

From:

Sent:

To:

Cc:

Subject:

Dear Sir/Madam,

## **Re: Concerns with the Environment Agency's proposed Portreath Flood Protection Scheme**

I am writing as a resident of Portreath to raise serious concerns regarding the Environment Agency's proposed Portreath Flood Protection Scheme. While I fully support effective and sustainable flood mitigation for our community, I am deeply worried that the current scheme, as presented, may not deliver the intended benefits, and could have unintended negative consequences for residents and the environment.

### **Key concerns:**

- Lack of community support: According to the Environment Agency's own survey, 66% of Portreath residents surveyed are either unsure about or do not support the scheme, indicating a clear disconnect between the proposal and community confidence.
- Limited flood-risk reduction for some whilst raising flood risk for others: The Environment Agency's data suggests that the scheme would reduce flood risk for only 10 properties, while

potentially increasing surface-water and localised blockage-related flood risk for 40 + additional properties. The Agency itself has shifted from describing the project as a flood-alleviation scheme to framing it as a resilience and asset-protection measures.

- Loss of the green corridor: The proposal includes the complete removal of the green corridor, with only sporadic replanting in certain areas. This would have major consequences for local wildlife, biodiversity, ecology and the character of Portreath. The loss of this corridor would fundamentally alter the landscape and identity of the village.
- Risk of sewage contamination/poorer water quality: During high-flow events and during maintenance of the tunnel (which would be for an unspecified time), water from Redruth which may contain sewage from the Sunnyside Tank CSO and/or Tolskithey Lane CS will be diverted through the village and end up on the beach. Diverted water may also contain other industrial contaminants and mine waste posing potential risks to the beach, the stream, and bathing-water quality.
- Safety concerns: Residents are worried about the lack of access and emergency exit points in the 1.5-metre-deep channel, particularly if pets, children, or belongings were to fall in.
- Maintenance issues: The existing channel is poorly maintained, and recent flooding events have been linked to blockages and lack of maintenance. There is concern that the Environment Agency can't guarantee long-term funding for the regular maintenance.
- The impact on local businesses & parking availability during the construction phase.

### **Lack of Transparency and Consideration of Alternatives**

The information provided to date does not clearly demonstrate how the proposed measures will reduce flood risk in a meaningful or measurable way. Key documents, modelling data, and the rationale behind design decisions have not been made sufficiently accessible to the public.

It also remains unclear whether alternative approaches have been properly explored, including:

- Nature-based solutions
- Improved maintenance of existing infrastructure
- More targeted interventions in the highest-risk areas

Residents have repeatedly raised these issues, yet they have not been adequately addressed in public communications.

### **Requested Actions**

I respectfully ask that you:

1. Review the scheme in detail to ensure it genuinely meets the needs of Portreath residents. The Environment Agency should present a full comparison of all options, including costs, benefits, and long-term effectiveness.
2. Hold the Environment Agency accountable for transparency, ensuring that all evidence, modelling, and assessments are published and accessible to the public.
3. Facilitate further, meaningful public engagement before any decisions are finalised, allowing residents to ask questions, challenge assumptions, and contribute to the development of a safer, more effective solution.
4. Advocate for solutions that are environmentally responsible, community-supported, and demonstrably effective in reducing flood risk without introducing new hazards.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns. I look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully,

REDACTED

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Re: Concerns with the Environment Agency's proposed Portreath Flood Protection Scheme**

I am writing as a resident of Illogan to raise serious concerns regarding the Environment Agency's proposed Portreath Flood Protection Scheme. While I fully support effective and sustainable flood mitigation for our community, I am deeply worried that the current scheme, as presented, may not deliver the intended benefits, and could have unintended negative consequences for residents and the environment.

**Key concerns:**

- Lack of community support: According to the Environment Agency's own survey, 66% of Portreath residents surveyed are either unsure about or do not support the scheme, indicating a clear disconnect between the proposal and community confidence.
- Limited flood risk reduction for some whilst raising flood risk for others: The Environment Agency's data suggests that the scheme would reduce flood risk for only 10 properties, while potentially increasing surface water and localised blockage related flood risk for 40 + additional properties. The Agency itself has shifted from describing the project as a flood alleviation scheme to framing it as a resilience and asset protection measures.
- Loss of the green corridor: The proposal includes the complete removal of the green corridor, with only sporadic replanting in certain areas. This would have major consequences for local wildlife, biodiversity, ecology and the character of Portreath. The loss of this corridor would fundamentally alter the landscape and identity of the village.
- Risk of sewage contamination/poorer water quality: During high flow events and during maintenance of the tunnel (which would be for an unspecified time), water from Redruth which may contain sewage from the Sunnyside Tank CSO and/or Tolskithey Lane CS will be diverted through the village and end up on the beach. Diverted water may also contain other industrial contaminants and mine waste posing potential risks to the beach, the stream, and bathing water quality.
- Safety concerns: Residents are worried about the lack of access and emergency exit points in the 1.5-metre-deep channel, particularly if pets, children, or belongings were to fall in.
- Maintenance issues: The existing channel is poorly maintained, and recent flooding events have been linked to blockages and lack of maintenance. There is concern that the Environment Agency can't guarantee long term funding for the regular maintenance.

