

| Item Number | Date Matter raised | Theme | Document Reference (click arrow to select from list) | Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number | Matters Identified by Members | Action Required | Action Type | Comment provided by: | Response from team | Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column) | SMP Review | Comment provided by: | Date comment provided |
|-------------|--------------------|-------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|----------------------|---|--|---|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.1 Introduction Para 1.1.4 | We have been specific that these are policy options and not policy per se. | Can we ensure where we are referring to the 4 possible options, that we refer to "policy options". | Please amend as required | Jim Hutchison | "option" added throughout chapter 1 after the word policy. The Glossary already states that "In this context, "policy" refers to the generic shoreline management options" | throughout chapter 1 | Satisfied | Jim Hutchison | 08-Sep-10 |
| 2 | 25-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.1 Introduction Para 1.3.2 | Could we make it a little clearer on which of the various plan partners will be approving the plan - I assume the Councils and the EA? | Can this section make it clear which of the partners will be taking the plan to cabinet/RFDC for approval? | Please add. | Jim Hutchison | Text added "- Approval of the SMP2 by the operating authorities and the Environment Agency on behalf of Defra." | 1.3.2 | Satisfied | Jim Hutchison | 08-Sep-10 |
| 3 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.1 p.4 Objectives | 6 th bullet – to support and allow diversification etc. Why "support and allow" for this objective? | If no good reason I suggest amending in line with others. | Amend text. | Steve Jenkinson | 1.1.3 Objective - wording of • To support and allow diversification of tourism and recreational opportunities amended to remove "and allow". | 1.1.3 | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 08-Sep-10 |
| 4 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.1 p1 last para. | Refers to previous SMPs. | Suggest identifying these by name for information. | Add text. | Steve Jenkinson | Text added which lists sub cell reference and frontage description | 1.1 | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 08-Sep-10 |
| 5 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.1 p10 Main activities last bullet | Notes public consultation, but surely that is not part of development of this draft plan? | Suggest moving bullet. | Amend text. | Steve Jenkinson | Public consultation has now occurred and so this bullet point has left in. No amendment. | 1.3.2 | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 08-Sep-10 |
| 6.1 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.1 p7 first line. | Notes that the plan is in seven parts. This is confusing given 6 chapters and a series of appendices. | Improve description. | Amend text. | Steve Jenkinson | Text amended to "The Plan is presented in seven across six chapters". | 1.2.1 | QRG review continues on next line in column F. | | |
| 6.2 | 08-Sep-10 | | | | Wording?? | Check & amend. | Amend text. | Steve Jenkinson | Yes wording wrong so have amended. | p.7 & 8 | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 05-Nov-10 |
| 7 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.1 p9 1st para. Last line | This sentence may be mis-interpreted as suggesting issues being deferred till later. | Suggest re-wording. | Amend text. | Steve Jenkinson | Last sentence removed and paragraph reworded as follows "One important feature of this information is the responses and issues that will be raised during the public consultation process. This data will have been recorded and will have been considered to be used in finalising policy options. A record of this information is in Appendix B and it will help those managing the coast in the future to identify issues at a local scale, ensuring that views can be readily identified during the actual implementation of the Plan. The degree of effort all consulted have put in to developing the Plan is fully appreciated. The storage of issues information should help ensure that people's concerns are recognised in the future". | 1.2.3 | Satisfied with revised text in document (but note the text copied into this review sheet is incorrect). | Steve Jenkinson | |
| 8 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.1 page 8 | typo in relation to Appendix I. Should this not say 'supporting' instead of 'support'? | Review text and amend as appropriate | Amend document | A Frampton | typo amended to "supporting" | 1.2.2 | Satisfied | Andy Parson pp A Frampton | 08-Sep-10 |
| 9 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.3 p3 first para. | Notes coastal monitoring has recently started. Surely there has been monitoring in the past – does this refer to the Regional Monitoring? | This comment suggests no monitoring until recently – suggest re-wording to clarify, referencing the Regional Monitoring. | Amend text. | Steve Jenkinson | Text amended to "Coastal monitoring within the study area at specific locations as and when required has been ongoing for some time. More recently a Regional South West Coastal Monitoring programme has been established to undertake coastal monitoring on a more consistent and wide-ranging basis. Over time this will build up a valuable picture of change along the coast, however at this stage the data is too limited to draw trends and conclusions from to inform this SMP". | 3.1.1 | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 08-Sep-10 |
