

ANDREW GEORGE MP

RCMP



HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

Norman Baker MP  
Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State  
Department for Transport  
Great Minster House  
76 Marsham Street  
London SW1P 4DR

11<sup>th</sup> November 2010

Our ref:10/16.7/ag/jr



**RE: ISLES OF SCILLY LINK/FERRY TERMINAL PENZANCE**

Please find enclosed a number of letters I have received from constituents who raise concerns about the current proposals for the Isles of Scilly ferry link and the ferry terminal at Penzance as outlined in "Option A". I understand you may have already received copies of some of the letters, but I convey this collection of correspondence for your reference.

With good wishes.

Yours sincerely,

As I hope we will have an opportunity to meet to discuss this soon.

*Items with this correspondence may contain details relating to identifiable individuals and, where this is the case, they should be treated as confidential under Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act*

**PLEASE REPLY TO:** Andrew George MP, Trewella, 18 Mennaye Road, Penzance, TR18 4NG  
Tel: 01736 360020 Fax: 01736 332866 [www.andrewgeorge.org.uk](http://www.andrewgeorge.org.uk)

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 November 2010 10:15  
**To:** philip.hammond@dft.gsi.gov.uk; GEORGE, Andrew  
**Subject:** Penzance Harbour Development

Dear Philip Hammond, and dear Andrew,

This copy of a letter sent to Norman Baker is for your information.

With thanks,

[REDACTED]

11 November 2010

**Norman Baker MP**

Parliamentary Under Secretary of State

Department for Transport

Great Minster House

76 Marsham Street

London SW1P 4DR

Penzance Harbour Development

Dear Norman Baker,

I'm writing to protest against the plan known as Option A to redevelop our harbour.

I'm sure you are aware of the issues and the tremendous tide of local opinion against Option A, so I will merely state that my objections are on environmental, traffic management, cost and business grounds.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 25 October 2010 12:27  
**To:** GEORGE, Andrew  
**Subject:** strong opposition to option A

Dear Mr George

I am writing to copy in my letter to Norman Baker objecting to Option A. I urge you to do all you can to prevent this expensive, destructive development from going ahead.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Objection to Cornwall Council's Option A plans for Penzance Harbour

Dear Norman

I am a Penzance resident and I am writing to register once more with you my **strong opposition** to the proposed harbour development (option A) in Penzance – and to reiterate the strength of opposition to these plans within the town. I attended a meeting on Friday night, along with hundreds of others, which indicated high levels of discontent with the way this has been handled, as well as presenting a number of carefully thought out alternatives to Option A designed by local experts – these alternatives plans are not only *significantly* less costly, which seems more relevant than ever at a time of great spending cuts, but also significantly more popular with the people of Penzance. Graeme Hicks, the councillor responsible for the current scheme, is on record as saying that he was not concerned about the capital cost of the scheme because that was being covered by grant funding.

As a Penzance resident, I feel outraged not only by the nature of the 'Option A' plan itself, but also the way it has been handled and the infuriating lack of public consultation, and representation for the people of Penzance. The only Penzance councillor present at the vote voted against Option A.

The grounds of my objection are as follows:

- a) The South Pier and the Battery are **key archeological and historical sites** (as evidenced by the upgraded English Heritage status). The proposed building work would irreparably damage it, taking with it an important piece of history and beauty. This is a listed building, a valuable part of the town's heritage, and rightly the English Heritage objection stands.
- b) I feel strongly that the proposed building work would seriously harm the atmosphere and beauty of this historic area of town, blocking views of St Michael's Mount and the bay and **severely compromising the aesthetics of the front** → the seafront is one of Penzance's biggest assets and somewhere I and countless other residents and visitors enjoy walking on a daily basis (and swimming off the beach in question in summer). I also fail to see how burying one of the most beautiful harbour area's in the country in concrete and infill can possibly have economic benefits for the town. And what will be lost in rushing through Option A is, in my eyes, priceless.
- c) That **public consultation has been infuriatingly poor** and I feel the needs and opinions of Penzance residents have not been properly taken into account. There is widespread public opposition and anger about the project but we have felt powerless to affect the decision-making process. Indeed, the project is currently being investigated by the District Auditor and the European Parliament' Petitions Committee has the issue on its agenda. The term 'vanity project' rings true for Option A.
- d) That there is **no evidence** that Option A will deliver economic benefits, and in my view will affect town's future as a tourist destination thanks to this planned industrial development in the middle of the historic seafront.

d) There are **less harmful alternative proposals in existence**, so I feel this sort of destruction can easily be avoided.

This is a highly contentious development, and I strongly urge you to reject Option A and consider the viable alternatives that local community and business interests have developed.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 October 2010 14:52  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Isles of Scilly link project  
**Attachments:** [REDACTED]

One for Andrew's info.

