



# Ayrshire Shoreline Management Plan

## Appendix B: Stakeholder Engagement

IBE1107/D03

Final

July 2018







# Ayrshire Shoreline Management Plan

## Appendix B: Stakeholder Engagement

### DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Client	North / South Ayrshire Council					
Project Title	Ayrshire Shoreline Management Plan					
Document Title	Appendix B - Stakeholder Engagement					
Document No.	IBE1107/D03 – Appendix B					
This Document Comprises	DCS	TOC	Text	List of Tables	List of Figures	No. of Appendices
	1	1	9	1	0	0

Rev.	Status	Author(s)	Reviewed By	Approved By	Office of Origin	Issue Date
D01	Draft	D.King	R.Bingham	M.Brian	Belfast	23/01/2018
F01	Final	D King	R Bingham	M Brian	Belfast	27/07/2018



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>B-1</b>
1.1	BACKGROUND .....	B-1
1.2	GUIDING PRINCIPLES.....	B-1
1.3	STAKEHOLDER MAPPING .....	B-1
1.4	PROJECT STEERING GROUP.....	B-3
1.5	CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES .....	B-3
	1.5.1 Initial Consultation .....	B-3
	1.5.2 Elected Member Briefing.....	B-5
	1.5.3 Public Consultation.....	B-5
1.6	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK.....	B-7
	1.6.1 Initial Consultation .....	B-7
	1.6.2 Public Consultation.....	B-9

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Stakeholders consulted in relation to the Stakeholder Consultation Report.....	B-3
Table 2: Draft Plan Public Consultation Days .....	B-5



# **1 INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1 Background**

The Ayrshire Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) aims to provide guidance to operating authorities and regulatory bodies as to future sustainable flood and coastal erosion risk management policy along the Ayrshire coastline. The SMP essentially provides an agreed high level approach, intent and framework for shoreline management. In addition, the SMP also aims to provide guidance to planners, individuals and organisations with interests in the coast; setting out an overview of coastal behaviour, the pressures, constraints and opportunities for sustainable use of the coastal zone to facilitate and guide others in the development of their own plans.

To achieve this, meaningful and effective stakeholder communication and engagement was critical as it provided an essential means by which to improve the quality and comprehensiveness of the Plan. This was realised, by providing platforms through which the unique expertise and opinions of interested parties could be assimilated and taken into consideration throughout the decision-making process. This further enabled stakeholders to take ownership of the chosen solution(s).

## **1.2 Guiding principles**

Positive relationships, built upon trust and mutual understanding, are necessary to ensure effective stakeholder participation. Consequently, all communication and consultation activities adhered to the principles of being proactive, accessible, meaningful and accountable so as to provide for overall effectiveness.

Using these principles, stakeholder communication and engagement may take many direct and indirect forms, using both contemporary and traditional mediums, whilst remaining ever fluid and flexible so as to ensure that stakeholder and project needs are tailored to, as and when required.

## **1.3 Stakeholder Mapping**

The tailored nature of communication and engagement activities was dependent upon the identification of individuals and groups interested in, or affected by, the Plan. Consequently, stakeholder mapping was an essential conduit to ensuring that individuals and organisations were identified and targeted with relevant information about the project at the appropriate juncture(s).

Stakeholder mapping activities for the Ayrshire SMP included:

- an initial stakeholder mapping exercise; and
- ongoing stakeholder mapping activities.

The initial stakeholder mapping exercise included compilation of a list of all potential relevant stakeholders including:

- Environmental Authorities;
- Primary Stakeholders;
  - Government Departments;
  - County, city and town councils.
- Secondary Stakeholders:
  - State agencies and bodies;
  - Regional authorities;
  - Development boards;
  - Industry and representative bodies;
  - Non-governmental organisations;
  - Research projects.

Stakeholder details were compiled into a Stakeholder Register. The stakeholders included in the register constituted the Stakeholder Group. Ongoing stakeholder mapping ensured that the Stakeholder Register remained relevant and up-to-date.