| 10 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.3 p9 3.2.1 | Comments that size of defences may need to increase, but no follow up to lead into the next comment regarding creating width. | I suggest a further brief comment to clarify issues associated with increasing size of defences – eg cost, land take, access, visual impact. Then on to explain why creating width might be a better option. | Amend text. | Steve Jenkinson | Text added and amended as follows: "Increasing the size of defences has a number of implications including; cost, land-take, visual and amenity impact and access to the shoreline. We therefore need to create width where this is possible in order to absorb the sea's energy. Shoreline width can be created, either through setting back defences or through modifying the approach we take" | 3.2.1 | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 08-Sep-10 |
| 11 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.3 Sect 3.2.2 | Good discussion of issues. Is there a comment missing at the start simply to explain majority of defence activities are publicly funded? | Consider additional comment. | Add text. | Steve Jenkinson | Text added "Most of the coastal and flood defences that exist have been funded by public money, both for their construction and the their on-going maintenance requirements." | 3.2.2 | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 08-Sep-10 |
| 12 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.3 Sect 3.4.2 | 4 th para – notes the three epochs. | Suggest changing the emphasis as these epochs are not fixed eg. "short term (yrs 0 to 20 approx.)". | Amend text. | Steve Jenkinson | Text amended "Policy for each unit is therefore defined over time; short term (0-20 years), medium term (20-50 years) and long term (50-100 years)." | 3.4.2 | Inclusion of "approx." would have helped more in my view. Satisfied. | Steve Jenkinson | |

| Item Number | Date Matter raised | Theme | Document Reference (click arrow to select from list) | Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number | Matters Identified by Members | Action Required | Action Type | Comment provided by: | Response from team | Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column) | SMP Review | Comment provided by: | Date comment provided |
|-------------|--------------------|-------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| 13.1 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.3 Sect 3.4.2 | NAI and WPM abbreviations. | Suggest writing out in full for first use. | Amend text. | Steve Jenkinson | Actioned | 3.4.2 | QRG review continues on next line in column F. | | |
| 13.2 | 08-Sep-10 | | | | Cannot see change? | Please clarify. | | Steve Jenkinson | Prevoious edits were made in section 3.1.3. Further addition to text has been made. | 3.1.3 | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 05-Nov-10 |
| 14 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 | Whilst we understand the rationale for having all of the information in a series of PDZ reports, much of the information in these should perhaps be in the Supporting Appendices. Indeed, in some cases information contained in the PDZ reports is not in the supporting appendices and it is not clear where it has been derived from (e.g. cliff recession data). | Consider linkages between PDZ reports and supporting appendices to ensure that it is clear from where information in Section 4 is being drawn. | Amend document | Andy Parsons | The general structure of the PDZ documents has been adapted from other completed Haskoning SMPs and was generally adapted to suit the requirements of this SMP. The CSG agreed the usefulness of having a discursive style approach to the development of policy and general discussion of rationale for the preferred plan. In this way some of the PDZ discussion is only found within the PDZ but the coastal processes, defences, historic environment info etc is taken from Appendix C, D and so forth. Links and cross-referencing with appendices will be checked during other general edits to each PDZ document in turn. | No change. | Satisfied | Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |
| 15 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 & 5 | The policy statement summaries in Section 5 appear to duplicate almost all the information contained in the last part of the PDZ reports in Section 4 (except in Section 5 they include implications tables and in section 4 economics). It would make sense to reduce the size of the document and to avoid confusion to remove this duplication and just have this information in either section 4 or section 5 only. [AP] Ch.4 contains comprehensive summaries of data on a PDZ by PDZ basis, and sets out policy options for each Policy Unit. Ch.5 also sets out policy options for each Policy Unit, the main difference being the addition of the implications table. [SJ] | When finalising documents aim to remove duplication to reduce document size and avoid confusion. [AP] Can the Project Team explain why these two chapters were not merged? [SJ] | Consider amending document. | Andy Parsons Steve Jenkinson | The team have discussed this issue with the CSG. CSG have stated how useful Section 5 is in setting out all policy in one section as an overview of whole SMP area however feel that it is also valuable to retain the policy statement summaries at the end of each PDZ document as this allows each PDZ to be self contained without needing to refer to separate section of the SMP. Therefore the team propose that the current format of Section 4 / 5 is retained. | No change. | Satisfied | Andy Parsons Steve Jenkinson | 08-Sep-10 |
