



LLANDUDNO  
COASTAL  
FORUM

FFORWM  
ARFORDIROL  
LLANDUDNO

**Minutes of Llandudno Coastal Forum Meeting**  
**Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2016**

**1. THOSE PRESENT**

Cllr Frank Bradfield - Conwy County Borough Council  
Mr Peter Byron – Friends of West Shore  
Mr Geraint Edwards - Environment, Roads & Facilities, CCBC  
Mr Berin Jones - Llandudno Hospitality Association  
Cllr Dewi Miles - Conwy County Borough Council  
Cllr Greg JT Robbins - Llandudno Town Council (**Vice  
Chairman**)  
Mr Dyfed Rowlands - Environment, Roads & Facilities,  
CCBC  
Mr Mike Shields - Restore Our Beach  
Ms Debbie Wareham - Ships' Timbers (**Secretary**)

**APOLOGIES**

Mrs Eileen Burrows - Llandudno Chamber of Trade  
Cllr Dave Cowans - Environment, Roads & Facilities,  
CCBC  
Cllr Francis Davies - Llandudno Town Council  
Mr John Farrell - Restore Our Beach  
Mr Edward Hiller - Mostyn Estates Ltd  
Mr Gerry Sweeny - Friends of West Shore  
Mr Nigel Treacy - Destination Conwy (**Chairman**)

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Mr Owen Conry - Environment, Roads & Facilities,  
CCBC  
Ms Niamh Cahill - Project Engineer AECOM  
Mr Ryan Rooprai – Project Director - AECOM  
Mr Alan Williams - Technical Specialist - AECOM  
Ms Alison Shields - Independent

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

## **3. MINUTES**

### **3.1 To receive the minutes of Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> June, 2016 as a true record of the meeting.**

Proposed by Mr Berin Jones (LHA), and seconded by Mr Mike Shields (RoB).

### **3.2 Matters Arising from the Minutes of 2.06.2016**

None

## **4. URGENT ITEM**

None received at the time of publication.

## **5. LLANDUDNO BEACH MANAGEMENT PLAN – UPDATE**

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) who is Project Director of the Llandudno Beach Management Plan Consultancy Team from AECOM gave a presentation to Forum Members about the work of AECOM, the Project team members and their areas of responsibility regarding the Llandudno Beach Management plan, at which time he outlined AECOM's initial ideas for options for sea defences for Llandudno's north shore, and west shore, the overall scope of the work ahead, and proposed time scales for the preparation and delivery of the Llandudno Beach Management Plan. Forum Members thanked Mr Rooprai for his presentation, and to the BMP Team for answering Members additional questions. All Forum members were in agreement that as they had just had first sighting of the presentation, more time was needed to consider the content, and the initial ideas being presented. Hence, the AECOM Consultancy Team agreed to circulate the presentation to Members as a PDF, and a meeting would be convened in two weeks for a further update from AECOM on their progress, and for members to ask questions about the presentation material given to them on 17.11.2016.

### **Forum Member questions / comments on 17.11.2016:**

Mr Berin Jones (LHA) thanked the Consultancy team for coming to see the Forum and making the presentation. Mr Jones commented that it would be really beneficial if Forum Members had a full copy of the presentation, and then in two weeks, perhaps the Forum could come back, and have some proper discussion around the content of the presentation, which the Consultancy team are already very aware of, but the Forum are not, and which had been delivered quite speedily, at quite a distance, and Members do not have a paper copy to review. Mr Jones commented that it would have been much better for him to have a constructive conversation tonight if he had that information in front of him. Mr Jones asked the

Forum Chair (Cllr Greg Robbins) that his first proposal is that the Forum has two weeks to consider the information and that the Consultancy Team can return for discussion with members? The Forum Chair confirmed that the presentation content will be circulated, and the Forum Secretary can find out suitable available dates for the next meeting.

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) replied to say that they had envisaged that this would be an initial consultation for everybody to meet, and to say this is what we will be doing in the coming weeks, and we will keep you informed.

Mr Berin Jones (LHA) commented that one of the concerns he had was that a range of options was put to the public in February 2015 around options for beach management opportunities (for the north shore), but all that the AECOM drawings seemed to show for current options are breakwaters everywhere. Mr Jones then asked if we have a breakwater, such as then one locally near Penrhyn Bay, they have the ability to retain sedimentary material on the sand, which discolours it, and makes it rather boggy, would that be true?

