

# **Table of Comments Received on the Consultation Draft of The Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Shoreline Management Plans' Review (SMP2)**

## **Table of Contents**

**1 Introduction**

**2 General Comments on Content**

**3 Comments on Specific Locations**

**PDZ1**

**PDZ2**

**PDZ3**

**PDZ4**

**PDZ5**

**PDZ6**

**PDZ7**

**PDZ8**

**PDZ9**

**PDZ10**

**PDZ11**

**PDZ12**

**PDZ13**

**PDZ14**

**PDZ15**

**PDZ16**

**PDZ17**

## 1. Introduction

This document provides, in summary format, feedback received on The Consultation Draft of the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Shoreline Management Plans' Review (SMP2). Whilst the full text of responses received was not able to be captured in this table (due to size limitations), the file of all responses received was made available for decision makers to read and consider.

The purpose of this report is to both to set out the key comments received and to identify the actions and responses to be taken in order to address these.

For ease of managing and reviewing the comments received, they have been grouped by either general comments (at the front) or by policy development zone (PDZ) location, as appropriate.

## 2. General Comments

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
1	English Heritage Letter to CCPL 15/6/10	The historic environment (HE) is accorded due weight within the assessment. The need for recording strategies where significant HE assets are likely to be lost through coastal erosion is an issue. The use of NCERM is useful in focusing attention in specific risk areas. Identification of heritage assets at risk appears to be limited & inconsistent, a more even policy of reference may be justified.	EH were asked by EA to comment upon 3 No sites which may have issues. Perran Foundry (WHS) at Perranworthal, Crowns Engine Houses (WHS) near Botallack and Griggs Causeway Hayle. EH have replied that Crowns Engine Houses and Griggs Causeway are Grade 2, so Cornwall HES would comment. At Perran Foundry, the current PP runs out in Jan 2011 and the consented scheme represents on balance the best chance of securing the future of this Grade 1 site.	JR/HUK	Consideration of these 3 sites has been covered with additional text in chapter 4.
2	Cornwall Council Historic Environment Service (HES) Letter to CCPL 16/6/10	Commends the SMP for integration of HE issues throughout the document. HES has commented of previous drafts so is not commenting further. Full regard of the HE should be in place		JR/HUK	Cornwall & Isles of Scilly Environment Record identified as part of SMP wide action in the Action

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		<p>during development of individual schemes. HES stress the sheer volume of HE's within the SMP but consider that some non-designated sites may be of equal importance to designated sites</p> <p>The Action Plan should flag up the Cornwall &amp; Isles of Scilly Environment Record, which maps all known sites as a baseline of information to inform all proposed policies and this should be made apparent within the SMP.</p> <p>Key partners, should coastal works be proposed, should be outlined possibly in a consultation chart and possibly in the Action Plan.</p> <p>Some "typos" noted.</p>	<p>EH were asked if any non-designated sites were of great importance, reply awaited.</p> <p>Consider if of importance would be designated.</p>		<p>Plan.</p> <p>Typos addressed.</p>
3	National Trust Letter to CCPL 16/06/10	<p>Confirms that the NT cares for 221 miles of the Cornish Coast &amp; has been attending Steering Group meeting throughout the review.</p> <p>Request slight modification to the text in relation to the actual situation &amp; NT policies in PDZ6 MA16 [Mullion &amp; Poldhu Cove]</p>	<p>Consider requested edits and review PDZ text.</p>	JR/HUK	<p>Edits made to PDZ6 MA16 detailed discussion text as requested.</p>
4	Local Resident Email response on 29/4/10	<p>Report should show where money on flood defences will be spent.</p> <p>There is no overall economic summary giving costs to perform various levels of benefit/ cost ratios.</p> <p>How much are the proposals going to cost the tax payer</p> <p>Economic assessments should include road rebuilding costs.</p> <p>The erosion maps close to Truro are</p>	<p>Economics within the SMP are by definition broad-brush and cannot look at each location in detail.</p> <p>They are there to provide a high level assessment of possible affordability of the preferred plan.</p> <p>Will undertake review of discussion of economics in PDZs.</p>	JR/HUK	<p>Benefit / cost ratios have been checked again as part of response to NQRG Round 1 comments. The discussion text relating to B/C and affordability has been edited where</p>

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		inaccurate showing excessive erosion.			necessary in PDZ discussion text.
5	Stannary Information Office	Requesting that the right of Cornish people to take sand from the shores of Cornwall and the IoS [as confirmed by act of parliament 1609[7 Jac 1 C 18] be included within the SMP	At an individual scale this does not require consideration by a strategic plan such as the SMP. Where there have been historic arrangements to remove sand on a larger scale (such as at Gunwalloe and Poldhu) this has been referenced in the text.	JR/HUK	No change.
6	Cornwall Council Highways: Email from CSG member 12/07/10	Response to question regarding possible change in policy from HTL to MR at some sites: Having consulted within the department I think that the answer is that the Council would be concerned about a change of policy from a highway standpoint but would not necessarily object. Current transportation funding is directly linked to the 6 year Local Transport Plan and there is no provision in it to develop feasibility studies on the timescales considered in the SMP. Clearly the Council as Highway Authority would be involved in the solution at all of the sites you mention. However at this stage we would prefer not to see phrases such as 're design the road' in the document. It is more likely that the Highway Authority's view would be based on an assessment and subsequent feasibility studies of the best ways to deliver the transport needs of the locality. Albeit these studies being currently unfunded.	Agree with comment.	JR/HUK	Have tried to ensure that references to roads refer to a requirement for an assessment of the local transport needs and to ensure that routes are perhaps more resilient to flooding rather than talking about re-design.

**PDZ 1**

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
1	Local Resident Response Form completed at Donderry local meeting	Erosion is about 1metre per decade due to storms & tidal surge -not sea level rise. MR should be the policy for the 3 epochs	Agree that episodic events drive the erosion but sea level rise allows these storm events to have more impact on toe of cliff and for larger waves to reach the upper shoreline, so it does play an important role. Donderry considered in more detail during the public consultation period with a public meeting held. Based on Cornwall Council local knowledge and feedback from residents, HTL, MR, MR now proposed. This approach allows some form of management intervention all three epochs, with monitoring of cliff recession the key to 'activating' MR management following the first epoch. MR approach not defined or MR shoreline position, however MR does signify support for managing the eroding coastline at this vulnerable location where about 60 properties at are risk under the worst case NAI in 2105. Future position of the shoreline is difficult to predict due to the presence of a rocky platform currently providing	JR/HUK	Significant changes to the text detailed discussion for Donderry have been made in the PDZ1 document following the local meeting at Donderry.

