cannot be relied on and are unsafe, grossly understating the impact of the development on the town's fragile highway system.

- 5 *If the applicants were to correct the error relating to Vigo Bridge Road, reassign the pedestrian movements to car movements and select more appropriate trip rates, then the impacts on junction A and the Mount Tavy Road/Stannary Bridge Road junctions would treble, leading to gridlock. This would bring the development's impact into the 'severe' category. This alone merits refusal in terms of paragraph 116 of the NPPF.*

- 6 *The applicants have not assessed the potential for harmful impact of this development (cumulatively with other committed and potential developments) on:*

- *The vitality and viability of the Town Centre*
- *The fabric of the World Heritage Site (including recent public enhancements). This is an asset of "the highest significance ... internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value" (paragraph 202 of the NPPF)*

Specifically, the applicants have not explored the potential for harm caused to the World Heritage site at the B3357 Mount Tavy Road/ A386 Stannary Bridge Road T-junction and the Godolphin roundabout junctions both of which already exceed their theoretical capacity. Furthermore, the applicant has put forward no proposals to mitigate that harm, contrary to paragraphs 212 et seq of the NPPF.

A7 The Town Council objects to the application on the grounds that it has not been demonstrated that suitable provision has been made for:

- Sewage disposal and treatment*

- ii. *Primary and SEND education*
- iii. *Primary Health Care - general practices, community pharmacies, dentists.*
- iv. *Local bus services*
- v. *Public open space and recreation*

B

- 1 *To advise Full Council at its meeting of July 28th, 2026, that Devon County Council, in consultation with West Devon Borough Council, has agreed to prepare an Appraisal and Access Strategy for Tavistock. This is intended to inform the new Local Plan being prepared by WDBC and to assist in assessing the individual and cumulative impact of major development proposals.*
- 2 *To request the Town Clerk to welcome the development of this strategy and to request Devon County Council to involve Tavistock Town Council in the development of the strategy, to enable appropriate policies and guidance to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan review, ahead of the adoption of a new Local Plan for West Devon.*

- C To advise Full Council at its meeting of July 28th, 2026, to request WDBC, if that Council is inclined to approve the application, to impose the following condition:*

"Submissions for approval of any reserved matter must be made not later than the expiration of 18 months beginning with the date of grant of outline planning permission.

The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates:

- (i) the expiration of two and a half years from the date of the grant of outline planning permission; or if later*
- (ii) the expiration of one year from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.*

Reason: To comply with Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to ensure that the development will contribute to reducing the shortfall in West Devon's 5-year housing land supply"

Noted that in the discussion arising reference was made, variously to potential adverse impacts on local transport infrastructure, connectivity, issues with drafting, the cumulative impact of development proposals, potential survey work by the Highway authority and the importance attached to Town Council involvement.

ii) **Application No. 0491/26/OPA** (Minute No 71 refers (Green Hill).

RESOLVED THAT an objection be raised to the application for the following reasons:

A

- 1 *The application should be withdrawn or refused in order to give the applicant the opportunity to synchronise the documentation relating to the application which currently comprises 12 documents stating, variously, that the proposal is for 43, 48, 60 or 65 houses.*
- 2 *The Town Council accepts that the proposal is located in the built-up area. However, that does not absolve the applicant from having to demonstrate that the proposal is one for sustainable development, in accordance with paragraph 11 of the NPPF and, inter alia policies SPT1, SPT2, TTV1 and TTV2 of the JLP which are up to date, and which carry full statutory weight. The applicant has signally failed to do so, as set out in Section 3 of the attached report.*
- 3 *The proposal does not constitute sustainable development for the reasons below and set out in detail in Section 3 of the attached report .*
 - *The site is in an unsustainable location which encourages the use of the private car. There is no safe and easy pedestrian or cycle access between the site and the services of Tavistock Town Centre, schools and other community facilities and services and the application contains no measures to mitigate this. The proposal also makes it difficult for bus services to operate. It is, therefore in conflict with policy DEV10 of the JLP and with the policies and principles of the NPPF, especially para 110.*
 - *The proposal does not incorporate proposals to meet the affordable housing required by JLP policy DEV8, which remains up to date, and which carries full statutory weight. (Indeed, confusingly, the applicant states in the application form that there is to be no housing on the site at all)*
 - *All matters other than means of access are reserved, and no mechanism exists to bind a permission to the principles and 'promises' made in the illustrative drawings and the Design and Access Statement. Therefore, the local planning authority cannot be confident that the proposal will deliver sustainably designed development.*
 - *The flood risk assessment, which assesses the impact of a development of 43 houses, is inadequate to demonstrate that the development, separately or in combination with the proposed development at Violet Lane, is capable of mitigating the risk of flooding downstream*