| 16 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 MA maps | Not sure why Scheduled Monuments alone are included on these maps, are they not shown on maps elsewhere? | Consider the need to include on these maps. | Please clarify. | Steve Jenkinson | SMS removed from mapping | Ch 4 MA maps | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 08-Sep-10 |
| 17 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 PDZ 1 | Reads Pencarrow Head to Gribbin Head, rather than Rame Head to Pencarrow Head. [NH] Incorrect heading "Pencarrow Head to Gribbins Head" below photograph. [AP] | To be corrected. | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns Andy Parsons | Amended | Ch.4 PDZ 1 | Satisfied | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |
| 18 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 PDZ 1 Erosion rates | The table quotes recession rates etc, but I could see nothing on time periods eg. annual. | Need to clarify. | Amend text. | Steve Jenkinson | Have clarified in Table that historic rates are m/100yrs | Ch.4 PDZ 1 Erosion rates | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 08-Sep-10 |
| 19 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 PDZ 11 p17 | SEA summary - Cligga Head SSSI not in MA29 | To be corrected. | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns | Amended | Ch.4 PDZ 11 p17 | Satisfied | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |
| 20 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 PDZ 14 p13 | Discussion suggests Camel Estuary is designated as an SAC (2nd and 7th para). The Camel Estuary is not SAC, River Camel beyond Wadebridge is SAC. This is not clear in the discussion text. | Rephrase text for clarity | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns | Amended | Ch.4 PDZ 14 p13 | Satisfied | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |
| 21 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 PDZ 14 p21 | Rock Dunes - Rock Dunes SSSI has biological interests as well as geological. | Amend text to include biological | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns | Amended | Ch.4 PDZ 14 p21 | Satisfied | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |
| 22 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 PDZ 14 p25-26 | SEA and HRA summaries - further text would add clarity on why policies will not result in adverse effect on integrity to the River Camel SAC. | Additional text in SEA/HRA summaries as per text in HRA appendix. | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns | Text has been amended / expanded, based on the text in the HRA appendix. | Ch4, PDZ14, pp21-25 | Satisfied | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |
| 23 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 PDZ 14 p27 & 29 | Polzeath HTL/MR - suggest further statement on impact to Pentire Peninsular SSSI in discussion and SEA summary. | Additional text on impacts to Pentire Peninsular SSSI. | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns | Additional explanation has been provided in discussion and SEA summary | Ch4, PDZ14, pp27 & 30 | Satisfied | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |
| 24 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 PDZ 18 | Suggest that the HRA and SEA summaries for IoS are tailored to reflect conclusions for individual islands and designated sites present on each island. E.g. HRA summary for St Marys includes reference to impacts to SPA/Ramsar site on St Agnes. | Consider re-working summaries. | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns | Have taken updated text from HRA and split out into the separate Island management areas, so each HRA summary is only directly referring to that specific island. | Ch4, PDZ18, pp30,34,42,48,54 | Satisfied | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |

| Item Number | Date Matter raised | Theme | Document Reference (click arrow to select from list) | Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number | Matters Identified by Members | Action Required | Action Type | Comment provided by: | Response from team | Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column) | SMP Review | Comment provided by: | Date comment provided |
|-------------|--------------------|-------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|--------------------------------|--|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| 25 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 PDZ 18 | Page numbering wrong. | Please correct. | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns | Amended | PDZ18 - whole document | Satisfied | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |
| 26 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.4 PDZ 5 | HRA summary is for the Upper Fal, not Pendennis Point to Rosemullion Head. | To be corrected. | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns | Corrected. | PDZ5, p.33 | Unsure exactly where this change has been made, but assume done. Satisfied. | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |
