

Project title	Central Rhyl Coastal Defences
Subject	Scheme update with NRW
Location	Remote Teams Meeting
Date/time of meeting	05/05/21 13:30 to 14:00
Project number	100420823
Attendees	W Hope (Denbighshire County Council) E Litt (Natural Resources Wales) Sion M Williams (Natural Resources Wales) I Beckett (Balfour Beatty Civil Engineering Ltd) N Price (Mott MacDonald) V Deakin (Mott MacDonald)
Apologies	M Cowle (Mott MacDonald)
Recorded by	N Price, V Deakin
Distribution	Attendees plus apologies

Item	Text	Action
1	<p>Introduction and Objectives</p> <p>VD and NMP introduced the workshop and outlined the key objectives as follows (PowerPoint presentation used);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To discuss if the scheme is HTL • Provide an update on the existing structures • Provide an update on the scheme design <p>VD and NMP explained that MM had requested the meeting following NRW's comments in its response to the Central Rhyl Coastal Defences EIA Scoping report, that requested the scheme is discussed at the Liverpool Bay Cell 11 coastal group meeting to agree whether the scheme is in line with the definition of HTL and not in fact ATL. An agreement on the definition before the Marine licence and planning application is submitted is required, MML wanted to present the information currently available that shows the extent of existing coastal defence assets at Central Rhyl, to assist NRW's understanding of the scheme constraints in the form of existing coastal defence assets, and the reasons for the project team's view that the proposed scheme is HTL not ATL.</p> <p>EL referred to recent correspondence from NRW that quoted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplementary Guidance for the English SMP Refresh, including a chapter on policy definition and intent that says in relation to the application of Advance the Line: The definitions set out in the 2006 Guidance (volume 1, section 2.3) clearly state that use of the Advance the Line policy "should be limited 	

Item	Text	Action
	<p>to those policy units where significant land reclamation is considered." This descriptor should not be used for areas where there are already defences but works might encroach seaward to enable the same assets to be protected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2006 Guidance, stating that a Hold the Line policy covers "those situations where work or operations are carried out in front of the existing defences to improve or maintain the standard of protection provided by the existing defence line". Therefore, where works are undertaken for example to develop a beach in front of an existing seawall, including any control structures required; or where a seawall requires additional rock protection at the toe, or rebuilding with a new line of sheet piling in front of the existing toe; to sustain that existing defence line, this is > Hold the Line (Maintain / Replace), not Advance the Line. 	
2	<p>Existing defences in Central Rhyl</p> <p>VD presented slides showing a combination of photographs and survey sketches, that illustrated/demonstrated that the existing assets along the Central Rhyl frontage include a variety of stepped revetments in front of the sea wall, part visible and part buried, varying from 2m to over 10m (full extent TBC).</p> <p>An image from the Central Rhyl ground investigation was also presented that highlighted the existing buried stepped revetment and the amount of sediment that has accumulated.</p>	
3	<p>Current Concept design</p> <p>VD presented the current concept design that illustrated the proposed location of widened promenade and the toe of the revetment based on various slopes. The final slope of the revetment is to be determined following the completion of the overtopping assessment.</p> <p>It was discussed that in order to build the scheme now proposed, which includes a sheet pile foundation to the revetment toe, the new stepped revetment will need to extend by some distance in front of the sea wall to avoid clashing with the existing sections of stepped revetment beneath.</p> <p>EL said that she had requested that the scheme be discussed at the LBCG, envisaging an informal round-table discussion. However, on the basis of the presentation, EL confirmed that she now agrees that the scheme is HTL and it is not necessary to raise the issue at the LBCG meeting.</p> <p>WH suggested that, as an alternative, the issue could be discussed at the Liverpool Bay SMP refresh forum next week (subject to attendees). This discussion would relate to the definition of HTL and</p>	WH

Item	Text	Action
4	ATL for schemes in Wales using the Central Rhyl scheme as an example. EL agreed with this suggestion. WH highlighted that with the increase in SLR the footprint of coastal schemes is getting larger and therefore a review of definitions would be useful. AOB VD and EL arranged a meeting to discuss the sediment transport modelling draft results on 19 th May between 10:00 and 12:00.	VD to send meeting invite