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
			<p>some protection to the cliffs - cliff recession is very much dependent on future sea level rise hence the need for monitoring across all three epochs. Defences will be maintained during the first epoch. Cornwall Council have committed an 'intent of management' at this location over the 3 epochs. Some beach width may be lost. Strategy is required to determine how the risk from erosion is managed under MR in the medium to longer term. Assumption that east of the settlement is 'harder' and more sustainable would need to be proven - geotechnical investigation may be required to support long term adjustment of the settlement boundaries. Recent monitoring of the frontage has actually shown limited erosion to be occurring - ongoing monitoring of foreshore width and sediment volumes is quite critical during epoch 1.</p>		
2	Chairman Looe Town Trust Response Forms	<p>Plaidy Lane actively eroding and monitoring would be useful. Cliff falls in West Looe have occurred recently. River to Plaidy Lane always running water running out of cliffs.</p>	<p>Monitoring will continue at Plaidy as part of the SWRCMP. In order to maintain a more sustainable frontage into the future it is felt that a move toward NAI in epochs 2 &amp; 3 is important. The plan</p>	JR/HUK	No changes to document.

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		<p>Alternative routes to Plaidy Lane should be considered.</p> <p>The coastal path is very popular. The beach is a very important asset which the Town Trust manage along with other local assets, but have limited funding and may not be able to continue to do so as receive very limited financial support. The beach has accreted in recent times.</p> <p>Flood risk related to the drains which are built on reclaimed sand and water run up the slipway</p>	<p>recognises the importance of assets at Plaidy, particularly the beach and coast path. NAI will support continued presence of a healthy beach. It is acknowledged that the coast path may encounter re-routing difficulties at Plaidy over time but this in itself would not support continued HTL.</p>		
3	Local Resident Downderry Email Response	<p>Concerned did not receive notification of public meeting.</p> <p>Proposed policies would threaten road between Seaton &amp; Downderry, with significant cost implications. The Country Park at Seaton would be inundated with loss of recreation areas &amp; wildlife habitat as well as residential &amp; commercial properties.</p> <p>The existing defences are adhoc &amp; should be rationalised to increase their projected short life. Modifying the existing line of defences should enhance the current line of defence rather than interfere with the supply of sediment.</p>	<p>A focussed local meeting was held on 24/05/2010 to discuss all the concerns of residents and provide more insight to the SMP process.</p>	JR/HUK	<p>Significant changes to the text detailed discussion for Downderry have been made in the PDZ1 document following the local meeting at Downderry. Draft policy of HTL/NAI/NAI for Downderry west has been changed to HTL/MR/MR to provide assurance that walk-away approach will not be adopted</p>
4	Local Resident Downderry Email Response	<p>Concerned did not receive notification of public meeting &amp; 4 weeks into the end of the consultation is insufficient to gather accurate data for an alternative case.</p>	<p>A focussed local meeting was held on 24/05/2010 to discuss all the concerns of residents and provide more insight to the SMP process.</p>	JR/HUK	<p>Significant changes to the text detailed discussion for Downderry have been made in the PDZ1</p>

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		<p>The plan is based on inaccurate statistics which have been extrapolated to a point of significant error.</p> <p>Maintaining Brenton Road is the most cost effective way of maintaining a strong community in the local area.</p> <p>The existing private defences are very effective and the sea walls constructed in the 1990's have had a positive effect &amp; will last well into the later half of the millennium.</p> <p>Existing defences must be improved to keep the existing road into Downderry from Portwrinkle</p>			<p>document following the local meeting at Downderry. Draft policy of HTL/NAI/NAI for Downderry west has been changed to HTL/MR/MR to provide assurance that walk-away approach will not be adopted</p>
5	Looe Tennis Club	<p>Disagrees with proposed policies. The Clubhouse, café and courts are at risk if the sea defences at Hannafore are not maintained, requests that Hannafore is maintained to a high standard for future generations.</p>	<p>HUK agreed with proposed policy change to HTL, MR, NAI have spoken directly with Councillor and re-assessed the technical implications of holding in the short term. As this frontage is not under too much pressure, this is feasible in the short term in order to provide time to monitor pressure due to SLR and understand scale of MR required. This approach will avoid works in the short term and retain Marine Drive access road in the short term at least.</p> <p>Ongoing monitoring should inform future plans as to whether NAI in the longer term is viable, presently frontage appears to be stable, large-scale defences and expansive rocky platform give</p>	JR/HUK	<p>Policy changed to HTL/MR/NAI</p>



No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
			protection. SLR could increase pressure but it may remain most cost effective to undertake small-scale maintenance of existing defences than opt for whole scale realignment of the frontage including Marine Drive.		
6	Local Resident Donderry Email Response Form	Disagrees with the proposed policies. Considers the erosion lines shown are inaccurate, as a 5 year detailed survey concluded negligible erosion at the location.	A focussed local meeting was held on 24/05/2010 to discuss all the concerns of residents and provide more insight to the SMP process.	JR/HUK	Significant changes to the text detailed discussion for Donderry have been made in the PDZ1 document following the local meeting at Donderry. Draft policy of HTL/NAI/NAI for Donderry west has been changed to HTL/MR/MR to provide assurance that walk-away approach will not be adopted
7	Local Resident Donderry Email Response Form	Disagrees with the proposed policies. Considers the erosion lines shown are inaccurate as a 5 year detailed survey and reference to the 1907 OS maps concluded negligible erosion at the location, and this was also confirmed by a geological survey undertaken on purchasing the property 5 years ago. Coastal squeeze to due in part to the current defences at Seaton. The report	A focussed local meeting was held on 24/05/2010 to discuss all the concerns of residents and provide more insight to the SMP process.  The erosion lines are necessary to indicate the possible level of risk but they are only indicative and a more detailed strategy would be able to refine them.	JR/HUK	Significant changes to the text detailed discussion for Donderry have been made in the PDZ1 document following the local meeting at Donderry. Draft policy of HTL/NAI/NAI for Donderry west has

