

**From:** [Martin Nicolle](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Bryher Coastal Defence  
**Date:** 01 May 2023 20:56:17

---

**CAUTION:** This is an **EXTERNAL** email which was sent from outside of Cornwall Council's network. Do not click links, open attachments, or reply unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. Do not provide any login or password details if requested.

Dear Lisa,

Can I please give strong support to Diana Mompoloki's request (in email below) for more time for consultation on the amended planning application for the coastal defences on Bryher. I would suggest it needs to be significantly more than the month Diana suggested. The reasons are as follows:

(1) This is an important issue for Bryher, and the community needs more time to fully understand the proposals and options and to engage in discussions with the Council and other important stakeholders such as the Duchy, Wildlife Trust, and visitors. The objections raised in March 2023 surely show that the consultation process to date has not been effective (the community and others have not been fully engaged in a partnership approach to the project, and this is essential for success). We've only heard about the amended planning application (through the grapevine) and have not received any formal notification\*. There has never been any proper consultation with the community here. The proposed works were first presented to the people of Bryher in November 2021, by way of a static presentation of not very readable plans of what was to be done. My understanding is that the scheme had already gone to tender, even before this presentation, and the message was that, in order to use the funding available, the project had to go ahead immediately. A meeting was also held in Spring 2022, chaired by Andy Frazer, but again against a similar backdrop that it was already too far down the road to substantially change what was proposed, without prejudicing funding. This effectively silenced proper consideration, especially on the impact of proposed works on the natural beauty of the island, and, given limited funding was available, whether this could be better used. There was no attempt to look at alternatives. Points which were raised at the Spring 2022 meeting seem to have been largely ignored. There now appears to be an emerging local view that what is proposed is over the top and detrimental to the island. This may not have been heard. It has always been take it or lose it.

(2) The communications between the Council and the statutory consultees (Environment Agency, Natural England, and Historic England), since the first consultation have not, I believe, been published (only the Council's interim response to Natural England is on the planning website). The statutory consultees raised significant objections and the community and other stakeholders need to understand their views. This information must be made available to all parties to ensure transparency and to further build the partnership approach so needed.

(3) The draft updated Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) has not yet, I believe, been published and made available to the community and other stakeholders for consultation. This is clearly a critical document since it sets out a proposed strategy for the longer term.

(4) We also understand from the Council website that the Council has commissioned consultants (RSK Group) to work with the community, this summer, to develop a community-led Climate Change Adaptation Action Plan ([Climate Change Adaptation Action Plan | Council of the ISLES OF SCILLY](#)). Surely, this must be integrated with the discussions about the coastal defences since it's all about climate change adaptation. It will be a complete waste of time and money if it isn't.

(5) There is nearly a year before any of the proposed work will start, and proceeding too quickly risks damaging Scilly's reputation and having long-term negative impacts on the environment and economy.

Now is surely the time to fill the consultation gap. Before this goes to a Council meeting, the community, Council and other stakeholders (e.g. The Duchy and Wildlife Trust) should discuss and agree:

- (a) The longer-term strategy and how sustainable what is now being proposed will be in terms of anticipated sea level and climate changes.
- (b) What it's intended to do and how effective, necessary and damaging to the beauty of the island it will be.
- (c) What alternatives could be employed to reach the same objectives with less environmental harm and disruption.
- (d) What is not being done that possibly should be done.
- (e) The exact program of works, how it will impact especially on the holiday industry and how its impact could be mitigated etc.

Regards

Martin Nicolle

Hanjague, Bryher, TR23 OPR.

\*\*\* The above email was drafted yesterday, April 30. Council Planning notices, bearing today's date (commendable considering it is Bank Holiday), have today been put at various points on the Island. It is noted that in Harry Legg's original email to Amy (again below) he spoke about 14 days for any representations and, presumably as a result of Diana's email this is extended to 21 days. If this is in fact a 'concession', 7 days is woefully inadequate given what needs to be provided and covered.

---