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) replied to say it could be true, and it's something we need to look at over the coming weeks.

Mr Berin Jones went on to ask, if other options are being considered, without a breakwater?

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) commented that at the moment these are the initial options, but that if there are additional options we will definitely look at those.

The Forum Chair commented that for the Coastal Forum public consultation, four basic options with variations were offered, and of those options, the Forum Chair commented, that he could only see one, or possibly two, in the presentation.

Mr Owen Conry (CCBC – ERF) commented that the options being offered are exactly the options that were consulted on.

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) again described the options being presented.

Ms Alison Shields (Independent) asked for further clarification about the fish-tail groyne being suggested for the north shore as this was not part of the Coastal Forum Consultation.

Ms Alison Shields (Independent) also pointed out that the fish-tail groyne on the west shore did not achieve what it was supposed to do, adding that if a fish-tail groyne is being considered for the north shore, she would be very concerned.

Mr Owen Conry (CCBC – ERF) asked about the concern of the groyne on the west shore.

Ms Alison Shields (Independent) referred to the report that was written about the west shore groyne (Bull, C.J., Davis, A.M., and Jones, R., The Influence of Fish-tail Groynes (breakwaters) on the characteristics of the adjacent beach at Llandudno, North Wales. *Journal of Coastal Research*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (Winter, 1998), pp. 93-105) asking Ms Wareham (Forum Secretary) for clarification of that.

Ms Debbie Wareham affirmed that the groyne on the west shore is thought to contribute to the windblown sand problem, has created a sludgy sand base near to the groyne which feels like quick sand when its walked on, and sand dunes have become established on the shore side of the groyne.

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) commented that it is the nature of the type of structure that there can be such effects.

Ms Alison Shields (Independent) suggested sending the report across to the BMP Project Team adding that a fish-tail groyne was never an option for the north shore from the Consultation.

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) replied to say that it is a case of going back and reviewing the options put forward here, as the ones presented during the evening are only preliminary ideas, and it's making sure we have considered options, and if we have missed some, we need to bring those into the overall process.

Ms Alison Shields (Independent) asked the BMP Team if they have a copy of the Consultation.

The BMP Team replied to say that they do.

Mr Geraint Edwards (CCBC – ERF) addressed the Chair to say it is very important to remember that what we need out of this piece of work is robust analysis and that if we are selective of the options right now then that could set us back to step one of the scheme so I think the Consultants need to look at the options that have been developed through the Forum, they also need to consider other options, and they will go through this robust analysis which will identify and rank those different schemes. There will be benefits and dis-benefits for all those options, such as the environmental dis-benefits with the fish-tail groyne which have been made reference to will be valid and recorded. But if we ask the Consultant to dismiss options then we are entering into dangerous territory as we will be making decisions which might preclude us from future funding. So I think we should explore everything. I think the Consultant should go away, do the piece of work and bring it back to us and consult with us and at that stage when he has actually put all that work together, I think it would be inappropriate of use now to direct him. We all have our favoured options, but if we direct him in one direction I think this will seriously jeopardise us getting funding. The first question any funding organisation will ask is what have you looked at?

Ms Alison Shields (Independent) went on to ask that if a fish-tail groyne gets funding then is that the one that would be built in Llandudno?

Mr Geraint Edwards (CCBC – ERF) explained that we around this table cannot afford any of the options and that we will have to go somewhere else to fund this. So we are going to have to understand what the benefits are from each of these schemes whether they are coastal defence, regeneration, whatever those

schemes are, and seek that type of funding for this project. What we can do around this table and wider with consultation is we can identify what things Llandudno wants / needs in terms of its future, and those will be raised to the top of any prioritisation or scoring list. So that is the way we get into it. But dismissing or targeting an option now and saying that is the one we want and ask the Consultant to focus on that one will be very dangerous.

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) replied to say that we need to make sure that all the options are considered and we come up with a most robust technical analysis.

Mr Mike Shields (RoB) commented that he did not see an option for the standard groyne field that we used to have in the Bay?

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) replied to say that timber groynes were option three.