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		is too general. The erosion lines should be modified to remove property blight.			been changed to HTL/MR/MR to provide assurance that walk-away approach will not be adopted
8	CC Member	Disagrees with proposed policies at Hannafore as will bring major problems to the local community, who will be cut off. A new road has been estimated to cost some £30m. The current defences need to be maintained to an excellent standard.	HUK agreed with proposed policy change to HTL, MR, NAI have spoken directly with Councillor and re-assessed the technical implications of holding in the short term. As this frontage is not under too much pressure, this is feasible in the short term in order to provide time to monitor pressure due to SLR and understand scale of MR required. This approach will avoid works in the short term and retain Marine Drive access road in the short term at least. Ongoing monitoring should inform future plans as to whether NAI in the longer term is viable, presently frontage appears to be stable, large-scale defences and expansive rocky platform give protection. SLR could increase pressure but it may remain most cost effective to undertake small-scale maintenance of existing defences than opt for whole scale realignment of the frontage including Marine Drive.	JR/HUK	Draft Policy changed to HTL/MR/NAI

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
9	Davis Langdon	Concerned they were not on the stakeholder list as a representative had attended initial meetings,	Confirmed that they were recorded as attending initial meeting and contact details now modified on stakeholder list.	CCPL	22/04/10
10	Local Resident Email Response Form	Concerned as property within erosion zone as shown & will devalue property Considers should continue monitoring erosion rate carry out repairs as necessary & reduce run off from cliffs, protect properties and infrastructure	The erosion lines are necessary to indicate the possible level of risk but they are only indicative and a more detailed strategy would be able to refine them. Monitoring can help this process and a review of the erosion risk in SMP3 (say 10 years time) will have a better record of actual measured recession with which to work.	JR/HUK	Significant changes to the text detailed discussion for Donderry have been made in the PDZ1 document following the local meeting at Donderry. Draft policy of HTL/NAI/NAI for Donderry west has been changed to HTL/MR/MR. Continuation of monitoring in relation to the 'Action Line' is recommended alongside more strategic monitoring of the whole frontage.

## PDZ 2

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
1	Fowey Harbour Commissioners Letter to CCPL 9/3/10	40000 tonnes of material is removed from the harbour annually FHC and placed on local beaches. Areas of the foreshore are owned by FHC. Some evidence of new rock slides in	The information will be incorporated into the PDZ detailed discussion,	JR/HUK	Text and explanation added, PDZ2, p.12

	Polysfoot cave.			
--	-----------------	--	--	--

**PDZ 3**

	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
	Nil Response				

**PDZ 4**

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
1	Local Resident Email 20/5/01	PU 8.5 & 8.6 changing the policy on a point is inconsistent you are proposing to defend the south of a structure not the north.	This has been discussed in detail. To the south of Little Perhaver Point the frontage is entirely developed and requires management to address future risks. To the north, the frontage is unmodified by defences and is also designated as SSSI. Hence using the tip of Little Perhaver Point to provide a boundary between HTL/MR to the south and NAI to the north is felt to be appropriate.	JR/HUK	A better description in the detailed discussion has been added, particularly with regard to MR approach in the longer term and ownership of defences.
2	Local Resident Response Form	Supports policies for PU 8.4 & 8.5 the fishing industry is important as are the harbour properties to provide finance for the local economy.	Acknowledges the support for proposed policies.	JR/HUK	No changes.

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
3	Local Business & Resident Email 20/5/10 & follow up Letter to CCPL 2/6/10 & Email Response form	Disagrees with the policy at Gorran Haven where one side of the headland at Little Perhaver Point has a different proposed policy to the other and this is unrealistic. Provides a consultant's report relating to existing caves, stability and health and safety issues at the Point. Requests that works be carried out as a matter of urgency and the report be incorporated in the SMP.	The SMP is a high level strategic document & as such does not include specific proposals or schemes.	JR/HUK	A better description in the detailed discussion has been added for PU 8.5 & 8.6, particularly with regard to MR approach in the longer term and ownership of defences.
4	Local Resident & Pentewan Ward Councillor Email Response	Disagrees with proposed policies for MA08, considers that Pentewan village has some 14 business & 40 properties including some grade 2 that would be affected. Works to the outer harbour walls & headland together with replacement of harbour walls recently removed by the EA. Would provide a low cost long term solution. Also considers that sea levels were higher in the 1800 and as such should not be undermined by proposed sea level rise. There is an inconsistency in that Pentewan will be left, whereas Gorran Haven which is hardly affected will be defended.	We are looking to address and manage the flood risk at Pentewan through a policy of MR to give some flexibility in how that risk is managed. It is acknowledged that there are premises at risk. The policy at Pentewan Beach is likely to be changed to MR to facilitate a managed approach to enhancing the dunes and policy in 8.2 will need to tie in with this.	JR/HUK	Policy along Pentewan Beach frontage has been changed to NAI/MR/HTL/MR

**PDZ 5**

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
1	Local Resident Response Form	Supports policies. Falmouth is of great historic, cultural & economic importance, but with a very natural appearance & this should be preserved.	Support for policies is acknowledged. Preferred plan places great value on the historic and cultural importance of the Falmouth frontage.	JR/HUK	No changes.
2	Local Resident Response Form	Supports policies & possible locations of possible mitigation works	Support for policies is acknowledged.	JR/HUK	No changes.
3	Local Resident Response Form	Supports policies, but notes that the A39 already floods at the Norway Inn during some high spring tides. This is mentioned & will need early attention.	Yes agreed – flood risk along this frontage has been highlighted	JR/HUK	Text checked for completeness of description
4	Local Resident Email Response Form	Disagrees with the proposed policies. There is already a risk of flooding to 6 properties in Helford Village Creek, with some properties flooding with high spring tide & easterly winds. Sea level rise will exacerbate this as there are no sea defences. Could comment be made in the report about this risk.	Acknowledge that there is existing risk at this location (and others in Helford Estuary). Will review risks and descriptions in PDZ discussion.	JR/HUK	Substantial edits and additions have been made to PDZ discussion text on pp.38-39.