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 October 2010 14:29  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: Isles of Scilly link project

Hello Andrew, here is a copy of my letter to day to DfT  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 28, 2010 12:38 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Isles of Scilly link project

Dear [REDACTED] I attach a letter,  
Yours Sincerely,  
[REDACTED]

# TRYTHALL SHIPPING

website [www.trythallshipping.co.uk](http://www.trythallshipping.co.uk)

Date 28 October 2010

By E Mail

Major projects division  
Dept of Transport, Great Minster House  
76 Marsham Street London SW1P4DR

Dear [REDACTED]

## Transport Projects Revue, Isles of Scilly Shipping Service

Further to our recent meeting, I have read the recent DfT announcement. One can see that at present there is absolutely no "Local Contribution" to this project.

I believe that more "local contribution" can be achieved, but probably not through the "Route Partnership"/ Cornwall Council directly, because:

- a) They have taken up extreme positions politically which will be hard to climb down from.
- b) It appears from their latest press release that they were unaware that they already had "provisional approval" granted in 2007. (See attached)
- c) From day one, Isles of Scilly Council directed their consultants to concentrate on the one ship solution and this has adversely influenced all discussion of alternatives. (I have evidence of this should you need it).

The freight service to the islands is the "lifeline". This is a robust stand alone commercial enterprise, but at present is run by a monopoly operator. Costs and hence charges to customers could be reduced by reducing labour costs with the RoRo system outlined in my recent presentation. The lowest cost way for DfT to help in this would be:

- d) To provide a repayable loan towards the cost of the Stern landing vessel.
- e) To provide the out of town warehouse, Unit 18 Long Rock already in public ownership.
- f) To provide funds to upgrade the slipways at Penzance and Scilly. ( Our Scillonian friends say there is a problem with their slipway, in which case a crane could be provided at St Mary's quay as an alternative in adverse tide conditions. ( Years ago we had a shore side crane there but it was wrecked in a bizarre accident)

In addition, the Duchy of Cornwall as landlords, to provide a suitable site for an "Inland" freight distribution depot on St Mary's.

Passenger services to the islands are also important, but the sea service is not the sole operator, and Rand clearly state (page 61) that if it ceased visitor numbers would soon revert to previous figures using air travel. But they also show that a fast sea service would increase visitor numbers. Hence DfT expenditure on a replacement slow sea ferry is not value for money.

All recent studies (Fisher, Rand and Hyder) show that the helicopter is the preferred mode of travel carrying more than 50 % of the traffic, albeit at much higher fares. Yesterday it was announced that the Helicopter service is in financial difficulty, will have to sell the heliport and has been barred by Steamship Co. from operating from Land's End, the only viable alternative site.

Clearly, a fast ferry as proposed in my recent presentation will provide a much more acceptable alternative for visitors than Cornwall Council's proposed slow uncomfortable and expensive

monohull.

In these changed circumstance, private sector funding partners are now more attracted to the fast ferry solution, DfT input would need to be a lot less than that required by Cornwall Council's current scheme, and I suggest DfT provide the following:

- g) To provide funds to refurbish the building on Albert Pier Penzance for use as a passenger check in and transit area.
- h) To provide funds to refurbish the existing passenger waiting room at St Mary's
- i) To provide a repayable loan towards the cost of the Cloud Ten Fast Ferry.

In addition Cornwall Council as Harbour Authority at Penzance and Duchy of Cornwall as Harbour Authority at St Mary's to provide funds to dredge the berths 2 Metres, to provide access at all tides, the expenditure to be recouped from the increased harbour dues income resulting from the extra passenger traffic.

The figures for all of the above are set out in my previous documents and are repeated in the attachment herewith.

I do hope we can have a further meeting to discuss my proposals

Your sincerely



	£ million
<b>Cost of Cloud Ten fast passenger ferry with spares package, gangways and luggage handling equipment, Delivered to Penzance and in Class with Lloyds ---</b>	8.0
<b>Cost of stern loading vessel as quoted</b>	3.5
<b>Works at Penzance Harbour, widening slipway, and converting shed at end of Albert pier for use as passenger check in</b>	0.75
<b>Purchase of Long Rock out of town freight depot from SWRDA (Note, this facility is already in public ownership)</b>	0.75
<b>Works at St.Mary's Harbour, reinforcing slipway and access ramp</b>	0.75
<b>Purchase of freight distribution site on St Mary's industrial estate</b>	0.75
<b>Refurbish existing passenger check in facility on St. Mary's Quay</b>	0.25
<b>Not vital but would improve timetabling of fast passenger service; : Dredging of Berths at Penzance and St Mary's</b>	2.25
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£ 17 million</b>

**Note: My scheme does not require rock armour or extensions to the quays or infilling of beaches either at Penzance or St Mary's. and solves all health and safety issues by providing a completely separate freight service, with all fork truck activity out of town. The area transport security team confirm that because this is a "Class B" domestic sea route it does not require any dedicated port security structures or facilities.**



## Isles of Scilly Link an Alternative Proposal

### CURRENT SITUATION:

•Falling passenger numbers by sea, Slow uncomfortable journey, high labour cost and freight charges, multiple handling of goods. Failing Helicopter service.