Cllr Frank Bradfield (CCBC - Elected Representative) commented that he was delighted that the Consultancy Team came here and that they are receiving support from the Officers (of the Council). Cllr Bradfield went on to ask if anything that the BMP Team will do will be in tandem with a tidal barrage, should we get a barrage in the area, or would this be a separate thing? Cllr Frank Bradfield also asked if the stones from the current sea defences could be used within the tidal barrage structure or part of the submerged breakwater structure, due to the cost of moving them? Cllr Frank Bradfield added that he is interested to see what the Consultancy Team come up with when they come back. Cllr Frank Bradfield gave his apologies as he had to leave the meeting at that point.

Mr Owen Conry (CCBC – ERF) commented that the options that CCBC would have prepared for scope at tender would have been specific and considered the options that this Forum and the public would have expressed an interest on at the Consultation, which would have been the status quo with the existing beach – import the shingle / sand, imported beach with offshore breakwaters, imported beach with short connected breakwaters, imported beach with traditional groynes. So there were four options, and nothing new here, plus we have asked to consider other options. Everyone has been involved in the consultation process in the past. Maybe things were not called fish-tail groynes and if there is an issue with fish-tail groynes that is for the technical people to sort out. There is nothing new here. This has been discussed before at this Forum, and I would not want anyone to think there is anything new put on them here for the first time.

Cllr Dewi Miles (CCBC – Elected Representative) thanked the BMP Team for the presentation, adding that but similar to Berin (Mr Berin Jones - LHA) he could not see most of it, and could not hear most of it, so we have to have further information so we can discuss this properly. Cllr Dewi Miles explained to the BMP Consultants that whether they know or not, the people around the table are only there because of perhaps the best attended meeting ever in the Borough regarding the state of our beaches. There were two main priorities one of them was to protect the Town, the other was to provide an amenity for the locals and for the life of the Town which is tourism. The main problems were the shingle that sits on the beach, and what I would have like to have seen is you made no reference to the current defences that are there. Would you retain those, would you take them away completely, what would you do on the main shore (north shore)

mainly? As far as the windblown sand, I remember going to a meeting twenty five years ago to talk about the windblown sand, and to talk about the cycle path etc. But what I was hoping for this meeting is you would come up with several options from the information that you have had, and I hope that you have had all the information, from all the meetings, that we have had here, and would show us the best way forward for those two main priorities, protecting the town and providing the amenities.

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) commented that it is part of their remit to look at all the options, all the potential solutions, and this is what we were saying earlier about keeping an open mind, and we have to find a technical solution which is robust, and see if we can solve the issue with one of these technical solutions. We have to cast a wider net to have as many options as we can.

Cllr Dewi Miles (CCBC – Elected Representative) asked the BMP Team, what was their opinion then of the shingle that has already been laid down? For instance, with your options, and your forward planning, would that be retained, or would that be removed?

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) commented that at this stage, we cannot say as we have to look at things in an holistic light together, and not sure what has happened previously, but this is part of the work that we will be doing over the coming months, and will be something that we will consider, and something we need to look at in terms of whether it is retained, or not.

Mr Alan Williams (AECOM) commented to say that we know the material is mobile, we know that it moves around, if we take that material away, and put another type of material, putting smaller material, then that is going to be even more mobile, so we have to understand how that material is going to behave and what sort of structures you might need to control that movement, and then obviously bring in the other aspect of it, what sort of beach, the best amenity, can that be achieved, and what sort of arrangements do you need to meet all those objectives, and find a solution, which ticks as many of those boxes.

Cllr Dewi Miles (CCBC – Elected Representative) asked that he had seen an agenda for Christmas did the BMP Team think they will have that kind of information by then? Cllr Dewi Miles added that he does agree with Mr Geraint Edwards (CCBC - ERF) that we need as many options as possible, but it is important for us to realise the main point of why this Committee was formed, and that is, that material on the beach is definitely looked into, to see how best we move forward with that.

Mr Owen Conry (CCBC – ERF) commented that is option four.

Cllr Miles (CCBC – Elected Representative) added that he did not hear the word ‘remove’ materials.

Mr Owen Conry (CCBC – ERF) explained that option four is looking at existing material. At the end of the day if you remove that material you have to have to put something back in its place. So the option is to look at all the options, you cannot just look at one option, and look at this with your mind made up. There are four options there, and the four will be considered. You cannot go into this with your mind set, it is not fair, as you have to consider all options.

CLlr Miles (CCBC - Elected Representative) replied to say, he agreed with that, but added that he could not see how we could get all these cohesive options by Christmas if that is what you are saying.

