

7 Consultation and Approvals

7.1 *Consultation process*

One of the first study actions was to establish a stakeholder group with which the Mullion Harbour Study team could consult. The following organisations were invited to provide a representative to the stakeholder group:

- Carrick District Council
- Cornwall & Isles Of Scilly SWRDS
- Cornwall Archaeological Unit
- Cornwall County Council
- Cornwall Sea Fisheries Committee
- Cornwall Tourism Forum
- Coverack Harbour Company
- Crown Estates
- Duchy Of Cornwall Office
- English Heritage
- Environment Kernow
- English Nature and Area Of Natural Beauty Unit
- Environment Agency
- GOSW
- Kerrier District Council
- Isles Of Scilly Land Steward
- Isles Of Scilly Council
- Lizard Peninsular Tourist Association.
- Megavissey Harbour
- Mullion Harbour Association
- Mullion Cove Residents
- Mullion Parish Council
- Newlyn Harbour
- North Cornwall District Council
- NT Regional Committee
- Padstow Harbour
- Penzance Harbour
- Porthleven Harbour

- Restormel Borough Council
- South West Regional Ports Association
- St Mary’s Harbour
- Truro Harbour
- West Penwith District Council.

The stakeholder group was set up in order to:

- Provide a wide range of views from the local community, statutory consultees, regulatory authorities and relevant regional bodies to the study team.
- Disseminate information from the study as it came to light.
- Assist in identifying possible strategy options and their pros and cons, and opportunities to expand the use of the harbour.

A series of meetings were scheduled during the study. An introductory meeting was held on 22 March 2004, followed by further meetings on 7 September 2004 and 4 February 2005 to report on progress, obtain feedback from stakeholders and identify strategy options and their benefits/disbenefits. A final meeting to discuss the assessment was held on 30 September 2005.

In addition to the stakeholder meetings:

- Public ‘open days’ were held on 22 March 2004 and 30 September 2005 in Mullion Village. Displays were set up and the study team were present to answer questions from the general public about the study and to listen to views from the public.
- A webpage was prepared for the National trust website for Mullion Harbour, providing information on the study.
- Signs were installed at the harbour in early 2004, advising the public about the study and directing queries to the study team.
- The study was covered in articles in editions of the National Trust newsletter.
- Articles on the study were carried in the local newspaper.
- A questionnaire/interview programme was also conducted on 19-20 April 2005 in Mullion Cove and Village, canvassing views from the local tourist and fishing industries.
- A presentation was made to the Mullion Harbour Association and Mullion Parish Council in November 2005.

7.2 **Consultation feedback**

Feedback received during the development of the options from the stakeholder meetings and from discussions with stakeholder organisations is summarised in Table 7.1 below.

Table 7.1 Feedback from stakeholder meetings and discussions

March 2004 (stakeholder meeting)
<i>Mullion Harbour issues</i>
In early life of harbour, regular, annual repointing was carried out. Not carried out since the 1920’s.
Harbour under pressure not just from waves hitting the harbour, but also from water drawn out between waves during heavy storms.

High maintenance costs, cost of maintenance disproportionate to income received, insurance costs.
Sustaining the 'working' aspects of the harbour if not the structure itself.
The harbour is potentially Mullion's greatest economic asset and a significant draw for visitors.
There is a clear relationship between harbours and tourism with particular attractions being <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – a working environment – a sense of history (shown by internet interest in old photos) – activity/boats, etc
<i>Potential future uses and incomes for harbour</i> Currently fishing, tourism, leisure, diving; occasional filming, artists. Diving and fishing not a problem if well managed. Need for communities to realise value of harbour to help pay the bills. Probably only limited amount of income possible from small harbours. Opportunities for niche markets. Sponsorship of repair work may be a potential source of funds. 'Friends of Mullion Harbour' fundraising group might provide some funding.
<i>Other harbours</i>
Mullion is classed as one of the 40 Cornish 'community harbours', many of which have similar impacts on the local community (as Coverack does).
St Agnes has recently looked at a regeneration proposal that linked economic activity to harbours (Carrick District Council).
Prince of Wales piers looking at charging people for access.
Isles of Scilly currently working on a harbour regeneration project – may have data useful for this study.
Other harbours have been able to carry out major repairs on listed structures by rebuilding as originally built or maintaining outward appearance but with increased internal strength.
Agreed set of principles for repair/rebuild of community harbours would be useful.
Sept 2004 (stakeholder meeting)
It would be useful to discover the flood defences functions of harbours as well as their economic value.
Would the harbour be built there now if they knew then what we know now? Proposal was first a different size, but design would have been influenced by the geology, use of the harbour and aesthetics.
Mevagissey have spent £1.25 million on pier widening and strengthening but now looking at extensions of quay to meet inner harbours. Considered breakwater protection but prohibitively expensive.
Feb 2005 (stakeholder meeting)
<i>General</i>
In many ways the harbour is valued more highly than its Grade II listing would imply.
What happens if we have a major storm and significant damage occurs? Weakest part is the southern breakwater and if this degrades, then harbour likely to become unusable.
Responsibility for coast defence for private properties around the harbour may be an issue for NT to consider.
<i>Retreat option</i>
The option of reduction would have a significant impact on local businesses, especially if allowed to