Additional interested parties outside of the Stakeholder Group were also identified. These included:

- The general public living within the vicinity of the Ayrshire coast;
- Local groups;



- Councillors; and
- MSPs.

These individuals were invited to attend public consultation activities, and to use the various other mechanisms established to engage with the project team during the Plan development.

## 1.4 Project Steering Group

In addition to the Stakeholder Group and those interested parties identified during stakeholder mapping, a Project Steering Group (PSG) was established at the project outset to provide information and specialist knowledge in relation to the Plan. It was principally composed of statutory consultees, local authorities and other primary interest groups; to provide for the consideration of all interests when reviewing issues. The group meet regularly throughout the life of the project to discuss and provide feedback in relation to the development of the Plan. It provided a forum through which collaborative decision-making could be achieved in order to enhance stakeholder ownership of final decisions.

## 1.5 Consultation Activities

### 1.5.1 Initial Consultation

The Ayrshire Stakeholder Consultation Report was distributed to members of the Stakeholder Group on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2017. The report provides a brief description of the scope, necessity and intended purpose of the Plan. It was sent as an accompaniment to an email that invited members to provide information which might be pertinent to the successful development of the Plan.

Responses in relation to the report were received from several stakeholders who provided further details regarding past and present coastal processes, environmental concerns and works which had previously been undertaken. Details of responses received can be found in section 1.6.1.

**Table 1:** Stakeholders consulted in relation to the Stakeholder Consultation Report

Organisation	Contacted	Received	Medium
RSPB	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
Firth of Clyde Forum	22/05/2017	14/06/2017	Email
Scottish Water	22/05/2017	14/06/2017	Tel/Email
Transport Scotland	22/05/2017	12/06/2017	Email
Hunterston/EDF	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A

<b>Largs Golf Club</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Routenburn Golf Club</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>West Kilbride Golf Club</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Auchenharvie Golf Club</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Irvine Bogside Golf Club</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Gailes Link</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Western Gailes Golf Club</b>	22/05/2017	13/06/2017	Email
<b>Dundonald Links</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Troon Yacht Havens</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Darley Golf Course</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Fullarton Golf Club</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Lochgreen Golf Course</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Royal Troon Golf Club</b>	22/05/2017	12/06/2017	Tel/Email
<b>Prestwick St Nicholas Golf Club</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Prestwick St Cuthbert</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Dalmilling Golf Club</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Seafield Golf Course</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Belle isle Golf Club</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Trump Turnberry Ailsa</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Girvan Golf Course</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Brodick Golf Club</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Futurescape</b>	22/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Ayrshire Rivers Trust</b>	22/05/2017	12/06/2017	Email
<b>Community of Arran Seabed Trust</b>	31/05/2017	N/A	N/A
<b>Whiting Bay and Districts Improvement Association</b>	N/A	15/06/2017	Email
<b>North Ayrshire Council</b>	31/05/2017	15/08/2017	Email

### 1.5.2 Elected Member Briefing

In August 2017, Elected Members within North and South Ayrshire were provided with a short summary of the Ayrshire SMP and its associated environmental assessments. They were also provided with a PowerPoint presentation which detailed the scope, objectives, and policy options available to the Plan; along with a brief summary of the assets which had been identified as being at risk of coastal flooding. The purpose of these documents was to better inform Elected Members of the Plan, as a way of maintaining and enhancing stakeholder relationships, promoting positive dialogues in relation to the Plan, and ensuring ongoing transparency throughout the Plan development.

### 1.5.3 Public Consultation

Upon completion of the draft Plan, it was issued for public consultation. This was achieved by making the Plan and associated documents available in hard copy at North Ayrshire Council and South Ayrshire Council premises, and in electronic format via both Council websites. A number of Public Consultation Days; as detailed in Table 2 were also held to provide a forum for members of the public to view the draft Plan and directly engage with members of the Project Team; to ask questions, express concerns and/or provide feedback.