Forum Chair commented that we would return to the question of time scales.

Mr Peter Byron (FrWSh) commented that we do have a problem with the fish-tail groyne, and a big problem with very fine sand, on the leeward side. Mr Peter Byron added that he could not understand why we have the rocks here, and Colwyn Bay has the sand, and he could not see why we can't look at that option as well?

Mr Alan Williams (AECOM) commented that we have said we are not dismissing that option, we are looking at sand for Llandudno alongside how a sandy beach is going to behave. A sandy beach in Llandudno is going to behave totally differently to how a beach in Colwyn Bay would.

Ms Debbie Wareham (Forum Secretary / Ships' Timbers) commented that she echoed previous comments adding that a meeting in two weeks after having received the power point presentation as a PDF is an excellent way forward. Ms Debbie Wareham affirmed that she understood what Mr Geraint Edwards (CCBC – ERF) meant about having a number of options, as a similar process of considering a number of options was undertaken when deciding where to site the new lifeboat station on the north shore. However, Ms Debbie Wareham added that she thought those options needed to be the *right options*, not for example a fish-tail groyne for the north shore, as there would be issues of height, effect on amenity, rip currents, many of the issues were already known. Ms Debbie Wareham added that in terms of Llandudno, sand is what is wanted on the beach, evidenced in the earliest pictures of Llandudno – 1858 – with no wooden groynes. Until the current means of sea defence was put on the north shore, there was no huge problem of stones. We have no beach, and what Llandudno wants is the beach back. Ms Wareham added that she thought she was going to come to the meeting to see options on the screen about how we are going to get the beach back to how it was, but she did not feel confident with what she has seen. Ms Debbie Wareham thanked the BMP Team for their presentation adding that she hoped that in two weeks they would come back and look at something such as putting the groyne field back, and investigating whether such a system can withstand a 1 in 300 year storm surge?

Ms Debbie Wareham also pointed out that the objectives outlined in the presentation were to consider the environment, and heritage. Ms Debbie Wareham asked the BMP Team if they knew where the cultural heritage was on the north shore?

The BMP Team replied to say they did not know.

Ms Debbie Wareham commented that where the BMP Team had put the breakwater on the north shore completely obliterates the cultural heritage in that area, adding that the suggested breakwater also goes across where the current jetties are, hence destroying people's livelihoods, which would take away a part of local tourism, not to mention removing opportunities for people to go and see the heritage on the north shore.

Ms Debbie Wareham then moved on to mention the west shore commenting that it is important to maintain its beauty, but acknowledges the problem with the windblown sand. Ms Debbie Wareham then commented on the Dunes being returned to the west shore, but she was under the impression they would be regenerated where they were originally, and that previously having dunes as a means of sea defence was never an option. Ms Debbie Wareham thanked the BMP Team.

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) commented that there are a lot of matters here at play, and we want to try and absorb as much information as we can, to build up the right set of solutions. The whole point of this presentation was to meet, to discuss the issues, and hear the views, and we will take that feedback back.

Ms Debbie Wareham went on to add that one of the options which has not been taken forward was presented by Mr Edwards Hiller (Mostyn Estates), namely to have an offshore breakwater on the other side of the pier explaining that as the sea comes in, as a sweep into Llandudno Bay from the west, the idea was that it would break up the waves and make them less energetic as the sea curves around into Llandudno Bay, hence we would not have the on shore structures that people could see.

Ms Debbie Wareham then went on to mention Constable Bank, and the role it plays to protect Llandudno if any?

Mr Alan Williams (AECOM) replied to say that Constable Bank does not play a role to protect Llandudno.

Ms Debbie Wareham (Forum Secretary / Ships' Timbers) commented that the drift along the north Wales coast goes from west to east, towards Liverpool Bay, adding that the situation on the north shore is now appalling. Ms Wareham questioned the view that the stones on the lower fore-shore are a migration of the sea defences, adding that she would like to know where those large stones had come from. Ms Debbie Wareham asked if when the wind farms were constructed, with drilling into Constable Bank, did that start to move things around, with the large rocks drifting onto the beach?

Ms Alison Shields (Independent) explained that they had been part of the beach campaign from the beginning, and members of the Forum from, which they learnt much along the way. Ms Alison Shields asked with regards to Constable Bank, which reports will the BMP Team be using in the study, is it Shoreline Management Plan 2 (SMP 2)?