### CORNWALL COUNCIL SCHEME:

•Very expensive, slow uncomfortable journey, high operating costs, multiple handling of goods, not convenient for passengers, ¾ mile from transport hub, no car parking, draws traffic to Barbican area, claiming land from sea is expensive and contrary to government planning policies, interferes with important listed structures, poor design, spoils sea front, no protection for ship in heavy weather. **Cost £65+million.**

### MY PROPOSAL:

•FAST FERRY 90 minute trip, comfortable ride, reduced sea sickness, increased ridership, low pollution footprint, could operate all year if needed, but no demand at present for winter service.

Swath Ocean design CLOUDX- 98% availability on this route, same as monohull.

•ROLL on ROLL off freight service using containers, less labour, reduced handling, less damage, better security, lower freight charges, no special shore side infrastructure, uses existing slipways, no cranes needed.

•CONTAINERS: like a lorry with no wheels, all goods come by lorry on land so all goods can go in containers by sea, less labour than pallets or loose goods, Enables direct delivery to customer on the islands. Much improved level of service.

•STORE AND FORWARD WAREHOUSE, can be anywhere, use existing brown field site already in public (RDA) ownership. Transfer to ship by own labour, same as Cornwall Council Scheme. No warehouse needed at St Mary's quay.

•PORT SECURITY. This is class B route, same as a bus, so no special facilities required.

•ALBERT PIER TERMINAL Close to car park, trains buses and coach set down area. Passengers go straight aboard and settle down. Provides protected berth in bad weather.

•No rock armour, no filling in the sea, no traffic at barbican, no vehicles on listed quays, integrates with public transport.

•DREDGING essential for all proposals

•COSTS. total cost, including ships, cargo equipment and dredging. **£18 million**

Go to [www.trythallshipping.co.uk](http://www.trythallshipping.co.uk) for full details.

28 OCT 2010

[REDACTED]

25 October 2010

Mr Andrew George MP  
Constituency Office  
Trewella  
18 Mennaye Road  
Penzance, Cornwall  
TR18 4NG

Dear Sir,

**Re: Proposed Development at Penzance Harbour  
(Option A)**

Please find enclosed a copy of a letter addressed to Mr  
Norman Baker.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Enc.

Copy



25 October 2010

Mr Norman Baker MP  
Department for Transport  
Great Minster House  
76 Marsham Street  
London SW1P 4DR

Dear Sir

**Re Proposed Development at Penzance Harbour (Option A)**

Cornwall County Council now has the necessary planning permissions to go ahead with this scheme, and I would like to express my concerns about the effect this would have upon the town of Penzance.

This expensive plan was drawn up some time ago, when the financial climate was very different, although it seemed even then that the Council's commitment would be reflected in the level of Council Tax demanded. Since Cornwall County Council is now seeking ways to reduce expenditure, surely it is time to consider objectively other less costly but equally effective plans such as Option PZ, put forward by the Penzance Business Network.

The benefits that Option A would bring to Penzance are uncertain. This is a tourist destination, overlooking one of the most beautiful bays in the country, and the vista looking east towards St Michael's Mount as one strolls along the Promenade is one of the most admired. The South Pier, one of the most historically interesting parts of the town, and recently upgraded to the status of a Grade II\* Listed building, would be irretrievably buried under the plans of Option A.

Furthermore, Cornwall County Council recently commissioned a public consultation on the future development of the town. Among its recommendations it stated the need for a pedestrian-friendly seafront, with good pedestrian links to the town centre. How could these aims be met if a busy freight terminal is in operation? It is admitted that there will be considerable disruption during the works that would be carried out, and trade lost, even tourist trade, is slow to return.

The number of people who attended the recent meeting on 22.10.10 proved that there is strong opposition locally to Cornwall County Council's proposals. However, public opinion also supports maintaining a link with the Isles of Scilly. This is not in danger, despite much being made in the past of a possible move to Falmouth. The Isles of Scilly Steamship Company report their most successful financial result in 90 years, and have recently taken over the control of the dry dock. They say they will continue the service to the Isles of Scilly with or without public funding.

May I hope that you will bear these points in mind when you come to assess this situation?

Thank you

Yours faithfully,



Copies to:  
Rt Hon Philip Hammond MP  
Andrew George MP