**PDZ 6**

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
1	Local Resident Coverack Letter 12/5/10	Coverack would be split in two by the proposed policies & destroyed if HTL is not continued beyond 2025. Please take this into consideration.	Acknowledge that many comments have been received from Coverack residents. General opinion is to disagree with 2nd and 3rd policy. Eg if the road at Coverack is allowed to be broken by the sea, the village would be	JR/HUK	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <b>CHANGED</b> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Detailed discussion edited, factual errors

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
			<p>cut in two.  The SMP team fully accept that the understanding of the underlying geology is critical in dictating how the frontage is managed into the future. Therefore a change from the draft policy of HTL/MR/MR to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR) is proposed. This dual policy approach has been used elsewhere where there is a very conditional aspect to the policy choice. At Coverack that condition is the result of a geotechnical study. When the findings are known, the second and third epochs can then be directed toward the appropriate policy. The report has to very firmly detail the reasoning for any MR and explain the approach is not to split the village but to ensure sustainability of beach and frontage. Also need to highlight international importance of geological exposures. Actions set out in Action Plan are important in identifying that geotechnical investigation will need to determine the appropriate policy approach for epochs 2 &amp; 3.</p>		<p>corrected. More detail provided as to the reasoning behind the dual policy approach. Details relating to geotechnical study requirements added to the SMP2 Action Plan.</p>

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
2	Local Resident Coverack Letter 29/5/10	Coverack is a special place, it will go, please don't let it be split in two.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
3	Local MP Letter to CC 12/4/10	Requesting comments and advice on local residents of Coverack concerns - and passing on letters received.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
4	Local Resident Coverack Letter to MP 7/4/10	If the road at Coverack is allowed to be broken by the sea, the village would be cut in two. Suggests policy of HTL	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text



No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
					following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
5	Local Resident Coverack Letter to SMP Team & MP 7/4/10	If the road at Coverack is allowed to be broken by the sea, the village would be cut in two. Suggests policy of HTL. The village represents the very best of Cornwall.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
6	Local Resident Coverack Response Form	Policies at Coverack totally unacceptable. As 20 properties would be lost, the local economy will be endangered. Only minimal maintenance would be required to maintain the existing sea wall.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
7	Local Resident Coverack Response Form	Disagrees with policies. It is essential that maintenance of the sea walls continue, or the viability of the	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		community will be in danger			HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
8	Local Resident Coverack Response Forms	Disagrees with policies for first two epochs. It is essential that maintenance of the sea walls continue, or infrastructure will be lost and the viability of the community will be in danger. Maintenance is not currently undertaken quickly enough, requiring the parish to request minor work before more substantial damage occurs. Past sewerage work has damaged land drains, which is adding to the problems & should be rectified.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
9	Local Resident & Parish Councillor Coverack Response Form & Additional Notes	Disagree with 2 <sup>nd</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> epochs policies which are unacceptable. Considers consultants not familiar with local situation & offers to assist with site visit. The mean high water mark would not even reach the wall by 2055, given projected sea level rise. If the road is lost, water and sewerage infrastructure is also lost. A new road would be needed to reconnect	Monitoring of future sea level rise and rates of erosion from the upper foreshore will be essential in refining the approach at Coverack, along with geotechnical investigations. Given the HTL is policy for first epoch, SMP3 in 10 years time will be reviewing the situation then with the benefit of improved predictions of sea level rise and a much better record of	JR/HUK	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Detailed discussion edited, factual errors corrected. More detail provided as to the reasoning behind the dual policy approach.

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		<p>approximately 68 houses and the cost of this would be greater than maintenance costs of the sea wall. The remaining road connection will be inadequate. The loss of the road would be catastrophic to the viability of the community. Damage to the land drains has caused water pressure to build up causing damage. Minor works could be carried out to protect the frontage for the long term, with regular to low cost maintenance. Houses recently given planning permission would be lost.</p>	<p>shoreline change, along with records of the hydrodynamic conditions from wave buoys and tide gauge network. Local community should be assured that effectively no change in approach will actually begin without another full review being undertaken as part of SMP3. Ideally a local strategy would be undertaken sooner and would provide a more detailed evidence base than SMP2 is able to do.</p>		<p>Details relating to geotechnical study requirements added to the SMP2 Action Plan.</p>
10	Local Resident Coverack Response Form	<p>Disagrees with the 1<sup>st</sup> &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup> epoch proposed policies. Facilities such as water &amp; sewerage would be lost with the road and the village would be cut in two. Businesses would be lost. The existing defences are not maintained regularly, land drains have been blocked under the road and weight restrictions should be made on the road</p>	<p>See response to comment No.1 above.</p>	<p>See response to comment No.1 above.</p>	<p>Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)</p> <p>Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA &amp; NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.</p>
11	Local Resident Coverack Response Form	<p>Disagrees with the proposed policies. They are nonsensical, as ratepayers they expect some interest in preservation of their home &amp; more should be done to maintain the area to encourage tourism, not reduce it.</p>	<p>See response to comment No.1 above.</p>	<p>See response to comment No.1 above.</p>	<p>Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)</p> <p>Additional text added and edits made to the</p>