It follows that neither the presumption in favour of sustainable development nor the 'tilted balance' applies and, since the applicant has shown no material considerations why the conflict with the NPPF and with JLP policies SPT1, SPT2, TTV1 and TTV2 should be set aside, the application should be refused

- 4 *For the reasons set out in Section 4 of the attached report, cumulatively with other committed developments at Callington Road and Plymouth Road and other potential developments coming forward, the development is likely to have adverse impacts on the transport network, especially in the following locations:*

*k) Godolphin (Abbey Bridge) junction
l) Bedford Square junction
m) Drakes Statue junction
n) Pixon Lane/ A386 junction
o) Morrisons Junction
p) Tiddy Brook junction
q) Anderton Lane/A386 junction
r) Pixon Lane/Whitchurch Road junction
s) Anderton Lane/Whitchurch Road junction
t) Whitchurch Road which, practically, operates as a single lane road with passing places.*

The applicant has not carried out any assessment of these roads and locations, despite indicating that significant amounts of the development's traffic will pass along these routes and through these junctions.

Consequently, the application contains no proposals to mitigate the impact on these junctions, including potentially 'severe' impacts on junctions a), b), c) d)and e) above and on the Mount Tavy Road/Stannary Road junction. It is, therefore, contrary to paragraph 116 of the 2024 NPPF, Policy TR6 of the draft NPPF (December 2025) and policy DEV29 of the JLP.

- 5 *The Town Council believes that the applicant has severely underestimated the amount of traffic generated by the development
Consequently:*

- In the morning peak, 47 vehicles per hour as opposed to the applicant's estimate of 28 vehicles per hour.*
- In the evening peak, 38 vehicles per hour as opposed to the applicant's estimate of 22 vehicles per hour*

The explanation for this underestimate is as follows:

- The Transport Assessment assesses the impact of a development of up to 60 houses. This is not consistent with the description of development (up to 65 houses) on the application form.*

- *The Transport Assessment grossly overestimates the potential for pedestrian movements during the peak hours – these should be reassigned to other modes*
- *The TEMPro Model does not take account of the level of growth required by the NPPF*
- *The TRICS vehicle trip rates used are seriously underestimated and should be closer to 0.8 vehicles per hour than 0.5.*

Thus, the Town Council believes that the Transport Assessment's conclusions cannot be relied on and are unsafe, grossly understating the impact of the development on the town's fragile highway system.

- 6 *The applicants have not assessed the potential for harmful impact of the traffic generated by this development (cumulatively with other committed and potential developments) on:*

- *The vitality and viability of the Town Centre*
- *The fabric of the World Heritage Site (including recent public enhancements). This is an asset of "the highest significance ... internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value" (paragraph 202 of the NPPF)*

Specifically, the applicants have not explored the potential for harm caused to the World Heritage site at the B3357 Mount Tavy Road/ A386 Stannary Bridge Road T-junction and the Godolphin roundabout junctions both of which already exceed their theoretical capacity. Furthermore, the applicant has put forward no proposals to mitigate that harm, contrary to paragraphs 212 et seq of the NPPF.

- 7 *For the reasons set out in Section 5 of the attached report, the Town Council objects to the application on the grounds that it has not been demonstrated that suitable provision has been made for:*

- i. Sewage disposal and treatment*
- ii. Primary and SEND education*
- iii. Primary Health Care - general practices, community pharmacies, dentists.*
- iv. Local bus services*
- v. Public open space and recreation*

- 8 *On balance, the public benefits do not outweigh the harm caused by the proposal, including harm to the World Heritage Site and the Conservation Area, which should be accorded considerable weight. The Town Council, therefore, objects to the harm that the proposal will cause to Heritage Assets of the greatest significance*

B *To request the Town Clerk:*

- 1 *To ask Devon County Council to involve Tavistock Town Council in the development of the Tavistock Traffic Appraisal and Access Strategy, in order to enable appropriate policies and guidance to be*

included in the Neighbourhood Plan review, ahead of the adoption of a new Local Plan for West Devon & South Hams.

