**Comments Response Sheet**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report Name** | **St Agnes Preliminary Design Report** | | | | **Status** |
| **Report number** | **DKR6499-RT002** | | | |
| **Revision** | **R01** | | **R02** | |
| **Section** | **Comment** | **HRW Response** | **Comment** | **HRW Response** |  |
| General | Grammar and typos | All accepted |  |  |  |
| 2 p2 | GI? | Ground Investigation – acronym expanded |  |  | Closed |
| 2 Figure 2.1 | This needs a link between the site numbers and the site names, to make it easier to interpret later on. | Naming of sites to be included to match numbering |  |  | Closed |
| 2 Figure 2.2 | The labels are too small to read. Key features like beaches and the Big Pool area, water intakes, etc, need labelling | Better figure to include labels to be added |  |  | Closed |
| 4 | HOLDS - What are these? Needs an intro paragraph | Introduction added |  |  | Closed |
| 7.6 p11 | With existing sea defences | Added for clarity |  |  | Closed |
| 7.8.1 | Text add - . This is the lower end of typical values for granite, so is a conservative value to use. | Accepted |  |  | Closed |
| 7.8.4 p 12 | I’d like some suitable values to be suggested for these criteria, please. If geotextiles are specified by their manufacturers in particular ways, it would be useful to use the same approach here, because it makes the procurement exercise easier. | These will be included in the detailed design. At preliminary stage we’ve defined where geotextiles should go and we’ll include more detailed criteria with the detailed drawings |  |  | Open |
| 8.1 p 14 | If it doesn’t appear later, some commentary on the expected life of modern coastal geotextiles would be useful here, particularly compared toother methods that might be used | This is included in Section 9 with the options |  |  | Closed |
| 9.2.2 p 19 | ‘Dredged’ as in removed from the water (ie, below MHWS, or even MLWS)? Or recovered from the existing dune/upper beach formation (ie above MHWS)? The licensing implications for each method are substantially different. | Recovered from above MHWS, wording will be clarified |  |  | Closed |
| 9.22 p 19 | This is an important point and perhaps needs more emphasis: The burying of the geocontainers will be unlike what is present today, because the geocontainers will not be visible. | The fact that these are buried will be emphasised.  It must be noted that this solution will need a BMP as will need to be inspected at regular intervals and some recharge may be required in time follow large storms |  |  | Closed |
| 9.22 p 19 | Can an example or two of a similar approach being used at other British beaches be provided, to help the Planning Authority understand that this is not a completely new approach, please? | Examples can be provided |  |  | Open |
| 9.2.3 p 21 | Is this the ‘Robulon’ material? The info provided doesn’t discuss how it is turned into bags. Is this done by the manufacturer, or by the contractor? | Manufacturer will do this, added to text |  |  | Closed |
| 9.2.3 p 21 | It would be useful to comment on how compatible this option is with the idea of ‘rolling back’ dunes, given this is one of the few places on the off-islands where dunes could move naturally. | This defence is far more likely to be reshaped by overtopping waves than from wind blown dune reshaping.  The establishment of flora should ensure that the crest is substantially stable though it may contribute sand to the area behind the defence. Text to be added |  |  | Open |
| 9.3.2 B p 23 | I can’t see where the TeccoCell option is discussed and rejected for expected non-performance. Is there some additional explanation needed? | Some commentary can be added |  |  | Open |
| 9.3.2 B p 23 | No frosts on Scilly! | Very fortunate! |  |  |  |
| 9.3.2 B p 23 | How does the expected life of PBA compare to the expected life of rock mattress? | The design life will be similar, in theory the rock mattress will have a longer design life as the bag may degrade but the rock will be substantially stable at this point. PBA will need reapplication after its design life |  |  | Closed |
| 9.4.5 p 28 | There’s lots of cardinal directions capitalised. They’re normally not capitalised. | Noted, will correct |  |  | Closed |
| 10.1 p 31 | We need more identification of the extent to which construction of each option is likely to lead to activity within marine and land designated areas. Eg, does lifting geobags into position require vehicle tracking within the marine area below MHWS? Will construction of rock revetment at the E end of Porth Killier require occupation of the foreshore by a digger? This sort of explanation will be key for the subsequent EIA development. | We are not doing a detailed environmental appraisal but will consider potential impacts to designations for the construction as well as completed works in the option appraisal |  |  | Closed |
| 10.1 p 31 | What does this acronym stand for? | Water Framework Directive - added |  |  | Closed |