**Table 2:** Draft Plan Public Consultation Days

Location and Venue	Date and Time	RPS Staff	LA Staff
Irvine Library, 168 High Street, Irvine, KA12 8AN	Monday 19 <sup>th</sup> February 2018, 12pm – 7pm	MB/DK	PR
Millport Library, The Garrison, Millport, Isle of Cumbrae, KA28 0DG	Tuesday 20 <sup>th</sup> February 2018, 12pm - 6:50pm	MB/DK	PR
Ardrossan Civic Centre, 150 Glasgow Street, Ardrossan,	Wednesday 21 <sup>st</sup> February 2018, 12pm – 7pm	MB/DK	PR

KA22 8EU			
Brodick Library, Main Street, Brodick, Isle of Arran, KA27 8DL	Thursday 22 <sup>nd</sup> February 2018, 12pm - 6:50pm	MB/DK	PR
Largs Library, 26 Allanpark Street, Largs, KA30 9AG	Friday 23 <sup>rd</sup> February 2018, 12pm - 5pm	MB/DK	PR
Prestwick Library, 14 Kyle Street, Prestwick, KA9 1PQ.	Monday 5 <sup>th</sup> March 2018, 2pm – 6pm	MB/DK	SG
Carnegie Library, 12 Main Street, Ayr, KA8 8EB.	Tuesday 6 <sup>th</sup> March 2018, 2pm - 6pm	MB/DK	SG
Girvan Library, Montgomerie Street, Girvan, KA26 9HE.	Wednesday 7 <sup>th</sup> March 2018, 12pm - 1pm and 2pm – 5pm	MB/DK	SG
Troon Library, 5 South Beach, Troon, KA10 6EF.	Thursday 8 <sup>th</sup> March 2018, 2pm - 6pm	MB/DK	SG

## 1.6 Consultation Feedback

### 1.6.1 Initial Consultation

Information received in response to the invitation which was sent out to members of the Stakeholder Group to provide details which might be pertinent to the Plan can be summarised as follows:

Ayrshire Rivers Trust:

- Alterations to the mouth of the River Stinchar in 2013.
- Migratory trout common to all Ayrshire Rivers.
- Sedimentation resulting in management means such as dredging may lead to degradation of marine habitats. Reducing this type of sediment loss/deposition should be a priority.

Firth of Clyde Forum:

- Coast should be managed flexibly to allow for the uncertainties in the future impacts of sea-level rise and storminess on the shoreline.
- Reference to GEN 5 climate change on page 18-19 and Gen 8 on page 22 – 23 at: <http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2015/03/6517>

Royal Troon Golf Club:

- All the land within the ownership of Royal Troon Golf Club south of the Gyaws Burn lies within an SSSI (extends 150 hectares).
- The Royal Troon Golf Club enjoys gold level standard certification under the Golf Environment Organisation.
- Coastal protection work undertaken primarily comprised of chespaie sand fencing and the installation of gabions.
- In the late 80's/early 90's various remedial measures were implemented to regenerate and stabilise dunes however repeated severe storms resulted in continued loss of ground. Remedial measures include sand traps, fencing and netting, gabion wire baskets and plastic Georgia mesh.
- Formal monitoring regime currently in place – annual inspection and monitoring survey of coastal dynamics.
- “Coastal erosion at Royal Troon is fairly latent at least through certain sections with little obvious change being noted over the five year term. Certain sections of the coastline however, are not recovering following periods of erosion attributable to high tides and/or increased storm surge events”.