- 2 *To ask West Devon Borough Council, if it is minded to approve the application, to delay the decision until DCC has completed the Tavistock Traffic Appraisal and Access Strategy.*

- 3 *To request WDBC, if it is minded to approve the application, to impose the following condition:*

"Submissions for approval of any reserved matter must be made not later than the expiration of 18 months beginning with the date of grant of outline planning permission.

The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates:

(i) the expiration of two and a half years from the date of the grant of outline planning permission; or if later

(ii) the expiration of one year from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: To comply with Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to ensure that the development will contribute to reducing the shortfall in West Devon's 5-year housing land supply"

Noted that

- information from a Member setting out views and prospective approaches had previously been circulated;
- in the discussion arising concerns in relation to the proposal were expressed including, but not limited to, accuracy (number of units), location, accessibility (pedestrian, vehicular, public transport), traffic volumes (and dependency on associated robust survey work), the views of some other consultees and related matters;
- Councillor J Moody (Deputy Mayor) declared an interest by virtue of serving on the Borough Development Management and Licensing Committee and left the Meeting whilst Minute No 101 was discussed.

ITEMS CIRCULATED FOR INFORMATION ONLY

102. SERVICE REPORTS

The Council received, for information, the Reports of the General Manager, and the Managers of the Pannier Market, Works Department and Town Hall & Butchers' Hall (Appendices 7 - 10 refer).

- i. General Managers Report (Appendix 7);
- ii. Pannier Market Report (Appendix 8);
- iii. Works Department (Appendix 9);
- iv. Town Hall & Butchers' Hall Report (Appendix 10).

Noted that

- items (ii) – (iii) above refer – reference was made to the work of staff with particular reference to public conveniences, recent Canal cleaning, and more generally adverse weather conditions;
- Councillor A Lewis left the Meeting at the commencement of (ii) above.

103. FINANCE & OTHER MATTERS

The Council received, for information, the following: -

- a) Report of the Administration Office (Appendix 11);
Noted That reference was drawn to attendance at two recent (and one prospective) training event(s) by the Mayor not yet listed.
- b) The following Member update or feedback was brought forward:
 - i. Representatives on outside bodies:
 - Report was made of a positive recent meeting of the Oke Rail Forum and associated long term goals;.
 - ii. Feedback from Members following their attendance at any training sessions:
 - A member reported attendance at Managing Conflict in Meetings training, which was well attended/received.

104. TO RECEIVE SUCH COMMUNICATIONS OR REPORTS AS MAY BE SUBMITTED BY THE TOWN MAYOR

None were submitted

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

105. PUBLIC BODIES (ADMISSION TO MEETINGS) ACT 1960

Pursuant to Section 1(2) of the Public Bodies Admission to Meetings Act 1960, and having regard to the confidential nature of the business to be transacted it was:-

RESOLVED THAT the Press and Public be excluded from the Meeting for the following items of business.

CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS REQUIRING A DECISION

106. BUDGET & POLICY COMMITTEE (CONTINUED)

(**CONFIDENTIAL** by virtue of relating to legal and/or commercial matters, staffing and/or the financial or business affairs of person or persons other than the Council).

The Council received and considered Minute No's. 88 & 91-94 of the Meeting of the Budget & Policy Committee (Appendix 4 refers) held on Tuesday 14th July, 2026.

RESOLVED THAT subject to the addition by way of a new section (c) to recommendation 88 to the effect that:

'(c) should opportunity for assignment arise prior to/in line with the foregoing timeframe then recommendations (a) – (b) above be waived in favour of assignment'

the Recommendations included in the foregoing report of the Budget and Policy Committee be approved and adopted.

Noted That

- Minute No 88 (above) refers - the Clerk noted the importance attached to normal commercial/good practice in the management of the Council's estate.
- Minute No 91 refers – in response to a question an outline was provided of both the general and more specific aspects of recruitment/retention.

The Council then proceeded to consider Budget and Policy Committee Minute No's 88 and 89 arising from which, in the absence of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor and at the request of the Meeting, Councillor S Hipsey was elected to take the Chair for the conduct of these two items only.