Mr Alan Williams (AECOM) commented that they will use SMP 2, along with a number of other reports.

Mr Geraint Edwards (CCBC – ERF) confirmed he would send the link to the SMP 2.

Ms Alison Shields (Independent) went on to explain that the Victorians built Llandudno with Constable Bank in mind as it was a natural sea defence. After generations of people living here, we know that Constable Bank was a natural part of our sea defence.



Mr Alan Williams (AECOM) confirmed that the predominant drift is from west to east (out at sea) but under north easterly conditions, then yes it will provide some protection to Llandudno. In the predominant direction though, Constable Bank will not intercept waves that come from the northwest.

Ms Debbie Wareham (Forum Secretary / Ships' Timbers) commented that there are two parts to Constable Bank, the part off Rhyl Flats / Little Orme, and there is the another part just off the pier and the Great Orme, which they dredged in the 1960's so that the boats could moor up along the pier.

Mr Mike Shields (RoB) commented that the main wind force to Llandudno Bay is usually offshore but when we do get a north easterly or north westerly, when we get our worst weather, that's when Constable Bank protects us.

Ms Alison Shields (Independent) asked about the wood used for the Groynes as one option discussed by the Forum was recycled material, and that could be a project for Conwy County to use its own material?

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) commented that they would consider any material which is suitable and would consider also how it would behave during storms.

Mr Berin Jones (LHA) commented that he was concerned that the options the Forum had been presented with, and which had been discussed with the Forum were not as comprehensive, or inclusive of options that the Forum, as a less informed group, had already considered. The timescales which suggest that in four weeks the BMP Team propose to have a draft plan, does not give a lot of confidence, that the BMP Team are going to consider enough options, and they clearly have to consider all the reports that we (the Forum) have discussed, and that gives concern that the time scale is set too short, bearing in mind it has to be done once, and it has to be done right, both for the Council's sake, as they are spending an amount of money on maintaining the existing beach, and for the amenity of the Town. Then for the west shore in comparison to other locations where they have drifting sand in a westerly direction, we have not got any suggestions of any kind, such as a Formby Bay type scenario, which could create a feature as well as anything else, but we seem to be stuck on breakwaters. And that is what I don't need to have – breakwaters, breakwaters, breakwaters! I would hope to see some creative alternative options from you, so if we are talking January, that is probably as early as we should be thinking, if not February. Any time less than that I would be concerned there is not enough time to consider all possible options, and immense data we have considered over the last two years.

The Forum Chair commented that time scale is a concern and that when the Forum meets next we want to discuss the possibility of the BMP Team being there. The Forum Chair suggested the next meeting date as Thursday, 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2016 which would give everyone a chance to go through the proposals presented to them, and if we can compare the information that we have looked with what you are considering that would be positive and useful.

Mr Owen Conry (CCBC – ERF) commented that as regards options on breakwaters, in the Consultation (north shore), 862 people gave feedback and there were four options, three options mentioned groynes, which are breakwaters, so just to be clear, to say we have not considered the options, these are the

options the public have identified and which have been through the Llandudno Coastal Forum first, so it is not a case of the Consultancy Team attending and presenting what they want to do, these are options that were consulted on by members of the public outside this Forum and maybe we should not use the word breakwater, and you are describing them as groynes, they are the same thing, so when you are talking about Llandudno Bay, people have already discussed this, so this is not new, what the Consultancy Team are doing, and it has been consulted on in the past. Of course there are other options as well to consider, which have not been presented, but I would not want people getting the impression that this is all news to us. Everybody around this table has read the minutes, these four options – existing sea defence, imported sand / beach with offshore breakwater, imported sand / beach with short connected breakwater, imported beach with traditional groynes – these have been discussed over the last two years.

Ms Debbie Wareham (Forum Secretary / Ships' Timbers) commented to say that yes these options have been discussed, but the question the Forum was faced with was to ask people what they did want, and what did they not want on the north shore, and that is what was presented at the north shore consultation. People wanted the traditional groyne field, as we understand that, they did not want offshore breakwaters. Ms Debbie Wareham added that she did not remember the use of the words 'fish-tail groyne' being presented at the Consultation.