slowly disintegrate and cause physical and aesthetic dis-benefits.
If staged retreat was an option, it would need to be implemented over a planned period.
Unmanaged retreat was not regarded as a feasible option.
Danger of damage to NT reputation if reduction options are considered, especially if this is seen as a pilot project. NT explained that Mullion is pilot project in terms of the approach to the problem and not in terms of outcomes or solutions.
Demolition might be as expensive as some of the other options, although whole life costings need to be considered.
<p>Issues noted for consideration in relation to managed retreat option included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible increased risk of flooding of the private properties adjoining the harbour. • Control of public access and health and safety would pose serious management issues. • Planned demolition would be expensive. • Aesthetics – the harbour is a much loved part of the scenery. • Navigation. • Environmental – no harbour would be a more natural option, but this may have an impact on sand deposition in the cove. • Local authorities' view – probable impact on tourism and economy but a local rather than a regional impact. • Detailed and sensitive PR required.
Some attendees noted that managed retreat should only be considered as a 'for comparison' option.
<i>Repair and maintain option</i>
At Mevagissey, the arms were widened and lengthened and work funded through coastal defence budgets as it reduces the danger of flooding. Halcrow noted that at Mullion, fewer households means this is unlikely to be a source of funding.
<p>Issues noted for consideration in relation to the repair and maintain option included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should NT ring fence income/funding for future maintenance? • Might NT be able to set up a Trust fund and improve level of information to let people know that money given here will help the harbour? • NT will constantly need to revisit and review the maintenance regime as sea level rises, although the general view was that rising sea levels were a lesser threat than increased wave energy and changed wave orientation. • Reactive maintenance regime seen as less useful than proactive regime. • Consider raising the parapet if this provides a material benefit or reduction to maintenance costs. • Consider protecting the inner corner between the Western Breakwater and Northern Quay, which suffers damage. • Consider strengthening the parapet. • Consider 'rounding off' corners of harbour structures if this reduces the wave loadings. • Consider use of traditional materials over modern ones.
<i>Major modifications/ additional structures</i>

Re-curve of harbour wall – might this increase the loading on existing structure or is it a viable option?

Issues noted for consideration in relation to the major modifications/additional structures option included:

- Concerns on aesthetics and health and safety issues with the offshore breakwater option.
- Need to consider navigational issues and use of coreloc units.
- An offshore breakwater could be an environmental benefit in terms of creating a fisheries habitat.
- Wave power generation might help to reduce wave attack on the harbour and produce electricity. Halcrow noted that this technology is at a prototype stage and this is not an option in the short term.

August 2005 (follow-up discussion with stakeholder organisations)

- Maintain and repair option is good but maintain and repair until failure option is more practical.
- From a conservation point of view, maintain and repair is a preferable approach but appreciate that there are other wider issues to take into consideration. Would like to see an attempt to maintain and repair for as long as is reasonably practical.
- Early, proactive maintenance and regular monitoring are important.
- Maintain and repair period allows for structure to be recorded/documentated for posterity.
- English Heritage would prefer the harbour structure to remain, and therefore the options for maintenance and repair have to be the ones preferred by English Heritage. As well as being listed in their own right, the harbour walls form part of the interest and history of the coastline.