| 27 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.5 Mapping | The lines indicating policy on the maps in this chapter are not always clear, especially where they overlay the background mapping. | Consider changing the background mapping to black and white so that the coloured policy lines stand out more. | Amend mapping | A Frampton | Changed mapping to display with 30% transparency. This makes the policy bands more clearly visible. | Ch 5 mapping | Satisfied | Andy Parson pp A Frampton | 08-Sep-10 |
| 28 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.5 Mapping | Add policy unit boundary lines in addition to the Management Area boundaries already shown on these maps to aid understanding of where policy units sit within the larger MA's. | Add Policy Units to maps. | Amend mapping | A Frampton | Added policy unit boundaries | Ch 5 mapping | Noted that the PU lines have been added. Would have been more helpful if the PU Numbers had been added too. However, provided the CSG is content then Satisfied. [APppAF] | Andy Parson pp A Frampton | 08-Sep-10 |
| 29 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.5 Mapping | On some maps, the policy lines shown are not clear and do not match the underlying mapping. For example in the estuaries (e.g. Management Area 3). | Review lines and improve quality. | Amend mapping | A Frampton | changed mapping to display with 30% transparency. This makes the policy bands more clearly visible. Adjusted bands in MA3 to match mapping coast | Ch 5 mapping | Satisfied | Andy Parson pp A Frampton | 08-Sep-10 |
| 30 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.5 Policy mapping | Visually I think the policy lines work well. Couple of comments: - it may be worth putting the health warning that these lines do not represent the coastline position on each of the maps - it is not clear which line represents which epoch - there is a dramatic change of scale in some cases – do the really large scale maps need to be at the large scale given what they are showing? The smaller scale maps work better. | Consider changes. | Amend mapping. | Steve Jenkinson | Introduction text of Chapter 5 does explain that lines are not the position of the coast. Additional text added to describe the positioning of the coloured policy bands in terms of epochs. CSG agreement to display policy mapping at MA scale so scale of maps not changed. | Ch 5 mapping and introduction | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 08-Sep-10 |
| 31.1 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | Ch.5 Policy Maps | PDZ 7 - Management Area 17 - Baulk Head to Trewavas - map does not reflect MR policy for Loe Bar. PDZ 11 - Management Area 30 - St Agnes Head to Pentire Point West - map does not reflect HTL/MR policy at Trevouance Cove. PDZ 14 - Management Area 35 - Camel Estuary - policies on map wrong at Rock and Rock Dunes. PDZ 15 - Management Area 38 - map does not reflect HTL/MR policy at Crackington Haven. | Team to amend maps and check for other discrepancies. | Amend maps. | Nikki Hiorns | Cross-check of all policy maps and policies undertaken with policy display shapefile corrected, and mapping updated. | ch 5 mapping | QRG review continues on next line in column F. | | |
| 31.2 | 08-Sep-10 | | | | PDZ7 - noted. PDZ11 - policy unit on map is still NAI; PDZ15 - PDZ14 - noted; PDZ15 - noted. | Please address PDZ11. | | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns | PDZ11 policy mapping has been amended. | PDZ11, MA30 | Satisfied | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns | 05-Nov-10 |
| 32 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | HRA | General | Amended report to reflect recent changes to the Habitats Regulations (e.g. Reg 48 is now Reg 61) | Please correct. | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns | Document amended throughout - updating all references to old/new regs. Corrected MH 100811 | n/a - throughout | Satisfied | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns | 08-Sep-10 |
| 33 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | HRA | Sect 3.1.1 | Refers to the Poole and Christchurch Bays SMP2 rather than Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly SMP2. | Please correct. | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns | Corrected. MH 100811 | | Satisfied | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns | 08-Sep-10 |
| 34 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | HRA | Sect 3.2.23 | Discusses IoS SPA rather than IoS SAC. Boundary of SAC (and SPA) are unclear in Figure 3.6. | Please correct. | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns | Both points addressed. Maps redrawn and text amended. MH 100811 | | Changes noted (but map could do with being larger). Satisfied. | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns | 08-Sep-10 |
| 35.1 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | HRA | Sect 5.3.11 | Add shore dock impact and mitigation discussed in Appendix C here. | Suggest additional text. | Amend document. | Nikki Hiorns | Sections restructured with regard to NAEOL and mitigation measures. Should clarify this point and align the assessment better with the formal HRA assessment procedures. MH 100811 | | QRG review continues on next line in column F. | | |