Cllr Dewi Miles (CCBC – Elected Representative) commented that he did not mind if we go outside the options that we have, as long as you come up with what we want. Cllr Dewi Miles then went on to ask, how many tenders for the BMP Contract, have you had all the information that you say that you have had which has been discussed here as I do not think that you have, that everything has been sent through to you, how many tenders did you receive, and how long have you been working on the project? Cllr Dewi Miles added that Forum members have been subjected to countless emails, people asking on the street, giving criticism to the Forum about what is happening, and we need to be able to answer questions coming from members of the public regarding this. Cllr Dewi Miles commented that we cannot decide anything from these options as he could not see nor understand the presentation.

Mr Owen Conry (CCBC – ERF) commented that the point of this evening was not to decide anything.

Cllr Dewi Miles (CCBC – Elected Representative) added that you expect us to look at something by Christmas and it has taken us two years to come anywhere near where we are now. Although we are lay people, we are not stupid lay people.

Mr Peter Byron (FrwSh) commented that he felt that everything has been decided.

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) commented that they had received a large number of reports.

Mr Owen Conry (CCBC – ERF) commented to say that for a project like this we advertised this through the National Procurement Service of which seven were identified as suitable Coastal Consultants, two applied for the contract. As regards information everything that we have has been given.

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) commented that they had worked on the project for four weeks. They are making sure that the information they are getting is correct.

Ms Alison Shields (Independent) asked that the report she had made reference to earlier had not been received.

Mr Owen Conry (CCBC – ERF) clarified that the Consultancy team did not say they had not received that report.

Ms Alison Shields (Independent) went on to say that she thought it is unfair to the Consultancy team if they have not received the reports, which have been referred to in meetings throughout, suggesting that a Forum Member could help with that.

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) explained that a lot of information has been passed across, and they will check that they have that report. Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) added that they are hoping to bring the programme forward to what was initially planned, and they will keep in contact and make sure that the Forum is aware. Any information would be taken on board and they are now aware of bits of information they need to consider.

Ms Alison Shields (Independent) clarified that she was concerned that the Team will not have the time to go through all the information. Ms Alison Shields also explained that given the local response to the situation on the north shore, it is important to get this right first time to avoid negative comments from the public.

Mr Owen Conry (CCBC – ERF) explained that he could show the Forum Members the twenty eight reports that were sent across to the Consultancy team.

The Forum chair asked for a list of those reports.

Ms Debbie Wareham (Forum Secretary / Ships' Timbers) explained her interest in local heritage and commented that she had hoped that the report on the cultural heritage would have been factored in to where the breakwaters were being placed adding if she could send that information across, or visit the north shore if needs be?

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) replied to say that sending the report across would be fantastic.

Mr Dyfed Rowlands (CCBC – ERF) commented that there had been a lot of discussion about the options that have been presented here this evening. These options that have been presented are just indicative plans of ideas we as Forum have developed together, and the Consultants have amended them slightly. When we decide which option we and the Public want for Llandudno, these options will be taken forward and maybe we will have to do some numerical and physical modelling, further work, studies to identify whether or not, the structures we have identified, will retain a sandy beach, or whatever kind of beach we want to put in there. Now the orientation of those breakwaters, or groynes, might change depending upon what results the model might say, so all the ideas that we have discussed as a Forum have been looked at

by the Consultant, and they may change slightly. An example from Colwyn Bay Waterfront, the Groyne at Porth Eirias was designed initially as a fish-tail groyne but when we came to model it, it was just developed as a finger groyne because the cost implication of having that fish-tail at the end was too much. So just bear that in mind. So the plans we have drawn up as a Forum is not necessarily what will work so further work is required in relation to that.

Ms Debbie Wareham (Forum Secretary / Ships' Timbers) asked if the modelling is part of AECOM's remit?

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) replied to say it was not. AECOM are doing a separate piece of work, there is no modelling at this stage. That will be part of the next stage, to prove our solution.

Ms Debbie Wareham (Forum Secretary / Ships' Timbers) went on to clarify that AECOM will compile a report of what they think, and then we have another report after that to model those ideas? Is that going to be another cost?

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) confirmed that the modelling will be tendered again.

Ms Debbie Wareham (Forum Secretary / Ships' Timbers) asked that we won't know then if these options will work until they are modelled?

