Coastal Liaison Group

Minutes of Meeting No. 17

12th February 2020 – 4pm

Chief Executive Conference Room, County Hall, Swords

Present Apologies

Councillors Adrian Henchy David Healy Paul Mulville

Brian Dennehy

Representatives Michael Moynihan

Raymond Brett

Fintan Price

Charles Sargent

Pat O’Brien

Henry Donovan

Council Officials Matthew McAleese

Kevin Halpenny

Hans Visser

Eamon Lynch

Visitors Adrian Bell, RPS

Kristopher Caulder, RPS

Philip Crowe, UCD

KH opened the meeting by thanking everyone for attending and asking if everyone could introduce themselves. Introductions were made around the table.

1. Minutes of last Meeting.

The minutes of the previous meeting held on the 11th September 2019 which had been circulated prior to the meeting were proposed by Councillor P Mulville, seconded by Councillor A. Henchy and AGREED.

1. Update on Emergency Works at Burrow Beach and briefing on options assessment for addressing coastal erosion/flooding in the Rogerstown Estuary.

A presentation was made by RPS. They began by giving a brief recap of their study to date. Discussion took place throughout the presentation. In relation to The Burrow there are 3 options available and for Rush South only 1 option.

The Burrow

1. Embankment, urban walls, promenade, rock amour
2. Embankment, urban walls, and inland flood defences
3. Embankment, urban wall, tail groynes, beach nourishment

Rush South

1. Flood wall, gates and culverts

RPS stated that Option 3 is the recommend option. Discussion followed in relation to this and the location of sand. RB enquired about sand from Dublin Port. AB stated that not all sand is the same as there is different grain and extensive studies are needed to remove sand and transfer it to another location. It is very important to go through the natural process, the longest part being acquiring permits and getting started. This are is also highly designated and it is necessary to thread carefully. The presentation continued and it was stated that all proposals need statutory approval from OPW, NWPS, EPA etc. The next stage is the Environmental Assessment – any planning project needs the appropriate assessment under the Birds & Habitat Directive. If it is considered that there is any impact on the environment, it cannot go ahead. In the meantime, the seabees will extended to allow for the assessment to take place. CS enquired as to the impact on natural population. KC stated that this option is protecting the natural beach and residents. RB stated that the situation is desperate and extreme – properties are in danger and people could take matters in their own hands. How long will it take for Option 2? PM asked about the extra Seabees, how far will they go? Also, in relation to the public meeting, how long will it be before this can held? KH stated that the extension of the Seabees will take place in the next 2 weeks following further discussion with RPS. He also stated that he would intend to hold the public meeting in 3 weeks. BD stated that as these are 2 different projects, Portrane Beach & Rush South, when will Rush South begin as this is not as bad as Portrane. KH stated that Rush South is progressing and will be prepared for the environmental assessment. MM asked what is a realistic timeline and the length of the groynes the beach? KC stated that it will take approximately 1 year to get to planning and then it must go through the planning process (possibly 2yrs). He stated that there will be approximately 8 groynes, 70 metres from the dunes. AH enquired if Option 3 was most viable and if FCC were confident that all parties were on board? AB stated that the Council will have to wait for the environmental assessment. RB stated that barriers are constantly being found to delay this and enquired will the OPW and NWPS back this? KH stated all evidence needs to be gathered and for this to go to planning stage. RB stated that his has been done before, at the final minute then stopped. What guarantee is there? FCC always get the blame? KH informed the meeting that discussions have been ongoing to avoid this kind of situation and the CEO is on board. FP asked about Rush South Beach and if groynes would be placed there as this could affect the Golf Club? AB stated that the amount of loss at this point was very small and there was no justification for intervention. Golf Clubs are considered agricultural land and have not the same value. AH looked for clarification that the timeframe is 1 yr to planning and in the interim the seabees would be extended. He also asked about the public meeting. KC stated that this was the case and that the seabees would not stop what is happening but slow it down. KH said that he was quite aware of the feelings in the locality, but FCC need to have all details and information to hand to meet. MM enquired if funding for this has been ringfenced? KH stated that the funding body has encouraged FCC to progress. RB asked if a letter could be sent to the OPW and the NWPS asking them to attend the public meeting to explain their position and willingness to back the project. KH stated that the Council cannot demand attendance from anyone. FCC have had positive meetings with the OPW, and they are engaging. THE CEO is very energised to proceed with this. He informed the meeting that he will tell them that residents have this concern, that there is a lack of confidence and they need assurance. AH enquired if they are not available could they make a statement to show the people that they are on board. BD asked for clarification in relation to the houses on North Beach – discussion to place about fences that are in place to prevent erosion, which are unauthorised, and if this situation could be remedied. KH stated that he will check exactly what the situation is at this location. RB asked if there is a situation whereby sand could be stock piled to have it ready. AB said no, not until the planning process was complete and there the Council will have different options for sand depending on the market at the time. HD stated that the sand was building up behind the Seabees in the middle and enquired if they could be sealed at each end. KC stated that this would create a danger as there would be no access. MM enquired if there was anymore protection as his end and about the toilets? KH stated that toilets will need to be demolished.

1. Briefing on Coastal Communities Adapting Together (CCAT) INTERREG Programme

KH introduced Philip Crow from UCD and informed the members that FCC have embarked on the EU project called Coastal Communities Adapting Together, CCAT. He stated that they had a shared interest in what is happening to our coastline and they want to share knowledge, understanding, find solutions etc. What is happening is not unique in Fingal. This is a 2-year programme funded by the EU through Interreg. We will engage in getting the best solutions. PC stated that this would bring people along with the process of change on the coast and the various techniques of involving change. It will involve local groups through engagement, different initiatives over the next few months. The project will also fund the engagement of an individual to work solely on this with the communities.

1. Report on approach to Fingal Coastal Monitoring programme.   
   KH gave update on work of OPW in relation to monitoring.

.

1. Briefing on Brook End former Landfill.

Atkins have produced a draft report with various recommendations. This is now with the Environment Department and full document will be given in due course.

1. Update on Report on National Coastal Erosion Audit.

No update available

1. Date of next meeting.

The date of the next meeting is Wednesday 22nd April 2020 at 4pm in the Chief Executive Conference Room, 4th Floor, County Hall, Swords.