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
					PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
12	Local Resident Coverack Response Form	Disagrees with the 2 <sup>nd</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> epoch policies as the village would be cut in two, several businesses would be demolished. There will be no access for emergency vehicles, parts of the village would be cut off, and the community would be destroyed.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <b>CHANGED</b> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
13	Local Resident Coverack Letter to SMP Team 9/6/10	Grave concern over proposed policies, as access to properties will be lost. Coverack is a quaint & beautiful fishing harbour & it is important to protect our national heritage for future generations to enjoy.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <b>CHANGED</b> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
14	Local Resident Coverack	Disagrees with the proposed policies. The current harbour walls are 286	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
	Response Form	years old and are well maintained. The council are currently not maintaining the other sea walls sufficiently. A weight limit on the road may help. Considers money spent on reports, investigations modelling etc, would be better spent on actual works and repairs.	There is a move towards funding going into works on the ground rather than studies, this is true, however an understanding of the geotechnical situation is a minimum requirement for effective future management of this frontage	above.	<u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  See also response to comment No.1 above.  Reference to requirement for technical investigation is detailed in PDZ discussion.
15	Local Resident Coverack Response Form & Additional Notes	Disagrees with proposed policies. Highlights factual errors in the description such as Harbour not medieval but built 1724, car park names incorrect and so questions the accuracy of whole report. While accepting that eventually the sea wall would be lost in the next 100 years, believes the cost of providing the necessary new infrastructure would far outweigh the cost of maintaining the sea wall.	Will amend factual errors. Increasing erosion pressures are reality however and we need a sustainable future strategy to deal with them, put together with decreasing availability of funding we cannot afford to put our heads in the sand, we have to be proactive as early as possible. However community should rest assured that very high importance is placed on monitoring and this information will really dictate how an adaptation strategy proceeds at Coverack.	JR/HUK	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Text amended in PDZ discussion. Importance of monitoring and adapting based on actual recorded changes emphasised in text.
16	Local Resident Coverack Response Form & Additional Notes	Disagrees with proposed policies. The area in front of the bus stop is infill material, if the road disappeared water & sewerage pipe will be exposed and broken. Access to parts of the village will be cut off, with no access for emergency vehicles . The sea walls should be extended and permission given to allow local	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		landowners to erect sea defences [this has recently been refused].			meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
17	Local Resident Coverack Response Form & Additional Notes	Disagrees with proposed policies. Breaching of the sea walls cannot be allowed in the short or long term, as this will severely impact on the community, tourism & human needs. These should override the geological and wild life habitat needs.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
18	Local Resident Coverack Email Response Form	Disagrees with proposed policies. To lose the road would destroy the viability and purpose of the local community and part of the attraction of Cornwall.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
19	Owner Nursing Home Coverack Email Response	Disagrees with proposed policies should be HTL. The nursing home has 32 vulnerable residents and would become cut off and unviable if the	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		road were lost. Maintenance has been lacking in the last 10 years			Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
20	Business Owner Coverack Email Response Form	Should be a fair balance between maintenance of heritage, habitat, & community.. Financial cost of maintaining the defences should not be the overriding consideration. Defences have maintained what is here for hundreds of years, but current ones could be better designed.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
21	Local Resident Coverack Email Response Form	Disagrees with proposed policies. Purchased property 2 years ago following surveyors report, which stated no risk from erosion but policy change will now alter this. Need to support Cornish towns like Coverack, vital for the whole community. Coverack has been viable for hundreds of years the existing defences should be extended and maintained, in which the local community could assist. Local farmers	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		are no longer allowed to dump rock around the harbour to aid protection, this policy should be reversed.			local community.
22	Local Resident Coverack Email Response Form	Disagrees with proposed policies. More than 20 properties will be affected if the road is lost as will the sewerage system which caters for other villages. Loss of the road will affect tourism for the whole of the Lizard Peninsula.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
23	Local Resident Coverack Email Response Form	Disagrees with the proposed policies. As proposed, they would impact on the whole community and infrastructure.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
24	Local Resident Coverack Email Response Form	Disagrees with proposed policies. More than 20 properties will be affected if the road is lost, as will the sewerage system, which caters for other villages. Only limited areas of	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)



No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		the shoreline erode and these could and should be protected. Coverack is therefore sustainable in the long term. Loss of the road will affect tourism for the whole of the Lizard Peninsula.			Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
25	Local Property owner & Resident Email Response	Disagrees with proposed policies. Considers that CC Highways have a legal obligation to maintain the highway and that the plan is erroneous because alternative costs to reposition the road have not been calculated. Believes that CC has a legal duty to maintain the sea wall and the road. Costs for alternative works for the infrastructure would be far higher than maintaining the sea defences.	CC Highways do still intend to keep to the commitment to maintain the walls in the short term but they admit it is unsustainable in the longer term. Therefore their current commitment will carry us through epoch 1 (in line with proposed HTL) but they accept that some form of adaptation is required in the longer term.	JR/HUK	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Edits to text in PDZ discussion to reflect position of CC Highways
26	Local Resident Response Form	Disagrees with proposed policies. It would be more cost effective to maintain the defences, which have proved resilient over the decades. To do otherwise would destroy the infrastructure, village & tourism.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
27	Local Resident	Disagrees with proposed policies.	See response to comment No.1	JR/HUK	Draft policy of

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		Inadequate reasoning given for no guaranteed support for the community. Needs a more holistic approach	above.  The SMP approach is to be holistic and consider all aspects of the coastline and what we value about it. It's primary objective is to ensure a long-term sustainable future is secured for settlements such as Coverack rather than being defensive minded and short-term-ist. We have to consider the future implications of not acting in the medium term to address the very significant risks from rising sea levels.		HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Principles behind SMP are set out in chapters 1,2 and 3. No changes made to PDZ text.
28	St Keverne PC Letter & Signed Petition [Inc 222 signatures from 171 households] & Annex of Comments	PU15.4 Disagrees with 2nd epoch policy. Considers by giving weight to geological & habitat conservation, the report fails to address human heritage adequately. The proposed policies will not meet the objectives set out for PU15.4 and will not support the community. The economic appraisal carried out is questionable and does not include other infrastructure costs, which will be needed. Until further detailed appraisals and studies are carried out, considers that the policy for the 2 <sup>nd</sup> epoch should be HTL, to prevent premature irreversible decisions being made possibly by 3 <sup>rd</sup> parties without full understanding of the processes.	Economic appraisal at SMP level is by its nature a high level assessment. A more detailed economic assessment which accompanied a geotechnical survey at Coverack would be extremely useful. But there is little doubt that maintenance costs of the walls are high given their dimensions. The Action Plan is recommending that all studies are carried out in next 5-10 years during epoch 1 and in time to inform SMP3. At that point in time we have a stronger evidence base with which to refine the policies.	JR/HUK	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
29	Local Resident	Disagrees with 2 <sup>nd</sup> epoch policy,	See response to comment No.1	See response to	Draft policy of

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
	Email Response Form	considers that it should be HTL until a detailed study of the economic and social cost of MR has been undertaken.	above.	comment No.1 above.	HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
30	Local Resident Email Response form	Disagrees with 2 <sup>nd</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> epoch policies. Concerns about the economic viability if Coverack is split in two. Loss of historic environment. Concerns over loss of car park at Dolor Point, as used as turning bay for emergency vehicles.	See response to comment No.1 above.	See response to comment No.1 above.	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA & NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.
31	Local Resident Email Response form	Disagrees with proposed policies. Considers no justification given for change in policy from SMP1 [sections of which are quoted] No adequate reason for overturning SMP1 assessment or the assertion that long term sustainability is difficult to justify. Insufficient evidence given to show	SMP is high level assessment, cannot go into the level of details suggested by this comment <u>however</u> that is why the Action Plan is recommending that more detailed study is undertaken as early as possible. Accept that there are shortcomings in economic assessment – again	JR/HUK	Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)  Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		<p>sea level rise would lead to rapid denuding of foreshore sediment. CISCAG should have explored further ways of maintaining the line &amp; no evidence given as to why early retreat would ultimately provide more long term benefit.</p> <p>The economic assessment in Appendix H is wholly inadequate, cost benefit should be carried out on a holistic basis</p> <p>Considers the proposed policies may be in breach of the Equalities Act. Even if realignment is proposed, this should not be for the whole bay.</p> <p>Purchased property in a reasonable belief that defences would be maintained. No assessments of existing defences have been made &amp; fuller assessments of hydrography &amp; geology need to be made before policy decisions are made.</p>	<p>due to high level nature of SMP.</p> <p>Importance of monitoring is emphasised – this will provide the evidence base on how the foreshore is responding to increasing pressure from sea level rise.</p>		<p>meeting held with EA &amp; NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.</p>
32	Local Resident Email Response Form	<p>Disagrees with 2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> epoch policies. Loss of Mill Road would lead to the loss of 9 properties, 4 businesses &amp; the harbour. Tourism would disappear</p> <p>The things that give the AONB its status would be lost.</p>	<p>Disagree that tourism would disappear – key values of the settlement would be protected as part of any future MR – it is only an adaptation of the frontage not abandonment. AONB is a very wide designation covering the whole of the Lizard and it is principally for its natural beauty that the area is designated, i.e. the undeveloped nature – therefore the proposed plan would certainly</p>	JR/HUK	<p>Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <b>CHANGED</b> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)</p> <p>Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA &amp; NE and following receipt of all comments from</p>

