

Kenneth Pye & Simon J. Blott

Kenneth Pye Associates Ltd

Report No: 95

Date: March 2014



About Natural Resources Wales

Natural Resources Wales is the organisation responsible for the work carried out by the three former organisations, the Countryside Council for Wales, Environment Agency Wales and Forestry Commission Wales. It is also responsible for some functions previously undertaken by Welsh Government.

Our purpose is to ensure that the natural resources of Wales are sustainably maintained, used and enhanced, now and in the future.

We work for the communities of Wales to protect people and their homes as much as possible from environmental incidents like flooding and pollution. We provide opportunities for people to learn, use and benefit from Wales' natural resources.

We work to support Wales' economy by enabling the sustainable use of natural resources to support jobs and enterprise. We help businesses and developers to understand and consider environmental limits when they make important decisions.

We work to maintain and improve the quality of the environment for everyone and we work towards making the environment and our natural resources more resilient to climate change and other pressures.

Published by: Natural Resources Wales Maes y Ffynnon Penrhosgarnedd Bangor LL57 2DW

0300 065 3000

© Natural Resources Wales [2014]

All rights reserved. This document may be reproduced with prior permission of Natural Resources Wales

Further copies of this report are available from the library

Email: library@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk

Evidence at Natural Resources Wales

Natural Resources Wales is an evidence based organisation. We seek to ensure that our strategy, decisions, operations and advice to Welsh Government and others are underpinned by sound and quality-assured evidence. We recognise that it is critically important to have a good understanding of our changing environment.

We will realise this vision by:

- Maintaining and developing the technical specialist skills of our staff;
- Securing our data and information;
- Having a well resourced proactive programme of evidence work;
- Continuing to review and add to our evidence to ensure it is fit for the challenges facing us; and
- Communicating our evidence in an open and transparent way.

This Evidence Report series serves as a record of work carried out or commissioned by Natural Resources Wales. It also helps us to share and promote use of our evidence by others and develop future collaborations. However, the views and recommendations presented in this report are not necessarily those of NRW and should, therefore, not be attributed to NRW.

Report series:	Evidence Report
Report number:	95
Publication date:	15 May 2014
Contract number:	STE0141
Contractor:	Kenneth Pye Associates Ltd
Contract Manager:	Dr. Emmer Litt
Title:	Newborough Phase 1 Dune Rejuvenation Works Topographic Survey Report March 2014
Author(s):	Prof. Kenneth Pye & Dr. Simon J. Blott
Approved By:	Dr. Emmer Litt
Restrictions:	None

Distribution List (core)

NRW Library, Bangor

Recommended citation for this volume:

KPAL (2014a) Newborough Phase 1 Dune Rejuvenation Works Topographic Survey, March 2014. NRW Evidence Report No. 95. Kenneth Pye Associates Ltd., Solihull.

Table of Contents

About	out Natural Resources Wales			
Eviden	ce at Natural Resources Wales iii			
Table o	of Contentsv			
1.0	Job Summary1			
2.0	Scope and purpose2			
3.0	Survey methods and error checking 2			
4.0	Results - profile comparisons			
4.1.	Area 23			
4.2.	Area 33			
4.3.	Area 43			
5.0	References			
6.0	Tables			
7.0	Figures			
8.0	Field photographs			
Data A	Data Archive Appendix			

1.0 Job Summary

KPAL Job No:	130314			
Report Date:	15/05/2014			
Client:	Natural Resources Wales			
Client Job Title:	Newborough Phase I Dune Rejuvenation Works			
Survey conducted:	13 th March 2014			
Instruments used:	Leica Viva NetRover controller and GS08 SmartAntenna mounted			
	on GLS30 pole (2 m)			
	Leica RX900 controller and ATX900 antenna mounted on GLS30			
	pole (2 m)			
	Leica GX1230 RTK base station mounted on GST20-9 tripod			
	Leica RX1210T Field Controller			
	Pacific Crest ADL Vantage radio transceiver (430-470 MHz)			
No. of data points:	1565			
RTK Control Station:	Wooden post surveyed-in using Leica Smartnet GPRS on 16 May			
	2013 (BM1). No GPRS signal could be obtained on 13 March 2014,			
	so an additional check on the position of BM1 was not possible at			
	this time, but the post was found to be firm in the ground and no			
	movement was considered likely between the surveys:			
	Easting: 242096.666 m			
	Northing: 363312.415 m			
	Height: 21.475 m OD			
RTK Backup Station:	Wooden post surveyed-in using Leica Smartnet GPRS on 16 May			
	2013 (BM2), 25 m NNE of Control Station above (see Table 2).			
Fixed profiles:	Thirty existing profile lines (1-30, previously surveyed on 16-17			
	May 2013) were resurveyed and compared with data surveyed from			
	2009 LiDAR and 16-17 May 2013 ground survey. Two new profile			
	lines in Area 2 (Profiles 15A and 16A) were surveyed and compared			
	to positions interpolated from the DEM for 16-17 May 2013 and			
	2009 LiDAR. Chainages along profile lines were interpolated at			
	positions on a theoretical straight-line between the zero and end			
	points of the profile.			

