

**PDZ 18 [Isles of Scilly]**

This document provides, in summary format, feedback received on The Consultation Draft of the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Shoreline Management Plans’ Review (SMP2) specifically for the Isles of Scilly (PDZ18). Whilst the full text of responses received is not 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.

| No | Comment from                            | Comments   | Proposed Action/Response   | Action to be taken by | Action taken  |
|----|---|--|--|-----------------------|---|
| 1  | English Heritage Letter to CCPL 15/6/10 | Scilly has the highest density of scheduled monuments within an LA area in the UK. It should be recognised within the document that Scilly also has the highest number of SMs at risk from coastal erosion in the SW Region, so a strategy to deal with coastal change impacts on heritage assets needs priority. Management Area 42: An in-depth strategy is recommended for the Hugh Town area and this should include areas of the Garrison including Lower Benham Battery. Policy unit 42-21 any localised management should only take | Yes all these points are valid details which need to be brought out more fully in the PDZ18 document.<br><br>An adjustment of the policy wording for PU42.21 from NAI to NAI (with localised HTL) is suggested to address need for potential localised stabilisation works around entire Garrison. | JR                    | Additional text added to overview discussion (Heritage section; Key Values & Drivers section; pp.5,6<br><br>Additional text added to Hugh Town & Garrison PU discussions.<br><br>Policy headline for PU42.21 changed to “ <b>NAI (with localised HTL)</b> ” across all three epochs to reflect need for |

| No | Comment from                          | Comments   | Proposed Action/Response  | Action to be taken by | Action taken   |
|----|---------------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------|--|
|    |                                       | <p>place if wave energy is not directed towards the Well Battery.</p> <p>NAI will have a detrimental impact upon the Garrison walls, due to the ongoing problem of sea cave formation, previous localised stabilisation repairs are considered viable.</p> <p>EH are finalising a conservation plan to secure the future of the Garrison, a very important historic site. The policy should include an unambiguous option of localised management.</p> |   |                       | <p>potential localised stabilisation works around entire Garrison.</p>   |
| 2  | Local Resident St Marys Response Form | <p>Disagrees with 3<sup>rd</sup> epoch policy</p> <p>Considers that better to start moving infrastructure now as need renewal anyway.</p> <p>Wave action on the quay at St Mary's can be seen on a video posted on YouTube [St Mary's Scilly Storm March 2008]</p>   | <p>Agree that very important part of overall management approach at Hugh Town is to consider the adaptation and gradual roll-back of the settlement, away from the risk zone. However at present, high level objective is to at least maintain the economic benefit derived from the harbour infrastructure. There is no clear alternative at present and a strategy must help to refine the approach to gradually moving the</p> | JR                    | <p>No change of policy but additional text added to give recognition throughout the PDZ discussions and particularly at high level that consideration of roll back of infrastructure and the Hugh Town settlement in general must form part of the future strategy for</p> |

| No | Comment from                                  | Comments   | Proposed Action/Response   | Action to be taken by | Action taken   |
|----|---|--|--|-----------------------|--|
|    |   |  | settlement and infrastructure out of the risk zone, including alternative port & harbour arrangement.  |                       | management of the risks.   |
| 3  | Local Resident St Martins Response Form       | Disagrees with 1 <sup>st</sup> epoch policy for 43.3 The track closest to English Island is vulnerable. Plans should be made to re site the track being the only access to the Eastern part of the island. Ancient Monuments on Cruther's Hill are not at risk as on the hill top. | There would be very little support for any policy other than NAI around St Martin's (continuation of SMP1) from statutory consultees. Coastal tracks and footpaths can generally be re-routed. Agree that monuments on Cruther's Hill will probably not be lost, but potentially high active rates of erosion must flag them up as vulnerable in the very long term. | JR                    | No change of policy proposed. Text added to PU43.3 rationale to highlight need for re-routing of footpaths / tracks.                             |
| 4  | Local Resident St Marys Letter to HUK 25/3/10 | Expresses concern that the policies may affect the viability of the island. That the policies were driven by cost considerations and concerned that funding may not be available. Also requesting sea level data.  | Considering costs of maintaining or improving defences is necessary part of SMP review. Adaptation of Hugh Town settlement is considered to be a priority and the policies have been discussed at length. The key objective is that we introduce a sustainable intent of management – in the longer term this is the best way to maintain the viability of Hugh      | JR                    | No change proposed to policy. Rationale for shorter term HTL moving into adaptation managed through MR approach is provided at each policy unit. |



| No | Comment from                             | Comments  | Proposed Action/Response  | Action to be taken by | Action taken   |
|----|--|---|---|-----------------------|--|
|    |  |   |   |                       | privately funded works may be undertaken at South Beach (but these must be consistent with nature conservation objectives)   |
| 6  | Duchy of Cornwall<br>Email Response Form | Agrees with the proposed policies, but concerned that there is no reference to vulnerability of water supply to sea level rise & salinity. This threat unique to IoS. | This has already been identified as a strategic risk issue for IoS. Will check over the discussion text and tables for reference to this issue. Add references and highlight strategic nature of risk where applicable. | JR                    | Improved reference to the fresh water supply risks has been made (although it had already been identified). This issue is specifically detailed within discussions for, Porth Mellon, Porth Hellick, Old Town Bay, Big Pool (Ginamoney Carn & Porth Killier) as well as at a strategic level in the overview discussion. |