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
			not compromise the status of the AONB in any way.		local community.
33	Local Resident Email Response Form	<p>Disagrees with 2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> epoch policies.</p> <p>It is not credible that the MR policy would be more cost effective than HTL.</p> <p>If Cornwall Council adopts this policy before the detailed studies are undertaken, Coverack will be hung out to dry &amp; the more thoughtful aspirations will not be achieved</p> <p>Also, comments upon the loss of the road, tourism and the resilience of the existing defences.</p> <p>Believes the authorities will not be able to carry out their statutory functions [to supply water etc]</p>	<p>It will be an absolute priority that detailed studies are completed before any changes to the present management situation occur. If there is no evidence base to support the changes, they won't happen. The community must rest assured that objectives to retain the core values of Coverack are paramount and any future MR would not be aiming to split the village in two.</p>	JR/HUK	<p>Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)</p> <p>Additional text added and edits made to the PDZ6 discussion text following the Coverack meeting held with EA &amp; NE and following receipt of all comments from local community.</p>
34	Cornwall Council Highways Email of 12/07/10	<p>Regarding possible MR at Coverack: Coverack is rather different as the threat to the road and hence the viability of the village is more immediate. Routine and emergency repairs to the sea wall supporting the road are carried out from existing highway budgets and I see no reason to alter this commitment. However this version of HTL will become unsustainable over time and a study, with refurbishment of the structure as an option, would be beneficial. The scheme appears in the Defra Medium Term Plan for 2010 with this in mind. The adjacent wall to the south was</p>	<p>Yes agree the existing commitment should continue in line with HTL policy for epoch 1. Monitoring of the foreshore and geotechnical assessment of the cliff position will then be essential during that time period to inform the management approach beyond epoch 1. A good evidence base is essential to gain any confidence from the community that what is being proposed is the most sustainable long term approach.</p>	JR/HUK	<p>Draft policy of HTL/MR/MR is <u>CHANGED</u> to HTL/(HTL/MR)/(HTL/MR)</p> <p>Edits to text in PDZ discussion to reflect position of CC Highways</p>

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		rebuilt in 1990. It's likely that the work was funded through the Coast Protection Act under the previous arrangement with a highway contribution. A similar arrangement may be applicable for the remaining section of sea wall.			

**PDZ 7**

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
1	Local Householder Praa Email Response	Perceives that since the defences at the western end of the sands have been put in place, the erosion at the eastern end has increased. Current proposed policies will result in the loss of the Hendra Lane/Sea Meads road, cutting off property.	There is possible link between western defences and rates of erosion along the Hendra frontage however gradual sea level rise and increasing storminess will also be influencing the rates of erosion. Policies have all been reviewed and adapted to suit a more holistic aspiration for managing erosion risks to the whole Praa Sands frontage.  A focussed public meeting has been undertaken at Praa Sands to discuss the issues with the local community.	JR/HUK	A focussed public meeting has been undertaken at Praa Sands to discuss the issues with the local community.  Policies have changed from NAI and HTL to more comprehensive MR approach. Text edits to flag up possible approaches to managing erosion risk and enhancing dune areas.
2	Local Householder Praa Email communication to	Expresses concerns at proposal in Plan for no active intervention. Family has owned a property at Praa Sands for 25 years and during this	It is still unlikely that public funding of a full HTL scheme would be available. This would also be very unsustainable and	JR/HUK	A focussed public meeting has been undertaken at Praa Sands to discuss the

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
	CCPL 30/06/10	<p>time have seen significant erosion of garden towards house. Since early 1990s have been in contact with Kerrier District Council about the possibility of coast protection works to protect properties. Initially given to understand that funds would be forthcoming from MAFF and that in subsequent years a scheme would be designed for the eastern end (late 1994) to commence in 1995/6. This was delayed and in 1998 and again in 2001, ruled out on the basis of revised 'priority scores' based on rate of erosion and number of houses immediately affected. In 2003/2004 a further exchange of letters with Kerrier and DEFRA informed of a similar conclusion.</p> <p>The latest information on which the CISCAG report is based paints different picture, with a substantially accelerated rate of erosion expected due to rising sea levels and as quoted in report "the loss of property and road likely to occur perhaps as early as 25-30 years". Now therefore a stronger rather than weaker case for coast protection at the eastern end of Praa Sands since instead of affecting 3 houses as previously assumed, it will now affect a much larger number of houses on both sides of the road in Green</p>	<p>would therefore not satisfy any of the Governments required outcome measures. However a change of the draft policy from NAI to MR provides scope for managing the erosion risks to the whole frontage and could provide benefits to the frontage in enhancing the dune system etc.</p> <p>HUK agree with proposed change to MR at Praa Sands West across the 3 epochs. Praa Sands was considered in more detail during public consultation stage with a public meeting held. Praa Sands West policy may need to change to MR in order to provide MR at Praa Sands east through a HUK developed possible approach with fish tail groynes around the whole Praa frontage as explained to the public.</p>		<p>issues with the local community.</p> <p>Preferred plan is now a more comprehensive MR approach</p>

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		Lanes and Sea Meads together with the road itself.			
3	Local Property Owner Email	Garden has suffered erosion over past 25 years Understands that Kerrier DC had previously submitted scheme to defra but turned down due to priority score. Considers that with increased erosion & more properties and the road at risk now stronger case for undertaking scheme with good benefit /cost	See response above	See response above	See response above