| 35.2 | 08-Sep-10 | | | | Comment noted but unsure where this change has been made? | Please clarify. | | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns | The last part of paragraph 5.3.10 (in Annex I) clarifies the potential for impact on Shore Dock, whilst Section 6 (of Annex I) identifies the measures to be implemented to avoid or prevent any impact occurring. | HRA, Annexe I, para 5.3.10 | Satisfied | Thomas Schindl pp Nikki Hiorns | 05-Nov-10 |

| Item Number | Date Matter raised | Theme | Document Reference (click arrow to select from list) | Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number | Matters Identified by Members | Action Required | Action Type | Comment provided by: | Response from team | Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column) | SMP Review | Comment provided by: | Date comment provided |
|-------------|--------------------|-------|--|--|---|--|----------------------------|----------------------|---|--|---|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| 36 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | General | Blank pages. | There are a number of blank pages separating chapters and appendices. | Could these potentially be reduced as it's adding up to a lot of waste paper!? | Amend layout of documents. | Karen Thomas | This will be reviewed for the final SMP. | | Satisfied | Karen Thomas | 08-Sep-10 |
| 37 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Main Report | General | The main report is well written and is easy to read. The early chapters tackle the issues of challenges we face in defending everywhere forever and reference to the need for adaptation is made throughout the first few chapters. | None. | N/A. | Karen Thomas | Thank you | | Satisfied | Karen Thomas | 08-Sep-10 |
| 38 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | General | Tables & diagrams | Throughout the report and appendices tables and diagrams seem to have been inserted that are not in focus and therefore hard to read. | Could the original digital versions be merged into the report? | Improve clarity. | Karen Thomas | A number of tables / mapping have been improved eg map 'snatches' throughout chapter 4 PDZs which makes these more consistent. | | Satisfied | Karen Thomas | 08-Sep-10 |
| 39 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix A | Page 1 | In the list of appendices, some of the appendix titles are not in bold. | Make appendix titles all bold (i.e. Appendix D and Appendix J). | Amend document | A Frampton | Have checked and within list on page A1 all appendix titles are bold. Please clarify action required. | No change. | The issue was that formatting of the words of the most of the titles were bold but some not. Appendix J still different, but not important, so Satisfied. | Andy Parson pp A Frampton | 08-Sep-10 |
| 40 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix A | Section A3 p7 | It would be useful to indicate where more information on consultation can be found in support of those items shown in bold in the flow chart on this page. | Add reference to consultation information. | Amend document | Andy Parsons | Appendix / Chapter locations added into this flow chart where appropriate. | Appendix A, Section A3, pg 7 | Satisfied | Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |
| 41.1 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix B | p.5 | Refers to the following table, but no table. | Add table. | Amend document. | Steve Jenkinson | Please clarify flow chart that is being referred to. | No change. | QRG review continues on next line in column F. | | |
| 41.2 | 08-Sep-10 | | | | p.5 last para. refers to "The following table..." but no table?? | | | | Steve Jenkinson | Reference to this table has been removed. | Appendix B, p.5 | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson |
| 42 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix B | Table B3.7 | Summarises comments from stakeholders, but text clarity not good. | Please improve clarity. | Amend document. | Steve Jenkinson | Note accept that footer etc formatting of appendix B needs improving and will be done for final SMP once track changes can be removed. | Table B3.7 | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 08-Sep-10 |
| 43 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix C | Coastal Processes report | Figure 3.2 (on page 18) - the legend overlaps the figure title. | Amend layout so figure title is clear. | Amend document | A Frampton | Moved legend away from figure title | Figure 3.2 (on page 18) | It still overlaps, but is just about readable. Please check OK when finalising the report from present "Draft" status. Satisfied. | A Frampton | 08-Sep-10 |
| 44 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix C | Estuaries report, Section 1, pg 1, first para, last sentence | Does the text need to be amended to reflect the fact the Cornwall is now a unitary and Caradon District Council no longer exists? | Amend text. | Amend document | Andy Parsons | At the time of report production this was correct. | No change. | Satisfied | Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |
| 45 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix C | NAI/WPM Assessment | We question the use of the term 'Coastal Development' in the context of the NAI and WPM assessments. This is confusing as the text is describing 'Coastal Evolution' - use of 'Coastal Development' invokes images of construction of new communities/facilities etc. | Change terminology to be 'coastal evolution' (or similar throughout the NAI/WPM Assessment). | Amend document | Andy Parsons | coastal development replaced with coastal evolution | through early part of the NAI/WPM assessment document | Some of the changes have introduced typos, eg for Portwrinkle on page 2 it now says "Coastal evolution Coastal evolution". Please proof read and correct when accepting the track changes to finalise. Satisfied. | Andy Parsons | 08-Sep-10 |
| 46 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix C Introduction | p.1 | Notes 3 parts, but there are 4 parts. Also helpful to clarify whether Part 1 includes all defences (open coast and estuaries). | Amend text to clarify. | Amend document. | Steve Jenkinson | Four parts confirmed. Text amended to state "Part 1: Defences Assessment: this summarises the coast protection and sea defence structures in the study area (including estuaries)." to make this clearer. | Appendix C Introduction | Satisfied | Steve Jenkinson | 08-Sep-10 |
| 47 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix D | Page 25 to 27 | The footer (bottom left) needs to be correct as it currently shows an error message. | Edit footer to remove error message. | Amend document | A Frampton | Error messages in footers removed | Throughout App D | Satisfied | Andy Parson pp A Frampton | 08-Sep-10 |

| Item Number | Date Matter raised | Theme | Document Reference (click arrow to select from list) | Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number | Matters Identified by Members | Action Required | Action Type | Comment provided by: | Response from team | Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column) | SMP Review | Comment provided by: | Date comment provided |
|-------------|--------------------|-------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 48 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix D | Title page | The title page of Appendix D calls this Appendix 'Theme Review'. Elsewhere in the documents this is referred to as 'Appendix D - Natural and Built Environment Baseline (Thematic Review).' | Amend title page to be consistent to how it is referred to in the rest of the documents. | Amend document | A Frampton | Title amended to Appendix D - Natural and Built Environment Baseline (Thematic Review)." | title page App D | Satisfied | Andy Parson pp A Frampton | 08-Sep-10 |
| 49.1 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix F Environmental Report, | Annex 1. | What is the key to colour coding in Annex 1? Although orange appears to represent negative impacts, many orange cells record positive impacts, particularly towards the end of the tables. Some examples are PDZ 15. PU 38.1; PDZ15 PU 37.1, 37.5; PDZ15 PU 37.3; PDZ1 PU 3.1, 3.6. | Please provide notation, check entries and amend colour coding as necessary. | Review of Draft | Liz Galloway | A review of the Annex I assessment tables has taken place. There are examples of incorrect colour coding. Further discussion with CSG and Environment Agency required as to presentation of revised Annex I assessment table. | No change at present. | QRG review continues on next line in column F. | | |
| 49.2 | 08-Sep-10 | | | | Satisfied that review of colour coding is underway, but have the errors in colour coding lead to any errors in overall conclusions? | Please respond | | Karl Fuller pp Liz Galloway | Re-assessment following some changes to the Policies for some Policy Units was undertaken and checked through all the assets assessed. Where colour coding errors were found, these were revised and the summary for each PDZ was reviewed in line with any changes. The revised assessment (showing correct colour coding) is presented in Appendix 1 and 2 of the SoEP, and the summary for each | SoEP, Appendices 1 & 2, SoEP - Section 5 | Satisfied | Liz Galloway | 05-Nov-10 |
| 50 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix F. SEA Report | para. 2.2.7. | Should not the descriptor 'moderate' be added to the text in 2.2.7? | Please review wording. | Review of Draft | Liz Galloway | ? | | "moderate" appears in Table 2.1, but not in the list of descriptors in paragraph 2.2.7 No action - environmental report not to be reissued. | Karl Fuller pp Liz Galloway | 08-Sep-10 |
| 51 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix H | p3 | £2500 is stated as the removal costs for defences. | This needs a unit of measure e.g. per m? | Amend document | Karen Thomas | Document amended to show it is per metre. | Section H3. | Satisfied | Karen Thomas | 08-Sep-10 |
| 52 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix J | 2.1 & 3.1.2 | Report states that landward freshwater bodies were identified using Environment Agency Tidal Flood Zone 2 maps (2.1) and Flood Zone 3 maps (3.1.2). Not clear which is correct. | Please clarify which maps were used to identify freshwater bodies and ensure the report is consistent. | Amend document | Karl Fuller | Report now updated to consistently refer to Flood Zone 2 used to identify features. | Section 2.1 and 3.1.2 | Satisfied | Karl Fuller | 08-Sep-10 |
| 53 | 23-Apr-10 | Q&P | Appendix J (WFD) | 4.0 Conclusions | Page numbering is not the same as the Contents. Conclusions is said to start on p. 14 but in reality starts on p.12. | Review page numbering | Amend document | Liz Galloway | Page numbering amended. | Contents updated. | Satisfied | Karl Fuller pp Liz Galloway | 08-Sep-10 |