



Cell 1 Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme Update Report 5: 'Partial Measures' Survey 2013



Durham Council Final Report

June 2013

# Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms	ii ii iii
Water Levels Used in Interpretation of Changes	ii iii
	iii
Glossary of Terms	
Preamble	iv
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Study Area	1
1.2 Methodology	1
2. Analysis of Survey Data	4
2.1 Featherbed Rocks	4
2.2 Seaham (Dawdon)	5
2.3 Blast Beach	6
2.4 Hawthorne Hive	7
3. Problems Encountered and Uncertainty in Analysis	8
4. Recommendations for 'Fine-tuning' the Monitoring Programme	8
5. Conclusions and Areas of Concern	8

# Appendices

Appendix A	Beach Profiles
Appendix B	Cliff Top Survey

List of Figures Figure 1 Sec Figure 2 Sur Sediment Cells in England and Wales Survey Locations

### List of Tables

Analytical, Update and Overview Reports Produced to Date Sub-division of the Cell 1 Coastline Table 1 Table 2

Authors	
Lily Death	Holorow
спу вооп	Halciow
Dr Paul Fish –	Halcrow
Review of Draft	
Dr Andy Parsons	Halcrow
Ammanual of	
<ul> <li>Approval of</li> </ul>	
Final	

## **Disclaimer**

Halcrow Group Limited ('Halcrow') is a CH2M HILL company. Halcrow has prepared this report in accordance with the instructions of our client Scarborough Borough Council (SBC) for the client's sole and specific use. Any other persons who use any information contained herein do so at their own risk. This report is a review of coastal survey information made available by SBC. The objective of this report is to provide an assessment and review of the relevant background documentation and to analyse and interpret the coastal monitoring data. Halcrow has used reasonable skill, care and diligence in the interpretation of data provided to them and accepts no responsibility for the content, quality or accuracy of any Third party reports, monitoring data or further information provided either to them by SBC or, via SBC from a Third party source, for analysis under this term contract.

Raw data analysed in this report is available to download via the project's webpage: <u>www.northeastcoastalobservatory.org.uk</u>. The North East Coastal Observatory does not "license" the use of images or data or sign license agreements. The North East Coastal Observatory generally has no objection to the reproduction and use of these materials (aerial photography, wave data, beach surveys, bathymetric surveys), subject to the following conditions:

- 1. North East Coastal Observatory material may not be used to state or imply the endorsement by North East Coastal Observatory or by any North East Coastal Observatory employee of a commercial product, service, or activity, or used in any manner that might mislead.
- 2. North East Coastal Observatory should be acknowledged as the source of the material in any use of images and data accessed through this website, please state "Image/Data courtesy of North East Coastal Observatory". We recommend that the caption for any image and data published includes our website, so that others can locate or obtain copies when needed. We always appreciate notification of beneficial uses of images and data within your applications. This will help us continue to maintain these freely available services. Send e-mail to Robin.Siddle@scarborough.gov.uk
- 3. It is unlawful to falsely claim copyright or other rights in North East Coastal Observatory material.
- 4. North East Coastal Observatory shall in no way be liable for any costs, expenses, claims, or demands arising out of the use of North East Coastal Observatory material by a recipient or a recipient's distributees.
- 5. North East Coastal Observatory does not indemnify nor hold harmless users of North East Coastal Observatory material, nor release such users from copyright infringement, nor grant exclusive use rights with respect to North East Coastal Observatory material.
- 6. North East Coastal Observatory material is not protected by copyright unless noted (in associated metadata). If copyrighted, permission should be obtained from the copyright owner prior to use. If not copyrighted, North East Coastal Observatory material may be reproduced and distributed without further permission from North East Coastal Observatory.

# Abbreviations and Acronyms

Acronym / Abbreviation	Definition
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
DGM	Digital Ground Model
HAT	Highest Astronomical Tide
LAT	Lowest Astronomical Tide
MHWN	Mean High Water Neap
MHWS	Mean High Water Spring
MLWS	Mean Low Water Neap
MLWS	Mean Low Water Spring
m	metres
ODN	Ordnance Datum Newlyn

# Water Levels Used in Interpretation of Changes

	Water Level (m A			
Water Level Parameter	River Tyne to Frenchman's Bay	Frenchman's Bay to Souter Point	Souter Point to Chourdon Point	Chourdon Point to Hartlepool Headland
1 in 200 year	3.41	3.44	3.66	3.91
HAT	2.85	2.88	3.18	3.30
MHWS	2.15	2.18	2.48	2.70
MLWS	-2.15	-2.12	-1.92	-1.90