September 2005 (stakeholder meeting)

- Maintain and repair until failure, then managed retreat option is in the long run the only viable and sensible way to look after Mullion Cove and is the best way forward. This option enable the community and NT to get the best of both worlds – by maintaining the status quo while practicable, everyone can continue to enjoy the place as they have been used to but a time will come when the harbour is seriously damaged ‘beyond repair’ and then measures to dismantle it to minimise visual, ecological, historic and economic interests would be put in place.
- The key issue is how to determine the actual point when ‘beyond repair’ state is reached. The community would expect NT to properly manage the harbour so that it was a robust and well-maintained structure (maintenance will need to be done well into the future to keep the trust of the community), but would clearly understand and accept that some forces of nature are overwhelming and would destroy even the best maintained structure. The eventual position of Mullion Cove without a harbour is not unthinkable.
- There is a funding issue as capital costs for storm damage works are likely to be insurance-derived while operating costs for maintenance and repair are borne by NT; and insurance cover is not guaranteed. It is recognised that it would therefore be likely that the balance point in deciding when the harbour was no longer sustainable would be determined by the availability of insurance and the withdrawal of provision of funds for storm damage works. It is accepted that NT does not have the resources to sustain the harbour indefinitely. Fundraising efforts by NT and the community to assist with annual maintenance costs are considered worthwhile but insufficient to sustain the harbour in the long term.
- If people are to value the harbour more, then it should be used more.
- The Parish Council and Mullion Harbour Association should be advised directly of the study outcomes.
- A report in the West Briton publication or a leaflet/brochure explaining the issues and solutions would be worthwhile.

The questionnaire polled 44 members of the local community, focussing on those in the tourist industry. In addition, interviews were undertaken with local fishing and tourist industry representatives. The responses to the questionnaire and interviews indicated that:

- Tourism is a dominant economic activity in Mullion Village and Cove
- Most local businesses place significant importance on Mullion Harbour as a tourist attraction.
- The main activities for tourist at Mullion Harbour were ‘walking’ and general sightseeing. Other activities included fishing, photography, boating, diving, cycling, beach activities, swimming and the annual regatta day.
- Questionnaire respondents felt that the most important aspects of Mullion Harbour were the beauty of the area, the fact that fishermen still use it, the unspoilt character of the area, the atmosphere, and its attraction to tourists.
- The Mullion Holiday Park is the biggest holiday park on the Lizard Peninsula, attracting many visitors. One of the interviewees felt that many of these people would not visit Mullion Harbour as part of their trip because they often have young families to entertain, preferring Goonhilly and Flambards Experience.
- Fishermen interviewed noted that tourism was of equal importance to fishing as a source of income and that fishing represented “a way of life” as much as a job.

Further details of the questionnaire are provided in Appendix A.

7.3 Approvals and EIA required for options

Section 2.13 has outlined the approval/consent framework. However, the different options have different requirements in terms of approvals, as follows:

- A Food and Environment Protection Act 1985 Part II (as amended): Deposits in the Sea (FEPA) licence, from the Defra Marine Consents Unit. Defra has advised that a FEPA licence would be required for the offshore breakwater option only and that a formal environmental impact assessment would be required as part of the licence application.
- A Coast Protection Act 1949 (CPA) consent, from the Defra Marine Consents Unit. Defra has advised that this would be required for the offshore breakwater option only. This consent is applied for using the same documentation and application form as for the FEPA licence, so no additional work would need to be undertaken for this, although it would be prudent to consult with navigation authorities and individuals with navigation interests (Trinity House, local fishermen) during the detailed design of the breakwater.
- Approval to the proposed activity from the Crown Estate, as owners of the seabed at the site. The Crown Estate has advised that, as their title extends from the seabed landward to the line of Lowest Astronomical Tide, their approval would be required for the offshore breakwater option and might be required for the repair and maintain and removal options, depending on the work methodology and equipment involved.
- CROW Act approval, from English Nature.

Further to the planning and legislative framework described in Section 2.13, environmental impact assessments (EIA) are very unlikely to be required by the competent authority for the maintain and repair and managed retreat options. However, it is likely that the competent authority would require an EIA and Environmental Statement (ES) for the offshore breakwater option. In this case, the statutory consultation, advertising, public viewing and

objection resolution process outlined in Section 2.13 would then need to be followed for the offshore breakwater option.