A. Minute No 89 (Communications with West Devon Borough Council)

All Members of Council had been requested to bring with them, to the Meeting, a copy of the report as submitted to the last Meeting of the Budget and Policy Committee which set out various of the issues and implications associated with this matter.

The Council further received:

- a) an oral update, with reference to the report, outlining the: impediments/issues encountered in opening and maintaining channels of communication at the first tier which, it appeared, had now been closed off;
- b) for information, opportunity to review a note of a meeting with an officer at the second tier on operational matters, and which had been agreed by the parties, together with an overview of same. In particular note was taken of a progress update regarding a premises transfer that was in hand;
- c) Outstanding matters, that had been reserved to/by Council, in connection with conduct, attitude, behaviour, professionalism and reasonable expectation as regarding partnership working in the public sector (for landlord tenant matters see next item ((B) below)).

There followed a discussion, pursuant to and informed by Minute No 53 and prior reports regarding current position, direction of travel and next steps, potential origins, including consensus that the outstanding matters (c) above refers, be addressed so as to move forward. Concerns and the terms used previously to describe the tone, style and content of communications received were articulated with disappointment.

Inasmuch as matters could be addressed, the potential for second tier meetings was welcomed together with a potential change of approach from the principal authority following a recent officer meeting, which would hopefully now lead toward a necessary prioritisation of community interests and rebalancing toward proper relations.

The central importance attached by the Town Council to collegiate, professional, constructive and collaborative relationships was reiterated.

RESOLVED THAT Tavistock Town Council

- a) Instruct the Town Clerk to explore the issues outlined above, (and those arising regarding Minute 90 below as/if appropriate);
- b) Endorse and welcome the opportunity of regular meetings and progress same;
- c) To build relationships and create opportunities for the collegiate development and delivery of effective, efficient and economic public services working with Town Councils in the Borough, and to promote and afford opportunity for meaningful involvement, engagement and exchange of views on matters affecting their communities and place, this Council formally requests that West Devon Borough Council hold quarterly meetings with the Mayors and Clerks of the larger Towns in the Borough.

B. Minute No 90 (Tenancy Matter - Meadowlands)

All Members of Council had been requested to bring with them, to the Meeting, a copy of the report as submitted to the last Meeting of the Budget and Policy Committee which set out various of the issues and implications associated with this matter.

The Council further received an oral update, with reference to the report, outlining in particular:

- a) the recent and current legal position with regard to the matters as listed;
- b) associated prospective issues and options, including regarding risk mitigation;
- c) the recommendations of the Solicitors to the Council regarding how to appropriately protect the position of the Council and community it served.

RESOLVED THAT Tavistock Town Council

- i) as a good will gesture not seek to recharge the Tenant for legal costs incurred to date at this time, but keep the matter under review pending the outcome(s) of (ii) below;
- ii) instruct quarterly reviews of the arrangements put in place by the Tenant with the Licensee, including but not limited to authorising such enquiries, actions and proceedings as necessary to properly continue to ascertain the ongoing nature of the relationship between those parties and maintain compliance with the provisions of the lease.

Noted That Minute No's 89-90 refer - Councillors Mrs A Johnson, J Moody and Ms M Ewings declared an interest in these items by virtue of Membership of the other body concerned and related matters, and left the room during consideration thereof (Minute No 20 refers), returning at the conclusion of same.

107. PROPERTY, LEGAL & FINANCE MATTERS

(**CONFIDENTIAL** by virtue of relating to legal and/or commercial matters, staffing and/or the financial or business affairs of a person or persons other than the Council)

- i) **DEBTORS' REPORT** The Council considered and noted a list (Appendix 12) of all those with debts to the Council dating from earlier than the last Quarter Day and received updates accordingly.

An oral update was provided in that Debtor D having brought their payments up to date.

108. PROPERTY, LEGAL & FINANCE MATTERS

(**CONFIDENTIAL** by virtue of relating to legal and/or commercial matters, staffing and/or the financial or business affairs of person or persons other than the Council.

i. LANDLORD & TENANT MATTERS

There were no matters to report in connection with the above.

The Press and Public were re-admitted to the Meeting.

The Meeting closed at

Signed:

Dated:

CHAIRMAN