**Source:** *River Tyne to Flamborough Head Shoreline Management Plan 2.* Royal Haskoning, February 2007.

# **Glossary of Terms**

Term	Definition
Beach nourishment	Artificial process of replenishing a beach with material from another source
Berm crest	Ridge of sand or gravel deposited by wave action on the shore just above the normal high water mark.
Breaker zone	Area in the sea where the waves break.
Coastal	The reduction in habitat area which can arise if the natural landward
squeeze	migration of a habitat under sea level rise is prevented by the fixing of the high water mark, e.g. a sea wall.
Downdrift	Direction of alongshore movement of beach materials.
Ebb-tide	The falling tide, part of the tidal cycle between high water and the next low water.
Fetch	Length of water over which a given wind has blown that determines the size of the waves produced.
Flood-tide	Rising tide, part of the tidal cycle between low water and the next high water.
Foreshore	Zone between the high water and low water marks, also known as the intertidal zone.
Geomorphology	The branch of physical geography/geology which deals with the form of the Earth, the general configuration of its surface, the distribution of the
	land, water, etc.
Groyne	Shore protection structure built perpendicular to the shore; designed to trap sediment.
Mean High Water (MHW)	The average of all high waters observed over a sufficiently long period.
Mean Low Water (MLW)	The average of all low waters observed over a sufficiently long period.
Mean Sea Level (MSL)	Average height of the sea surface over a 19-year period.
Offshore zone	Extends from the low water mark to a water depth of about 15 m and is permanently covered with water.
Storm surge	A rise in the sea surface on an open coast, resulting from a storm.
Swell	Waves that have travelled out of the area in which they were generated.
Tidal prism	The volume of water within the estuary between the level of high and low tide, typically taken for mean spring tides.
Tide	Periodic rising and falling of large bodies of water resulting from the gravitational attraction of the moon and sun acting on the rotating earth.
Topography	Configuration of a surface including its relief and the position of its natural and man-made features.
Transgression	The landward movement of the shoreline in response to a rise in relative sea level.
Updrift	Direction opposite to the predominant movement of longshore transport.
Wave direction	Direction from which a wave approaches.
Wave refraction	Process by which the direction of approach of a wave changes as it moves into shallow water.

### Preamble

The Cell 1 Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme covers approximately 300km of the north east coastline, from the Scottish Border (just south of St. Abb's Head) to Flamborough Head in East Yorkshire. This coastline is often referred to as 'Coastal Sediment Cell 1' in England and Wales (Figure 1).



Figure 1 Sediment Cells in England and Wales

The main elements of the Cell 1 Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme involve:

- beach profile surveys
- topographic surveys
- cliff top recession surveys
- real-time wave data collection
- bathymetric and sea bed characterisation surveys
- aerial photography
- walk-over surveys

The beach profile surveys, topographic surveys and cliff top recession surveys are undertaken as a 'Full Measures' survey in autumn/early winter every year. Some of these surveys are then repeated the following spring as part of a 'Partial Measures' survey.

Table	Table 1         Analytical, Update and Overview Reports Produced to Date					
Year		Full Measures		Partial Measures		Cell 1
		Survey	Analytical Report	Survey	Update Report	Overview Report
1	2008/09	Sep-Dec 08	May 09	Mar-May 09		-
2	2009/10	Sep-Dec 09	Mar 10	Feb-Mar 10	July 10	-
3	2010/11	Aug-Nov 10	Feb 11	Feb-Apr 11	Aug 1	Sep 11
4	2011/12	Sep 2011	Aug 12	Mar-May 12	Feb 13	
5	2012/13	Sept 2012	Feb 13 (*)	Mar-Apr 13(*)	May 2013	

To date the following reports have been produced:

<sup>(\*)</sup> The present report is **Update Report 5** and provides an analysis of the 2013 Partial Measures survey for Durham Council's frontage.

# 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Study Area

Durham Council's frontage extends from Ryhope Dene to Crimdon Beck. For the purposes of this report, it has been sub-divided into four areas, namely:

- Featherbed Rocks
- Seaham (Dawdon)
- Blast Beach
- Hawthorn Hive
- Blackhall Colliery

## 1.2 Methodology

Along Durham County Council's frontage, the following surveying is undertaken:

- Full Measures survey annually each autumn/early winter comprising:
   Beach profile surveys along eight. transect lines
  - Partial Measures survey annually each spring comprising:
    - Beach profile surveys along five. transect lines
- Cliff top survey bi-annually at:
  - Seaham (Dawdon)

The location of these surveys is shown in Figure 2. The Partial Measures survey was undertaken along this frontage on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2013. During the survey the weather was sunny and dry, the wind was force 3 from the west and the sea state was calm.

This Update Report presents the following:

- description of the changes observed since the previous survey and an interpretation of the drivers of these changes (Section 2);
- documentation of any problems encountered during surveying or uncertainties inherent in the analysis (Section 3);
- recommendations for 'fine-tuning' the programme to enhance its outputs (Section 4); and
- providing key conclusions and highlighting any areas of concern (Section 5).

