

## Appendix E1 - Feedback on Environment WP Discussion Document - Estuary

Total responses 42 on 28.4.17

Q.1 Should we try to monitor our habitats, both land and marine in order to conserve them?

Yes 39 93% No 3,

Q.2 If you own a boat with holding tanks, would you use pump-out facilities if provided at the Harbour Office?

Yes 13 31% No 2, No tank 17 53.8% of those with a boat  
No boat 9

Q.3 If there was any evidence found of damage to marine life by moorings, would you support modifying them to mitigate such damage?

Yes 25 60% No 6

Q.4 Should local people take an active interest in monitoring water quality, or leave it to the environment and other agency?

Yes 29 69% Leave it to the EA 13

Q.5 Should we restrict development of the estuary edges and try and protect them from both development and natural damage?

Yes 33 79% No 3 Undecided 6,

Q. 6.a. Do you agree or disagree with the concept of a Noss Hard?

Yes 22 52% Disagree 11 Undecided 9

Q.6.b. Would you agree to us looking into the possibility of creating "sea Pool" type area at the upper end of Noss Creek?

Yes 15 No 27 64%

Q.7 Should we be doing any more to conserve our maritime nurseries of sea grass?

Yes 22 52% No 7 17% Don't know 13 31%

### All free text quotes here

\*Check the quality of effluent from the Newton & Noss sewage treatment works which creates a tidal wave of brown sludge every time it is discharged.

The problem of a Sea Pool, created by raising the level of the Noss Voss is that this area could quickly become muddy and possibly contaminated. It would also prevent visitors and other boats from tying up to the Ship, at the right state of the tide. We would also need to find an alternative launching and recovery site for the Pilot Gigs.

\*Bridgend Voss Proposal. The idea is fundamentally flawed. It will not make walking down either Bridgend Hill nor Stoke Road safer. The idea of a voss at this point and using builders rubble to construct the berms is a fallacy. The nett result will be landfill at behind the voss, with the culvert running through, which will ultimately end up being paved and over become a carpark. Will the culvert block with weed and flotsam and cause flooding to the property to the east?

I am worried that the modification to the creek will cause my property to flood, which never has done in the nearly 50 years I have owned it. Can you provide hydrographic modelling that would indicate otherwise?

Putting a high voss across the upper end of Bridgend Creek would cause the water to bounce back more so, in the event of a seiche, as it would not have so far to dissipate its energy.

Regarding, swan nesting. I can only recall the swans having nests on rafts on the Newton arm of the creek, never having nested close to Post Office farm, in the 50 years that I recall.

\*The issue with creating a safe pool for learning to sail is that the winds in that area are so variable as to make it very difficult. There are plenty of opportunities for young to learn safely on the main estuary under appropriate supervision. Creating a pool for swimming is likely to increase pollution from human activities. Again there are plenty of opportunities for safe swimming from the natural ebb and flow of the tide. More needs to be done to stop effluent overflow into the estuary which can often affect swimming off Pope's Quay which is a popular spot for both young and old. We should be working to ensure that the estuary can achieve blue flag status.

Swans have nested at Bridgend but sporadically over the past 40 years. These days we enjoy the egrets which nest around Bridgend and which are not so tide dependent and a lot less threatening to pedestrians cyclists etc. There is no shortage of swan activity on the river/estuary.

There should be no more meddling with the appearance or function of the estuary. Those who want to turn it into something else should move somewhere else. Having once owned a boat and made use of moorings and anchoring at Cellars, I am not yet convinced that eelgrass is being permanently damaged, although I support unbiased monitoring. There is no justification for a "play pool" and we should put up with the lottery of parking at Noss Creek - no more concrete.

We must ensure that there continues to be good access for dinghies, paddle boards & the gigs.

Yes, bring pressure to bare on South West Water to stop sewage leaking , especially in Noss and also improve sewage treatment works to prevent discharges when heavy rain occurs . Introduce natural filter beds /lagoons for instance at the proposed development at Collaton , these would help reduce contaminated run-off water as well as sewage treatment.

\*Why not create sea pool at the brook, or build a low quay for boat launching etc at a lower state of the tide

Reduce sewage overspill to clean up water quality.

Q1. This is a heavily loaded question, of course we should. Who could say otherwise. But what is it to do with the N3P ?

The existing mooring plan allows for minimal "damage" within the requirements of the users. Who is to take priority over use of the funds? The worms or the humans? There is still a vast area unaffected where the worms can thrive and multiply. Other methods of mooring are difficult and hazardous to use in the fast flowing tideway and strings of boats impeded the safe navigation over the whole surface. Q5. Quays and slips reinforce the riverbanks. Q7. Despite anchoring the grass is thriving. Humans v Grass !!

Reinstating banks at Bridgend for swans

I don't like the idea of interfering with the pattern of water movement in the Yealm. Very small changes can have large knock on effects which i have witnessed in other locations. As long as adequate wrning signs are present that is OK. It would be better to enlarge the parking at the park to reduce the congestion in Noss (concerning Q about Noss Creek changes)

Not in favour of a Voss at Bridgend. Expensive and what would the purpose be? It would only save 30m of walking unlike the other 2 Vosses