- “Areas of particular concern include the right of the 2<sup>nd</sup> tee through and right of the 3<sup>rd</sup> hole, although here coastal defences in the form of wire gabion baskets are holding up and will provide good short term protection against seawater inundation”.
- Another key issue highlighted in the report is the repositioning of the mouth of the Pow Burn, where the sandpit on the south side of the Burn is accreting which is pushing the Burn northwards with impacts on the dune system to the south of the 6<sup>th</sup> green.
- The Club has commissioned STRI Ecology and Environment to prepare a Coastal Management Plan. Various surveys will be undertaken as part of the study...these include botanical and winter bird surveys in addition to extensive desk top surveys.

#### Whiting Bay and Districts Improvements Association:

- Area between Sandbraes and Glen Ashdale Burn is subject to erosion; as is Sandbraes Park, the area opposite the school and the putting green.
- Erosion also at the standing area for a boat slip was protected by gabions but these are breaking up.
- Further south, gabions protect a parking area and a sea wall extends to the south. While the wall appears to be holding the sea back there have been times when it was breached and holes have appeared in the road. At high tides, the waves often come over the wall and can flood the other side of the road.
- Coastal erosion appears to be getting worse and at a much faster rate than in the past.

#### Western Gailes Golf Club:

- A limited number of large concrete pipes are supporting the dunes. The pipes are filled with sand. A local company looked to fortify some of the dunes with gabions.
- High tides in winter can give rise to sea water encroaching around the area of the burn at the south end of the golf course. Would estimate the depth to be up to around three feet in and around the burn area. This can give rise to sedimentation.
- Proportion of the dunes has been lost over the years as this would apply to the full extent of the course shoreline.
- Part of the golf course lies within an SSSI.
- Awaiting photographs of erosion/coastal landscape.

#### Transport Scotland:

- Suggested consulting SEPA/Local Council.

## **1.6.2 Public Consultation**

Information received via the Public Consultation Days and through the online consultation process is collated in the Consultation Summary Report, IBE1107Rp0005 July 2018. The comments received during public consultation events were generally positive and in agreement with the proposed policies for each policy unit or sub-cell and the Ayrshire coast as a whole. Where disagreement was expressed, it was mostly in relation to particular localised issues as opposed to issues affecting the entire policy unit or sub-cell. However all issues raised were noted, along with any suggestions for amendments or future work in order to ensure that the consultation process was fully inclusive.

One recurring comment related to concern with regard to the timescale for the implementation of the Plan, and any works which may result. Other key issues raised were as follows:

### **1.6.2.1 Clarity**

The need for greater clarity was identified in relation to several aspects of the Plan and Environmental Report (ER). In particular, the notion of maximum wave height required explanation, insofar as it needed to be clarified that the wave heights quoted within the Plan are those at the shoreline, as opposed to deep-sea wave heights, and are thus depth limited. Clarification was further required in relation to the depth of the Plan Area inland. Whilst this was noted in the ER as being a minimum of 1km inland of the coastline, this was not elucidated within the Plan. Clarification was also sought with regard to the extent of implementation of proposed policy within policy units. It was noted that it was unclear as to whether proposed policy would be implemented throughout the relevant policy unit or solely in relation to those areas which would justify the use of the policy. Further detail was added to the final Plan to clarify that the proposed policy provided an indication of the most appropriate approach towards shoreline management within a given unit. That said, the approach outlined is one of generality and thus the most appropriate measures with regard to specific sites will depend on the issue at hand, and upon the technical, environmental, social and economic circumstances which surround it.

### **1.6.2.2 Information**

The approach taken towards the development of the Plan, with regard to the information which was used in relation to its formulation, was both commended and criticised, and a range of suggestions relating to the use of further information was provided. An example of this relates to the use of Natural Environment Research Council's (NERC's) Greening the Grey document to inform the development of coastal defence infrastructure subsequent to the implementation of the Plan. A further example relates to the need to make specific reference to SEPA's indicative flood maps within the ER, with regard to the flood risk context along the shoreline.

