

From: [Mike Waters](#) (Petition Organizer/Chair Penzance Chamber of Commerce)
To: [WILLIAMS, Emma](#) (*Emma Williams, Casework Assistant to Andrew George MP*)

Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2010 10:09 PM
Subject: Re: Email from Andrew George MP

Andrew

Thank you for responding, although again it seems that you are misinformed. I am also aware that rather than writing the email direct to me you have given it a wider "bcc" distribution and I would be grateful if you would circulate my responses to those people as well.

1. Cornwall Council's Cabinet have clearly stated that they will only be pursuing Option A or the Falmouth option.
2. English Heritage, whilst maintaining its stance about breaching the existing sea wall have nonetheless recognised that there are no alternative options. You are, no doubt, aware that some 14 or so options were considered prior to reducing them to three for the public consultation event in 2004. Of those although Option A was not the favoured one it was the one which required the least amount of reclamation and was also the most cost-effective solution. I shall be bringing these to the meeting on Monday.
3. I have no doubt that if the project is called in then the Secretary of State will allow it to proceed as it is of strategic importance to Penzance, the Isles of Scilly and the whole of West Cornwall.
4. Although possible that if the decision was made to move the sea link to Falmouth it would require some paperwork the key to the matter is that Falmouth could accommodate the Scillonian tomorrow, they do not require any capital investment. As a result the time constraints on redeveloping our South Pier do not apply to them.
5. With regard to the petition I do not know who has been talking to you but I would seriously question their motives. The wording on the petition is quite clear that people signing it support Option A as it is the only cost effective solution. Furthermore everyone taking part in the process made it clear to the public what the petition was about; the artist's impressions were clearly posted in more than one place and we specifically drew people's attention to them; we also clearly displayed the comparison table between Option A and Option C that was presented to Cornwall Council recently as well as copies of the 2004 consultation exercise, the construction programme and numerous other documents. You can see from the photograph below the amount of information that was on display.



Perhaps you would care to provide some evidence of the scurrilous claims that any of us acted with any impropriety.

6. Since Network Rail stated a few weeks ago that they had no intention of moving the branch line from Penzance to Falmouth I nor anyone within ear-shot of me has suggested to people that such an occurrence would happen. For you to suggest otherwise is out of order.

7. Once again in keep mentioning my "supporters" you are failing to distinguish between me as an individual and me as Chairman of Penzance Chamber of Commerce. The petition is now being handled by "The True Friends of Penzance and the Isles of Scilly" which comprises members of the Chamber of Commerce, the Penzance and District Tourism Association, members of the public and non-aligned businesses. since the organisation was formed last Tuesday, 19th January, it has received an enormous amount of support from all quarters which is growing on a daily basis. The beauty of the organisation is that we put the facts of the matter in the public domain and allow them to make up their own minds. If you would care to look at www.truefriend.org.uk you can see for yourself that NO UNTRUTHS are contained therein.

8. How you can "caution me" about my "activities at the Wharfside" is beyond belief. I respectfully suggest that you stop listening to your contacts in the FOPH and start listening to the people of Penzance.

This is the second email in which you have stated that I will not be attending the meeting on Monday despite the fact that I have said no such thing. If you do not want me there then that is an entirely separate matter, but unless advised to the contrary I shall be there, if nothing else to be the voice of reason that one cannot simply go re-inventing the wheel. I reiterate that:

a. Every conceivable option has been looked at over the past 10 years and discounted either on the basis of being impracticable, too costly, unsustainable or a combination of the three. Option A is the most cost effective solution that requires the least amount of reclamation.

b. You were fully aware of the current plan for the South Pier in 2004 when the Harbour Revision Order was submitted.

c. You have previously stated that you will support the decision of Cornwall Council.

d. You previously stated that you would not support Option C if it increased freight charges. I am aware that in this respect Option C is no longer on the table.

As stated at the start of this email, I am aware that you gave yours to me a wide distribution and I would be obliged if you would similarly circulate this, no doubt I will be advised one way or the other.

Unless I hear to the contrary I shall see you at the meeting on Monday. If you could provide me with the papers that I have requested prior to that it would be most helpful. In addition I would also be obliged if you could confirm whether or not you contacted members of the Strategic Planning Committee by telephone prior to the meeting of the 14th December.

Mike Waters

.....
Editor's note: Text added in *italics* has been added by the Editor to clarify who is communicating.