Mr Geraint Edwards (CCBC – ERF) commented that AECOM are a massive company with four teams of people working on this, I include myself in this, we are lay people, we have spent an awful lot of time on it, but we don't have four teams of people backing us up doing all this preparatory work. This was meant to be preliminary in terms of this is the direction in which we are going in and all we wanted to get out of tonight was, yes, let's remember what we did as a Forum, let's make sure we are on track in the direction we are taking. The Consultant has said to us that they would like a bit more time, and we are in the middle, where we want this done quickly and properly, so time is constrained, but at the end of the day we need this delivered robustly, so we are all on the same page, but I just want to be clear that I never said, that we would as part of this work, take any scheme to a design stage. What we said we would get to is to explore these options, identify the benefits and dis-benefits, and come up with a solution and in the same way that Dyfed said, the first solution was three fish-tail groynes, that was our guess, which was not very good, as it ends up needing only one structure, but it takes us to a place in terms of identifying what it is we need to do, so it is steps along the way.

Mr Geraint Edwards (CCBC – ERF) continued to say that he is concerned that we are coming back in two weeks stopping some form of progress. I think the Forum wants to see outputs from this piece of work so if you are actually saying you want to repeat this in two weeks. We have four teams of people sitting there not making progress. I would much prefer to sit down with the Consultant and say when can you come back to us and bring us some information based on us advising you. The options we looked at are included in there and we are satisfied that they are. We can email the presentation out tomorrow morning, you can look at the details, you can convince yourselves that we have followed to the letter and I am confident that Owen has done precisely that. If you think we have changed something round then talk to us next week. I think it would be better rather than putting two weeks in the diary and coming back and repeating this

again, the teams that are sitting behind here, we have lost them for two weeks, so I would rather accept that we are going in the right direction when they can come back and do something meaningful with us in terms of starting to see the numbers behind the options. I think you would be better informed to do that and I would like to think that is before Christmas, but we obviously need to talk to the Consultant because they are setting the programme, but that is my recommendation.

Mr Dyfed Rowlands (CCBC – ERF) commented that in reference to a point Ms Debbie Wareham (Secretary / Ships’ Timbers) made in relation to the cultural heritage, AECOM has identified that they have a dedicated environmental team who will be looking at this, so as the schemes are developed they will be looking at all the cultural heritage and the plans that we have and have been provided, they have those, so they will be considered as part of this.

The Forum Chair commented that he acknowledged what Mr Geraint Edwards (CCBC – ERF) had said, adding that the Forum is not proposing that the Team do not do anything for the next two weeks, but the reality is it was a struggle to see the presentation. If we do all get the presentation by tomorrow, we can feedback probably by Monday. But that does not preclude us from having a meeting in two weeks to see what other things have progressed. There will be feedback from our members, and the team will have had more time and more of the detail of what we have been talking about now. So I don’t see there is break in the process but positive engagement as keeping the ownership within the public stake hold which is what this Forum is set up for.

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) commented that with regard to the heritage, their environmental team were out last week so they were processing that information. Any information that the Forum has they will use as part of the preliminary design process. As regards the programme schedule they accept the programme has slipped a little bit. Depending on what comes back, in terms of comments, two weeks, could be achieved. We will send what we have presented today, and it would be great to get feedback. If we can come back to you in terms of progress, and more thinking time on the information we have.

The Forum Chair commented that this was a positive way forward, as a lot of the Members feel things are happening behind closed doors, which it is not, but it is public perception too.

Mr Berin Jones (LHA) asked what the original time frame for this part of the study to take place was? This was answered as May to November. Mr Berin Jones suggested that if the Consultant was appointed only in September then is it fair to still keep to those original time frames?

Mr Geraint Edwards (CCBC – ERF) commented that he wanted a robust product for this. If the Consultant tells me to deliver that product it is going to take an additional four weeks, then it will take an additional four weeks. We do have our pressures, there are going to be people who want this very quickly. But I am not going to jeopardise the outcome for the robustness of the piece of work as that will lose credibility with everyone. But I have no doubt that the Consultant will not put their name to a document that is going to be sub-standard. We will have those conversations, but we are not at that point yet. If we said Christmas but it comes in January that is fine.

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) commented that to reiterate the point that the more time we have, the more analysis we can do, but there is a professional courtesy of keeping to the programme, as best as we can do. We will try to turn things around as quickly as possible while keeping the integrity, and robustness, of the report.

Mr Mike Shields (RoB) asked if the options that are going to be considered will take into account the reasons we are here in the first place. The only reason they fell into disrepair is because they were never repaired. So, would that option be taken into account?