## PDZ 8

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
1	Gary Gabriel & Associates Representative of various groups Email Response Form & follow up report	MA20 - disagrees with proposed polices, as considers will have Strategic impact on Cornwall's economy. Inadequate assessment of costs of alternative policy options. Creation of uncertainty for landowners and investors. SMP Review should not lead to decisions that will have a significant implication for Penzance.	Greatest uncertainty will result from not planning for the increase in future risks. Any significant investment based on the current defence configuration is not considering the erosion & flood risks. SMP is highlighting the need for a strategy as an urgent requirement – this will be able to look at the management options in much more detail and provide a more detailed evidence base considering both cost and technical feasibility of options.	JR/HUK	Importance of undertaking a strategy and the more detailed evidence base it can provide is flagged up by the SMP in PDZ discussion text.
2	Director The Heliport	Disagrees with the 2 <sup>nd</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> epochs	In the short term agree that cost	JR/HUK	Highlight in text that



No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
	Email Response form	proposed policies The wider economic costs have not been taken into account. The cost of sea defences will be less than the cost of relocating the infrastructure.	of maintenance of existing defences is less than moving infrastructure (and is HTL in epoch 1) but that is missing the whole point of the SMP. Many of the comments demonstrate that the long term principles behind SMP are not really understood. The very long term sustainability we are looking to achieve for the whole settlement and its infrastructure has to be achieved through a process of planning and adaptation to the coastal risks which are going to increase significantly through the next 100 years and beyond. Again undertaking a strategy is critical next step.		HTL during epoch 1 is intended to allow the evidence base to be developed through monitoring and undertaking strategy to provide better confidence in the decisions being made. SMP3 will review the proposed approach again before medium to long term plans are implemented anyway.
3	Director AECOM	AECOM is working with partners including CC & EU to help realise long term economic transformation of Penzance & the wider Mounts Bay area. Disagrees with proposed policies. The fundamental importance of the railway line appears to have been lost. A true economic cost/benefit calculation needs to be undertaken.	The most important aspect of the SMP review is to flag up the risks from future erosion and flooding and to propose a management intent that will ensure we are managing our shorelines in a sustainable position in 100 years time. This is its remit. Working with best current knowledge of climate change impacts, we have to undertake some adaptation of the Longrock – Eastern Green frontage as it is simply unsustainable to continue to defend it at all costs in its current	JR/HUK	Text edits indicate that Mounts Bay strategy is essential in establishing the extent of realignment and detail of approach at Wherry Town. It is accepted that there is not a great deal of scope for the realignment but some transition of the frontage is required. The plan is not directly implicating loss of the mentioned properties but with any

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
			position. It is the job of the SMP to highlight this to other plans and strategies (such as the one AECOM are working on) because it is very unlikely they will be fully aware of the extent of future risks. Significant investment decisions should not be made along such frontages without the full consideration of the risks.		realignment along a developed frontage there are likely to be impacts on property. Historically extreme events have proven the inherent vulnerability in having properties too close to the MHW position along the promenade and Wherry Town frontages.
4	Cornwall Council Officer	Disagrees with the 2 <sup>nd</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> epochs proposed policies for PU21.2. While some realignment may be possible [behind Western Green], there is insufficient land east of the Larrigan River as existing properties are only 20-30 metres from current defences. If these properties are to be lost, this should be made clear. Text is incorrect re historic realignment on the eastern stretch, buildings have been demolished by promenade, but the sea defence line from Jubilee Pool to the Larrigan River is still as shown on 1875 maps, except the line was advanced to construct the Jubilee Pool.	As with the above comments, this seems to miss the whole point of the SMP in flagging up the long term risks and long term sustainability. We accept absolutely that there are important transport links involved and that there will be difficulties in terms of current land use. However we cannot simply ignore the pressure on this frontage – we are asked to use Government guidance on climate change to assess the risks – this assessment has told us that it will be totally unsustainable to maintain defences and the current shoreline position in the medium to longer term. Therefore we <u>have</u> to make some recommendations for thinking about adaptation of the frontage to accommodate	JR/HUK	Edits and additions have been made to the PDZ8 detailed discussions to ensure these issues are fully covered and explained.
5	Cornwall Council Officer	Disagrees with 2 <sup>nd</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> epoch proposed policies for PU20.1 & PU20.2 The sea defences are fundamental to the prosperity of the			

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		<p>town and protect a regionally important transport corridor. Realignment of the road &amp; rail links are not viable in the wider economic picture &amp; would take land needed for employment. The criteria to determine the policies used should be re-examined.</p>	<p>these increasing risks. But it is critical that monitoring of the foreshore response and a detailed assessment of the different options and costs provides a firm evidence basis for moving ahead with a MR approach after epoch 1. If that evidence base cannot be provided, there are unlikely to be any changes to the present management scenario. However it is believed likely that natural coastal processes and an increasing amount of wave energy impacting on this frontage is likely to force the issue to be addressed, perhaps even in the short term (next 15-20 years)</p> <p>Chyandour and frontage to the west is established on harder geological outcrop therefore easier to sustain - Eastern Green and Longrock frontages are low, soft formerly dune fields - therefore are very vulnerable to both erosion and flooding. Although monitoring is important to establish true extent of pressure on the frontage, at present we are obliged to acknowledge this very high vulnerability by looking toward some realignment of the frontage</p>		

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
			in order to manage the risks and prevent a situation becoming established where a very extreme event could cause great damage to the transport routes and possible loss of life.		
6	Local Resident & Councillor	Supports policies for MA20	Support for policy is acknowledged	JR/HUK	No changes.
7	Local Resident	<p>Disagrees with 2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> epoch proposed policies for MA20 &amp; MA21 The Penzance promenade is the only such amenity in Cornwall &amp; should not be lost. It is historic &amp; a key element for the town.</p> <p>Concerned that no significant investment has been carried out in the recent past and due to neglect is now in poor state of repair.</p> <p>Provided additional responses with concerns that the projected sea level is too large, given that the rise over the last century has been modest.</p> <p>Naturally created sand dunes by the A30, at Longrock, are not practical &amp; concern that the author is expressing own view about climate change.</p> <p>Agrees that HTL is no longer possible in all cases.</p> <p>Coastal communities rely upon tourism &amp; to allow the sea to cut main communications links to the area is not acceptable. The economic cost of HTL far outweighs the option of do nothing.</p>	<p>As with comment 5 above, we are asked to specifically use Government (Defra) figures and guidance on climate change and sea level rise, these are certainly not our own opinions. We of course have to interpret this guidance in terms of its impact on any given frontage. It is clear that the whole western part of Mounts Bay is under pressure and the lower lying parts between Marazion and Penzance harbour particularly so.</p> <p>If we try to hold the present line without any compromise, we risk losing what is left of the beach at Wherrytown and with massively increasing pressure on the sea walls the whole promenade would become at great risk of loss. By allowing a certain amount of width to be used to stabilise the foreshore we may in turn ensure</p>	JR/HUK	Edits to PDZ8 discussion text to clarify that it is not intended to remove or lose the promenade altogether.

