



20/02/2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Concerns Regarding the Environment Agency's Proposed Portreath Flood Protection Scheme

I am writing as a resident of Portreath to express my serious concerns about the Environment Agency's proposed flood-protection scheme. While I fully support the need for effective and sustainable flood-mitigation measures, I am deeply worried that the current proposal will not deliver meaningful protection and may introduce new risks to both residents and the environment.

The Environment Agency's own survey shows that 66% of residents are either unsure about or do not support the scheme, which highlights a significant disconnect between the proposal and community confidence. In addition, the Agency's modelling indicates that the scheme would reduce flood risk for only ten properties in a 1:20 rain event, while potentially increasing surface-water and blockage-related flood risk for more than forty others. The shift in language from describing the project as a flood-alleviation scheme to framing it as a resilience and asset-protection measure raises further concerns about its effectiveness.

I am also extremely concerned about the proposed removal of the green corridor. The plan involves clearing the existing corridor entirely, with only partial replanting in selected areas. This would have major consequences for local wildlife, biodiversity, ecology, and the overall character of Portreath. The loss of this corridor would fundamentally alter the landscape and identity of the village.

There are also significant risks relating to water quality. During high-flow events, and during maintenance of the tunnel for an unspecified duration, water from Redruth—potentially containing sewage from the Sunnyside Tank CSO, Tolskithey Lane CS, industrial contaminants, and mine waste—would be diverted through the village and discharged onto the beach. This poses clear risks to the stream, the beach, and bathing-water quality.

Residents have also raised concerns about safety, particularly the lack of access and emergency-exit points in the proposed 1.5-metre-deep channel, which could be dangerous if pets, children, or belongings were to fall in. Maintenance is another major issue. The existing channel is already poorly maintained, and recent flooding has been linked to blockages and inadequate upkeep. Understandably, there is concern that the Environment Agency cannot guarantee long-term funding for the regular maintenance the new scheme would require. The construction phase is also likely to cause significant disruption to local businesses and reduce already limited parking availability.