Mr Ryan Rooprai (AECOM) replied to say we needed to take into consideration as many options as we can, and the whole life cycle of these options, and how they compare with each other. So we will consider that as well.

Mr Owen Conry (CCBC - ERF) confirmed that the email address to contact the Team is [LlandudnoBMP@conwy.gov.uk](mailto:LlandudnoBMP@conwy.gov.uk) to send any feedback.

## **6. WEST SHORE PUBLIC CONSULTATION- UPDATE**

### **Re: Ref 1: LCF 17.11.2016 – 6.1 Doc 1: West Shore Consultation Feedback**

The Forum chair asked if everyone had received the feedback, and asked if there were any comments or questions.

Ms Debbie Wareham (Secretary / Ships' Timbers) commented that the feedback was really positive which corroborates what the Forum was thinking in terms of what had been discussed beforehand. What was useful was the feedback on the dog agility, as that was only something the Forum had considered and we did not know what response we were going to get so it was a good result in that respect.

## **7. NORTH SHORE INTERIM WORK – UPDATE**

### **7.1 July 2016 works update**

Mr Dyfed Rowlands (CCBC –ERF) commented that the works were completed in July, and they had positive press coverage and made a difference to the summer season.

### **7.2 Interim works for 2017**

Mr Dyfed Rowlands (CCBC – ERF) confirmed that both Mr Geraint Edwards and Mr Dyfed Rowlands had a meeting with the Finance Committee of the Llandudno Town Council, in early September time to discuss future works to remove the lower stones on the north shore. It was agreed that the Local Authority should write to the Town Council requesting further funding from the Town Council to remove the stones for the next season. That has been done and they wait for a reply.

Mr Berin Jones (LHA) commented on the delay to this year's works and hopes that we do not go through the same process next year, due to the impact this has on Tourism.

Mr Dyfed Rowlands (CCBC – ERF) commented that he agreed, adding that Tourism is important, but that it is the funding which is the issue, and the Local Authority has not got the funding to undertake the task so we will do our very best to obtain the funding for the future.

The Forum Chair asked if the Local Authority had approached the Tourism Section for funding?

Mr Dyfed Rowlands (CCBC – ERF) commented that they did for the 2016 works, but had not done yet for the 2017 works.

## **8. RNLI LLANDUDNO NEW LIFEBOAT STATION**

### **8.1 Sea Wall and rock armour update**

**Re: Reference 2: LCF 17.11.2016 – 8.1 Doc 1: RNLI Response Letter**

### **8.2 Llandudno Coastal Forum Visit to the new Lifeboat Station**

The Forum Chair commented that the visit to the Station under construction was very positive and we are now going to rearrange another visit for January 2017, so we will be able to see the situation with the rock armour, as they were still working on it when we were there. They did say at the visit that the wall would be filled in, so we need to make sure that happens.

Mr Mike Shields (RoB) commented that the person he spoke with at the site visit gave his assurance that the rock armour would be buried.

The Forum Chair asked for additional comments.

Ms Debbie Wareham (Forum Secretary / Ships' Timbers) commented that regarding the letter from the RNLI, in context of them not wanting a representative on the Coastal Forum, how does that affect using the RNLI logo on the Forum generic logo?

The Forum Chair agreed that the logo does now need addressing.

## **9. MATTERS ARISING RELEVANT TO THE LLANDUDNO COASTAL FORUM**

None

## **10. TO DISCUSS OR NOTE ITEMS OF CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED**

10.1 Costs for using the Town Council Chamber for Coastal Forum Meetings in 2017

**Re: Reference 3: LCF 17.11.2016 – 10.1 Doc 1: Email from Registration Services**

Ms Debbie Wareham (Forum Secretary / Ships' Timbers) mentioned the email correspondence from Glenys Davies, Registration Support Officer (07.11.2016). The use of the Council Chamber would be without cost until 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017, but after that the Forum would have to pay for its use. Apparently, Ken Finch (CCBC) used to sort this matter out.

The Forum Chair asked Mr Geraint Edwards (CCBC – ERF) if he could attend to this.

Mr Geraint Edwards (CCBC – ERF) agreed to attend to this matter.

## **11. TO NOTE THE TIME AND DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next Coastal Forum meeting is agreed as **Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2016 at 18:00hrs** at the Town Hall Llandudno.

**MEETING ENDED 19:50HRS**