

**Liv Rickman**

---

**From:** Mary Lowth [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 January 2024 13:20  
**To:** Planning (Isles of Scilly)  
**Subject:** Re: Planning Ref P/23/095/FUL

**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 Sir

I'd like to add my voice to Martin's objection, for the reasons he sets out below, and to reinforce the point that we all have a responsibility to robustly challenge anything that risks adding more plastic to the sea, irrespective of its expected degradation time.

Best wishes

Mary Lowth

Dr Mary Lowth  
Bank Cottage  
Bryher  
Isles of Scilly

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Martin Nicolle [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 15, 2024 11:31 AM  
**To:** 'planning@scilly.gov.uk' <planning@scilly.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** 'Stephen Swabey' <Stephen.Swabey@scilly.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Ref P/23/095/FUL

Green Bay, Bryher  
75m Geobag

We wish to object to the above application.

Councillors have a duty to protect our beautiful natural coastline, unless there are cogent arguments that any proposed change to this coastline is entirely necessary to preserve that coastline or sustainably protect infrastructure or property. In the proposals put forward for Bryher, all of which, with the exception of this one, have

been quietly dropped, no sound evidenced arguments were, we believe, put forward to justify the hard defences proposed, rather than look at softer alternatives such as draining any flooding efficiently or simply repairing and reinforcing the existing banks.

Again, it appears with this application, that there has been no consideration of using softer options, rather than simply going along with the 'experts' and raising the coastline with what potentially could become an unsightly 'hard' (geobag is still hard) engineered defence.

In simple terms, there are surely alternatives dealing with any water that occasionally overtops, rather than major works seeking to prevent it coming in. In this case, putting an additional simple drainage ditch to catch and return any overtopping to the sea along this stretch might seem a far less intrusive option? Another even cheaper and less intrusive solution would be to put a slightly raised bank to the South of the boatyard from the higher ground on Samson Hill and across the road to prevent any occasional overtopping in the area where the proposed geobag is sited from traveling to the boatyard. This could then be drained back into the sea.

It has been suggested that the boatyard at Green Bay will benefit but this to us seems suspect, because the boatyard is anyway in a low-lying location where flooding could occur over the bank anywhere along Green Bay or from the West at Great Porth (South) or Stony Porth. It will also be remembered that an additional leat was put in to drain the boatyard after the 2014 storms (concrete drain-pipe with stainless, one-way flap on beach).

Those living or with businesses closest to the proposed works should though have a major say. It would appear that there may have been little involvement from these parties?

We also question the lifespan of this geobag and what will happen to it when it degrades – more plastic waste in the sea?

I hope Councillors will not support unless they have before them the evidence – not just the speak of so-called experts.

Regards

Martin and Fiona Nicolle  
Hanjague Bryher  
TR23 OPR