Data from the present survey are presented in a processed form in the Appendices.





# 2. Analysis of Survey Data

# 2.1 Featherbed Rocks

Survey Date	Description of Changes Since Last Survey	Interpretation
26 <sup>th</sup> April 2013	Beach Profiles:         Featherbed Rocks is monitored by one beach profile line (EA1) during the Partial Measures survey (Appendix A). The previous survey was September 2011.         Profile EA1 has changed very little to 55m chainage. Between 55m chainage and 80m chainage the sea wall is more exposed than in the October 2012 profile, there has been around 0.2m of erosion. From 80m chainage to 150m chainage the rocks on the foreshore are exposed because the beach level has dropped by up to 0.5m. The profile is among the lowest recorded profiles and is comparable with March 2010.         The surveyor noted that section EA1 has no sand on it. Previously unseen groynes can be view to the north of the section line.	The sand veneer had been eroded from the beach over the winter of 2012/13. <b>Longer term trends:</b> The level of the beach in April 2013 was low. The most recent survey is comparable with the lowest beach levels, recorded in March 2010. However, this is considered to be due to seasonal fluctuations.

# 2.2 Seaham (Dawdon)

Survey Date	Description of Changes Since Last Survey	Interpretation
26 <sup>th</sup> April 2013	Cliff-top Survey: Three ground control points have been established along the cliff top at Dawdon (Figure B1). The separation between any two points is nominally 300m. These cliff top surveys are intended to inform on erosion rates of the undefended sea cliffs extending south of the rock armour revetment to the south of Seaham Harbour. The cliff top surveys at Dawdon are undertaken bi-annually. Measurements are taken from a fixed ground control point along a fixed bearing to the edge of the cliff top. Appendix B provides results from the April 2013 survey showing the position from the ground control point to the edge of the cliff top along the defined bearing and changes since the November 2008 baseline survey. The cliff monitoring data are inconclusive, and show no change larger than the 0.1m margin of error in the last 6 months. This result is an artefact of errors in the survey data masking any short term change in cliff position.	All of the ground control points showed a small cliff advance since the previous survey in October 2012. As a result there is low confidence in the cliff recession data. <b>Longer term trends:</b> Ground Control Points 1 and 3 has shown an average recession rate of 0.2m/year since monitoring began in 2008. Point 2 has shown no erosion. There is more confidence in the long-term pattern of change, where the cumulative measured erosion is greater than the error inherent in the technique.

# 2.3 Blast Beach

Survey Date	Description of Changes Since Last Survey	Interpretation
26 <sup>th</sup> April 2013	Beach Profiles:	There has been a variable pattern of accretion and erosion along this frontage over the winter of 2012/13.
	Blast Beach is covered by three beach profile lines during the Partial Measures survey (Appendix A).	The observed localised accretion of the beaches at
	Two of these commenced in November 2008, with SH1a being added in October 2009.	SH1 and SH1a.
	At SH1a the crest of the eroding face of spoil was at 140m chainage in October 2012 and April 2013.Between 140m and 205m chainage the beach has accreted by up to 2m. From 205m to the end of the survey at 270m chainage, where the rocks are exposed, the beach has not changed over the winter of 2012/13. The surveyor was unable to measure the bottom and top of section 1a due to vegetation SH1 the crest on the upper beach is at 75m chainage in October 2012 and April 2013. From 75m to 100m chainage the beach level has dropped by around 0.5m. Below 100m chainage for the rest of the survey the beach has accreted by 1.5m. SH2 the beach below the berm's crest has eroded by up to 1.5m at around 130m chainage. A mound of	There was erosion of beach material at SH2, but no obvious failures on the cliff, although the surveyor noted "a number of recent rock falls". As a result the material which fed the beaches is from the cliffs or other parts of the beach. The accretion is not likely to be from alongshore sediment transport and does not suggest that new material from offshore has entered the beach.
	material which was on the beach in the October 2012 survey has been eroded resulting in a 1.5m drop in beach level.	Longer term trends: Profile SH2 shows obvious progressive recession with the beach moving landward each year. Conversely both, SH1a and SH1 show fluctuations in the height and width of the beach with no obvious trend through time. The April 2013 beach profiles for SH1a and SH1 have a large mound on each, which is higher than any previous profile and has not been observed before.

# 2.4 Hawthorne Hive

Survey Date	Description of Changes Since Last Survey	Interpretation
26 <sup>th</sup> April 2013	Beach Profiles:	The beach profile is at a historically low level, with the profile being the lowest since 2008.
	Hawthorne Hive is covered by one beach profile line (EA2) during the Partial Measures survey (Appendix A). The surveyor was "unable to measure start of Section EA2 as the vegetation has choked out the section line and route over cliff faces". The beginning of the April 2013 survey s at 95m chainage, which is comparable with the October 2012 survey. The channel has in filled and the beach level at 105m chainage is 1.5m higher than in October 2012. Next to the channel the crest of the beach is at 110m chainage and this has remained relatively stable since October 2012. From the crest of the beach at 110m to the end of the survey at 200m chainage the beach level has dropped by 0.5m over the winter of 2012/13 although the gradient is similar.	<b>Longer term trends:</b> The profiles show that the beach is undergoing progressive erosion. There is a clear trend of the profiles moving back through time. The beach levels may still recover over the summer of 2013.