- The impact on local businesses & parking availability during the construction phase.

#### **Lack of Transparency and Consideration of Alternatives**

The information provided to date does not clearly demonstrate how the proposed measures will reduce flood risk in a meaningful or measurable way. Key documents, modelling data, and the rationale behind design decisions have not been made sufficiently accessible to the public.

It also remains unclear whether alternative approaches have been properly explored, including:

- Nature-based solutions
- Improved maintenance of existing infrastructure
- More targeted interventions in the highest-risk areas

Residents have repeatedly raised these issues, yet they have not been adequately addressed in public communications.

#### **Requested Actions**

I respectfully ask that you:

1. Review the scheme in detail to ensure it genuinely meets the needs of Portreath residents. The Environment Agency should present a full comparison of all options, including costs, benefits, and long-term effectiveness.
2. Hold the Environment Agency accountable for transparency, ensuring that all evidence, modelling, and assessments are published and accessible to the public.
3. Facilitate further, meaningful public engagement before any decisions are finalised, allowing residents to ask questions, challenge assumptions, and contribute to the development of a safer, more effective solution.
4. Advocate for solutions that are environmentally responsible, community supported, and demonstrably effective in reducing flood risk without introducing new hazards.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns. I look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully,

Dear Sir/Madam

**Re: Concerns with the Environment Agency's proposed Portreath Flood Protection Scheme**

I am writing as a resident of Portreath to raise serious concerns regarding the Environment Agency's proposed Portreath Flood Protection Scheme. While I fully support effective and sustainable flood mitigation for our community, I am deeply worried that the current scheme, as presented, may not deliver the intended benefits, and could have unintended negative consequences for residents and the environment.

### Key concerns:

- Lack of community support: According to the Environment Agency's own survey, 66% of Portreath residents surveyed are either unsure about or do not support the scheme, indicating a clear disconnect between the proposal and community confidence.
- Limited flood-risk reduction for some whilst raising flood risk for others: The Environment Agency's data suggests that the scheme would reduce flood risk for only 10 properties, while potentially increasing surface-water and localised blockage-related flood risk for 40 + additional properties. The Agency itself has shifted from describing the project as a flood-alleviation scheme to framing it as a resilience and asset-protection measures.
- Loss of the green corridor: The proposal includes the complete removal of the green corridor, with only sporadic replanting in certain areas. This would have major consequences for local wildlife, biodiversity, ecology and the character of Portreath. The loss of this corridor would fundamentally alter the landscape and identity of the village.
- Risk of sewage contamination/poorer water quality: During high-flow events and during maintenance of the tunnel (which would be for an unspecified time), water from Redruth which may contain sewage from the Sunnyside Tank CSO and/or Tolskithey Lane CS will be diverted through the village and end up on the beach. Diverted water may also contain other industrial contaminants and mine waste posing potential risks to the beach, the stream, and bathing-water quality.
- Safety concerns: Residents are worried about the lack of access and emergency exit points in the 1.5-metre-deep channel, particularly if pets, children, or belongings were to fall in.
- Maintenance issues: The existing channel is poorly maintained, and recent flooding events have been linked to blockages and lack of maintenance. There is concern that the Environment Agency can't guarantee long-term funding for the regular maintenance.
- The impact on local businesses & parking availability during the construction phase.

### **Lack of Transparency and Consideration of Alternatives**

The information provided to date does not clearly demonstrate how the proposed measures will reduce flood risk in a meaningful or measurable way. Key documents, modelling data, and the rationale behind design decisions have not been made sufficiently accessible to the public.

It also remains unclear whether alternative approaches have been properly explored, including:

- Nature-based solutions
- Improved maintenance of existing infrastructure
- More targeted interventions in the highest-risk areas

Residents have repeatedly raised these issues, yet they have not been adequately addressed in public communications.

### Requested Actions

I respectfully ask that you:

1. Review the scheme in detail to ensure it genuinely meets the needs of Portreath residents. The Environment Agency should present a full comparison of all options, including costs, benefits, and long-term effectiveness.
2. Hold the Environment Agency accountable for transparency, ensuring that all evidence, modelling, and assessments are published and accessible to the public.
3. Facilitate further, meaningful public engagement before any decisions are finalised, allowing residents to ask questions, challenge assumptions, and contribute to the development of a safer, more effective solution.
4. Advocate for solutions that are environmentally responsible, community-supported, and demonstrably effective in reducing flood risk without introducing new hazards.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns. I look forward to your response.