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
			<p>the future viability of the promenade, (albeit reduced in width).</p> <p>A feature of any realignment would be retention of a buffer strip between the MHW position and first line of properties. This would likely take the form of a promenade to maintain the amenity value - but it is accepted that some of the historical value would be lost. However a continued HTL policy would result in loss of fronting beach, eventual destruction of the existing defences and then a likely very rapid erosion and loss of the promenade area - hence this risk and vulnerability has to be addressed in some way.</p>		
8	Penzance Town Council Email Response Form	<p>Disagrees with proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> epoch policies for PU 21-1 21-2 The economic &amp; historic importance of both Newlyn &amp; Penzance harbours is such that to allow further developments to take place a policy of advance the line should be considered. An off shore island may also be a suitable option and would be supported by the TC. Disagrees with proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> epoch policies for PU 20-3</p>	<p>Advance the line options and the building of offshore defences / islands etc would be hugely expensive and although would help to break up offshore wave energy would do nothing to address the problem of increasing water levels along the frontage. It is not dismissed that some form of offshore structures may be used in the future as part of the MR approach to help retain sediment</p>	JR/HUK	<p>The sentiments behind the comment are fully appreciated, but again it misses the point of the SMP being about <b>long term</b> sustainability. But as with other areas, epoch 1 will be critical in maintaining the present management regime, whilst looking to provide a comprehensive</p>

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		<p>The aspiration should be to advance the line to avoid the same problems at Longrock.</p> <p>Agrees with the proposed policies for PU22-1 &amp; 22-2.</p> <p>Disagrees with proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> epoch policies for PU 20-1.</p> <p>The aspiration should be to advance the line in the 3<sup>rd</sup> epoch to allow the continued existence of the mainline railway, given its vital importance to the local economy.</p> <p>The hinterland at Longrock is the main employment Area and it has not been possible to identify suitable alternatives should MR occur.</p>	<p>on the beaches though. Any attempt to advance the line at Longrock – Eastern Green would be likely to lead to rapid erosion of the foreshore which would have been narrowed and steepened and probable total loss of the sandy foreshore in the longer term. This would hugely increase the pressure on defences and these would be technically difficult and increasingly costly to maintain. In general this type of approach would meet none of the governments sustainability objectives and it would be unlikely to demonstrate sufficient outcome measures to attract public funding.</p>		<p>evidence base that wide-scale change needs to occur and that predictions of coastal change are accurate.</p>

## **PDZ 9**

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
1	Local Resident Response Form	<p>Supports policies but concerned about possible re-routing of the coastal footpath at St Loy Cove.</p>	<p>Acknowledge support of policy. Re-routing of coast path is unlikely to be major issue given slow rates of erosion.</p>	JR/HUK	No changes.

**PDZ 10**

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
1	Hayle Town Council Letter 14/4/10	Supports policy at Hayle Requests justification for change from HTL to NAI at Harvey's Towans, as considers the chalets should be protected Griggs Quay/Causeway should remain HTL as this is the key link to the town.	Harvey's Towans to be changed to MR to address management issues. Griggs Quay now HTL during epoch 1 to allow further study to support MR proposals (or to discount if appropriate)	JR/HUK	Policies changes at the referenced locations. Appropriate edits made within the PDZ10 discussion text.
2	Local Resident Letter & Plans Dated 26/3/10	PU 27.4MR at Griggs Quay would cause flooding to tens and tens of properties - not none, as indicated in the document. The HTL policy should be extended to include Griggs Quay . Future projected sea level rise should be taken more into account when considering planning applications and developments within future 200 year flood areas should be required to produce a FRA. PU 27.5 HTL will lead to increased flooding with sea level rise and, as there is no flood storage area, pumping would have to be considered or possibly a barrage across the mouth of the Hayle estuary [which could be used to generate electricity].	Griggs Quay now HTL during epoch 1 to allow further study to support MR proposals (or to discount if appropriate)	JR/HUK	Policies changed at Griggs Quay for epoch 1.
3	Local Resident Letter & Plans Dated 27/3/10 & 30/3/10	Same resident asking for the HTL at Griggs Causeway to be further extended, providing more information & suggestions of possible schemes.	Griggs Quay now HTL during epoch 1 to allow further study to support MR proposals (or to discount if appropriate)	JR/HUK	Policies changed at Griggs Quay for epoch 1.
4	Local Resident Response Form	Noted that the stream runs out on the beach, not into the harbour.	Noted	JR/HUK	Text discussion checked.
5	St Erth PC	Expressed concern had not received	Provided details	JP EA	Sent details. 30/03/10

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
		details of the SMP.			
6	Local Resident Email	Requested further information concerning PU27.1.	Discussed issues with resident	JP EA	Discussion. 25/05/10

### PDZ 11

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
1	Local Resident Response Form	MA30 Current sea defences are insufficient to prevent widespread flooding of low lying area, if predicted sea level rise & increased storminess occur. Relocation of existing facilities would be a concern. Detailed mapping of flood extents including wave and wind action [worst case] is required.	Presume this comment relates to Perranporth. Action Plan recommends detailed assessment of the impacts of wave driven flooding as we know this is the principle mechanism of inundation of the lower lying areas. Still water flood extents do not represent the situation adequately. Some roll back of the facilities and assets will most likely be necessary in the medium to longer term. Identification of the long term sustainable position for defensive line is critical part of the MT approach.	JR/HUK	Appropriate recommendations made in the Action Plan (chapter 6).

### PDZ 12

No	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
	Nil Response				



**PDZ 13**

	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
	Nil Response				

**PDZ 14**

	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
	Nil Response				

**PDZ 15**

	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
	Nil Response				

**PDZ 16**

	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
	Nil Response				

**PDZ 17**

	Comment from	Comments	Proposed Action/Response	Action to be taken by	Action taken
	Nil Response				