### 3. Problems Encountered and Uncertainty in Analysis

### **Individual Profiles**

At the Blast Beach profile, SH1a, the surveyor was unable to measure the bottom and top of section 1a due to vegetation

At Hawthorne Hive the surveyor was "unable to measure start of Section EA2 as the vegetation has choked out the section line and route over cliff faces".

### **Cliff Top Surveys**

The cliff top position surveys at Dawdon are assumed to have a limit of accuracy of  $\pm 0.1$ m due to the techniques used. Whilst a short term erosion rate has been calculated from these cliff top survey data, there is low confidence in the results due to the short time span of the data collection and the likely error in the method. All of the three cliff data points show a small amount of growth over the last six months, which is likely to be due to error. The longer-term rate of change is more meaningful, with cliffs either eroding at a low rate or remaining stable. Additional data on cliff recession rates will be derived from analysis of high resolution and map-accurate aerial photography, which will be documented in a separate report.

### 4. Recommendations for 'Fine-tuning' the Monitoring Programme

No changes are recommended at the present time.

### 5. Conclusions and Areas of Concern

- At Featherbed Rocks the level of the beach in April 2013 was low. The most recent survey is comparable with the lowest beach levels, recorded in March 2010. The lowering of the beach could be the precursor to a trend of erosion affecting the cliff. As a result, the beach level should be watched closely over the next few surveys to see if this is an erosive trend, or natural variation.
- The Dawdon Cliff survey data shows that the average recession rate since monitoring began in 2008 is around 0.2m/yr although there is some uncertainty over the accuracy of the data.
- At Blast Beach there has been accretion and erosion along this frontage over the winter months. The observed accretion on the beach is likely to be the accumulation of sediment from the spoil or from alongshore. There is no immediate cause for concern along this frontage. In the future the sea cliffs are likely to reactivate and erode back once the spoil has eroded from the beach.
- At Hawthorn Hive the beach profile was at its lowest recorded level and the profiles show that the beach is undergoing progressive erosion. The low beach levels may recover over the summer of 2013.

Appendices

Appendix A

**Beach Profiles** 

Code	Description	
S	Sand	
М	Mud	
G	Gravel	
GS	Gravel & Sand	
MS	Mud & Sand	
В	Boulders	
R	Rock	
SD	Sea Defence	
SM	Saltmarsh	
W	Water Body	
GM	Gravel & Mud	
GR	Grass	
D	Dune (non-vegetated)	
DV	Dune (vegetated)	
F	Forested	
Х	Mixture	
FB	Obstruction	
СТ	Cliff Top	
CE	Cliff Edge	
CF	Cliff Face	
SH	Shell	
ZZ	Unknown	

The following sediment feature codes are used on some profile plots:

Profiles: 1bEA1



### Profiles: 1bSH1A



### Profiles: 1bSH1



Profiles: 1bSH2



### Profiles: 1cEA2



Appendix B

Cliff Top Survey

### **Cliff Top Survey**

### Seaham (Dawdon)

Three ground control points have been established at Dawdon (Figure B1). The maximum separation between any two points varies along the coast, reflecting the degree of risk from the erosion.

The cliff top surveys at Dawdon are undertaken bi-annually. Measurements are taken from a fixed ground control point along a fixed bearing to the edge of the cliff top.

Table B1 provides baseline information about these ground control points and results from the 2008 (baseline) survey showing the position from the ground control point to the edge of the cliff top along the defined bearing. Future reports will show results from subsequent surveys and provide a means of assessing erosion since the baseline survey.

Ground Control Point Details				Distance to Cliff Top (m)			Total Erosion (m)		Erosion Rate (m/year)
Ref	Easting	Northing	Bearing (º)	Baseline Survey (Nov 2008)	Previous Survey (Oct 2012)	Present Survey (Apr 2013)	Baseline (Nov 2008) to Present (Apr 2013)	Previous (Oct 2012) to Present (Apr 2013)	Baseline (Nov 2008) to Present (Apr 2013)
1	443515.4	548421.7	70	16.1	15.2	15.2	-0.9	0.01	-0.2
2	443607.8	548136.3	90	13.3	13.3	13.4	0.0	0.06	0.0
3	443756.1	547858.5	95	14.8	13.7	13.7	-1.1	0.03	-0.2

#### Table B1 – Cliff Top Surveys at Dawdon

