

Penzance Harbour Planning Applications 09-0213-P, 09-0214-LBC, 09-0216-CAC & 09-0399-P

Objections

Total number of objections received = **678**

Total number of objections that were, after acknowledgements sent out, rejected by the 'originator' = **6**

Total number of valid objections = **672**

Total number of support letters received = **8**

KEY

H	Heritage
D	Design
E	Environment
T	Transport and traffic
Ec	Economy
A	Amenity
AS	Alternative scheme supported (out of town)
O	Other

Code	Objection	Number of objections received
A1	Loss of amenity for swimmers	33
A2	Access to War memorial needs to be maintained for disabled and elderly people and ensure space around it for people to gather/proximity to memorial is dis-respectful to those who died	9

A3	Harbour wall extension will affect best local logging waves	3
AS1	Alternative schemes should be sought (out of town depot)	379
AS2	Alternative scheme should be sought (not specified)	101
AS3	Centre proposal at Newlyn harbour and use a Roll On - Roll Off Ferry	3
AS4	Alternatives should be studied in wider context of the sustainable development of Penzance as a whole	4
AS5	Use a twin-hull catamaran - faster and cheaper	3
D1	Development not in keeping with character of surroundings, bad design	393
D2	Development not sturdy enough to cope with storms etc.	7
D3	Development in wrong place, storms could harm vessels and containers	7
D4	Adverse impact on existing residential area and community	4
D5	Proposed materials and detailing inappropriate to area and adjacent buildings	14
D6	Proposals do not comply with planning policy	5
D7	Development unnecessarily creates new land at enormous cost and harms environment in process	8
D8	The provision of alternative Public Conveniences should be condition of planning consent.	1
E1	Object to loss of beach, harms landscape and natural values including views	447
E2	Marine ecology, birds and wildlife at Battery Rocks will be harmed	111
E3	Pollution from HGVs	13
E4	Recreational and residential areas adjacent will be affected by noise, fumes and lower house prices as a result of development	3
E5	Pollution of sea in bay area and adverse impact on fishing, swimming and the bay's beaches	9
E6	Destroys habitat of protected species, rock armour not an acceptable alternative, create an appropriate alternative	13
Ec1	Development harms long term tourism economy of town by damaging the natural environment and undermining town's heritage assets	316
Ec2	Scillonian is fit for many more years and purchase of new boat does not represent best value	4
Ec3	Silver Dolphin Dive Centre will be greatly affected	3
Ec4	Terminal will only be used part of the year and has limited capacity, so the masses will suffer for the benefit of the few	4
Ec5	Not economically viable to use one vessel for passengers and freight as busiest freight season (Dec-Mar) is least busiest passenger time	15
Ec6	Cost to taxpayer is unacceptable	8
Ec7	Economic case not proven - no proven benefit to Penzance	9

Ec8	Proposal does nothing for remaining harbour or harbour's other users	3
Ec9	The terminal building is inadequate in size to accommodate the number of passengers and will need to be extended in the future.	1
H1	Adverse affect on heritage setting and character of harbour and Penzance	398
H2	Destruction of listed property is unacceptable	67
H3	Damages South Pier	103
H4	Ruins beauty, heritage value and tradition of Cornwall's only promenade	24
H5	Building on Holy Headland is unacceptable	12
H6	Development in Conservation Area is unacceptable	4
H7	Damages important archaeological remains	2
O1	Not enough public consultation, consultation process not been open and democratic. Consultees not been listened to.	74
O2	Development is not needed	22
O3	Albert Pier will be precluded from any future development as a result of this scheme	3
O4	Development is for benefit of Scillies only	15
O5	Passengers do not need special facilities, other vacant buildings can be refurbished	16
O6	Unspecified objection (i.e. 'I object to the scheme')	40
O7	Loss of moorings especially on Albert Pier when vessel needs to seek refuge	6
O8	Longer Pier extension should be included for benefit of mooring holders	2
O9	Access to steps on lighthouse pier for anglers will be lost	1
O10	Adverse impact on Jubilee swimming pool	11
O11	Marina solution a better opportunity	2
O12	Why is Council still supporting scheme?	5
O13	Refer proposal to Environment Minister	1
T1	Traffic congestion in harbour area will increase causing adverse effects on health, natural and built environment and public safety	422
T2	No provision for convenient passenger parking	7
T3	No provision for coach passengers at new terminal	4
T4	Scheme doesn't integrate with existing public transport provision	9
T5	Freight loading restrictions would cause more traffic build up	4
T6	Pedestrian routes to proposed terminal are dangerous	4