The need to acknowledge the limitations of the information which was used to compile the Plan was also identified. For example, the Dynamic Coast: Scotland's National Coastal Change Assessment (NCCA) was used to inform the Plan. One of the limitations of this assessment is that it assumes no increase in erosion rates as a result of relative erosion risk where this has been managed in the past by way of defences. Another example relates to the use of SEPA's coastal flood maps which do not consider the impact of wave over-topping upon flood risk. These comments were noted and the limitations of the data are acknowledged in the final Plan.

#### **1.6.2.3 Detail**

Concern was expressed with regard to the level of detail into which the Plan went. This was particularly the case with regard to the use of coastal process information within the Plan. For example, it was expressed that the Plan did not adequately consider the interconnectedness of the coast and hinterland and the impact which this might have upon coastal processes and thus management approach. Another example related to a comment received which expressed concern for the extent to which modelling was undertaken and the extent to which it informed the management policies proposed. While this was acknowledged, the presumption on which the Plan was developed was that it would be based on existing information and knowledge (including that developed by way of modelling) without extensive recourse to new studies or research. No new modelling was thus undertaken as part of the Plan.

#### **1.6.2.4 Climate Change**

Criticism was received which suggested that a narrow view of climate change, one which does not adequately consider future changes to wave height and sediment movement, was undertaken during the development of the Plan. While this was acknowledged, the presumption on which the Plan was developed was that it would be based on existing information and knowledge without extensive recourse to new studies or research. Hence the effects of climate change could only be assessed to the degree that they had in the informing studies.

#### **1.6.2.5 Policy Development/Approach**

It was alleged that whilst the Plan takes into account the high-level impact of proposed policies upon tangible assets such as people, properties and material assets, it fails to consider intangible assets such as objectives relating to land use, landscape and the built and natural environment. This, it was claimed, results in an approach towards policy which focuses upon what is going to be built as opposed to what is trying to be achieved – i.e. integrated and sustainable shoreline management. This is incorrect as the plan and its associated policies were developed on the basis of what high level measures to manage the flood and erosion risk could be sustained from a geomorphological viewpoint



without incurring unacceptable impact on landuse, and the environment with little reference to what measures might actually be implemented and only passing reference to economic considerations. The setting of policy for each policy unit was heavily influenced by the input of strategic planners from North and South Ayrshire thus ensuring that the intangible aspects were given adequate consideration at this key stage of the process.

#### **1.6.2.6 Localised Issues**

A number of issues, such as the flooding of local road and rail infrastructure and the erosion of cultural heritage features, were highlighted. Furthermore, clarity was sought in relation to many localised issues, such as flooding to individual properties. The information which was received with regard to localised issues was acknowledged however it was not always possible to address these comments within the Plan and ER due to the strategic level of these documents. The policies which were proposed to manage the shoreline were reconsidered in light of new information, though it must be said that none of these changed significantly as a result of such reconsideration.

#### **1.6.2.7 Economic Justification**

The economic justification for the implementation of proposed policies was queried. This was particularly the case with regard to those areas in which extensive defences may be required despite few assets being at risk. Whilst this is an important issue, it was considered to be beyond the scope of the SMP as it requires detailed knowledge of measures to undertake the necessary cost/benefit assessment. It will be addressed where further study is pursued and measures are to be progressed to optioneering, design and construction.

#### **1.6.2.8 SMP Review**

Finally, the Plan concludes by stating that: *“The Ayrshire SMP should be reviewed in six years (2023) in order to assess if policies and actions proposed are still appropriate”*

It was commented that this statement suggests that there is little confidence in the policies proposed, given that it is the intention of the SMP to provide an approach to shoreline management which extends over the next 100 years and beyond, developed from a good and argued understanding of the coastline and coastal processes. This is incorrect; the coastline and human interaction with the coastline is constantly evolving. Hence it is entirely prudent that a strategic document such as the Ayrshire SMP is reviewed frequently in order to account for these changes. The suggested frequency of 6 years is associated with the typical review period for strategic development plans which the SMP is intended to inform, and was selected to ensure that the policies of the SMP are current when these documents are reviewed.