Survey undertaken by: S.J. Blott, M. Blott, K. Pye

2.0 Scope and purpose

The requirements for dune rejuvenation trials at Newborough Warren were identified in a report by Pye & Blott (2012). Three areas (referred to as Areas 2, 3 and 4) were subsequently selected for trials which commenced in January 2013 and involved (a) stripping of vegetation from the windward dune slopes, crests and parts of the arms and deflation corridors, (b) excavation of sand to deepen parts of the deflation corridors to encourage the development of wet slack habitat, (c) placement of stripped turf blocks in areas on and behind the dune arms, and (d) in the case of Area 3 the placement of excavated sand to create a bare sand mound.

A first topographic monitoring survey was carried out in May 2013 (KPAL, 2013) and was followed by a drone aerial photography survey by ExeGesis Ltd in June 2013. This report provides a summary of the results of a second ground topographic monitoring survey carried out on 13th March 2014.

3.0 Survey methods and error checking

In the March 2014 survey ground surface elevations were determined at 1565 points using Leica RTK GPS SmartRover equipment listed in the Job Summary (Section 1.0) above. The distribution of survey points in relation to the three rejuvenation trial areas is shown in Figures 1 and 2. Many of the survey points were located on profile lines which were also surveyed in May 2013. The limits of defined features, including areas of windblown sand deposition, the main dune crest, and areas of standing water, were also mapped by survey points.

Average vertical and horizontal errors reported by the instrument during the March 2014 survey were well within the expected range (Table 1).

The benchmark posts 1 and 2, which were established in May 2013, were still present in March 2014 and were found to be firm with no sign of movement over the intervening period. Re-checking of the position and elevation of the benchmarks using Leica SmartNet corrections was not possible due to very poor GPRS signal in March 2014. However, comparison of data for Benchmark 2 (wooden post) for the May 2013 and March 2014 surveys showed only small differences which are within acceptable limits (Table 2).

Ground photographs were taken at a number of locations around the site; a selection is reproduced in Appendix 1.

4.0 Results - profile comparisons

4.1. Area 2

The locations of survey profile lines within Area 2 are shown in Figures 3 and 4. The locations of ground photographs reproduced in this report are shown in Figure 5. Topographic profiles recorded during the March 2014 survey are compared with those of the May 2013 survey in Figure 6.

The changes in elevation along most of the profiles were relatively small, amounting to less than 10 cm on the margins of the deflation troughs and the greater part of the side walls. Greater lowering was evident on parts of the stoss slope, the sacrificial sand heaps around the margin of the deflation trough, and the area where turves and loose sand were deposited on the western side of the dune in during the original excavation works. A thin layer of deposited windblown sand was evident on the NW margin of the trial area, having been transported there from the adjoining upwind area by southwesterly and southerly winds.

4.2. Area 3

The locations of survey profile lines within Area 3 are shown in Figures 7 and 8. The locations of ground photographs reproduced in this report are shown in Figure 9. Topographic profiles recorded during the March 2014 survey are compared with those of the May 2013 survey in Figure 10.

Changes in elevation since May 2013 were again small (0 to 20 cm, depending on location. The main areas of lowering due to deflation ere on some lower parts of the stoss slope of the dune (e.g. Profile 18), and parts of the sacrificial sand heaps around the edge of deflation trough. A layer of wind-deposited sand, 1 - 10 cm thick, was evident on the downwind side of the dune crest, having been transported there by southwesterly winds. Some areas of sand accretion were also evident on parts of the stoss side of the dune (e.g. Profile 19).

4.3. Area 4

The locations of survey profile lines within Area 4 are shown in Figures 11 and 12. The locations of ground photographs reproduced in this report are shown in Figure 13. Topographic profiles recorded during the March 2014 survey are compared with those of the May 2013 survey in Figure 14.

Only very small elevation differences are evident on the higher sand areas around Area 4. Some limited deflation has taken place at the downwind (northeastern) end of the scraped area where the water level had fallen sufficiently to expose bare sand. Sand transported by the wind from the margins of this area and from the artificial sand mound had formed a thin (0-10cm) thick layer on the vegetation on the downwind side of the trial area.

The winter of 2013-14 was relatively wet, with the result that groundwater levels were high at the time of survey and shallow lakes were present in all three areas. At the upwind end of Area 4 the lake was more than 0.8 m deep in places.

5.0 References

KPAL (2013) *Newborough Warren Dune Topographic Monitoring Survey, May 2013.* Kenneth Pye Associates Ltd., Solihull.

Pye, K. & Blott, S.J. (2012) A Geomorphological Survey of welsh Dune Systems to Determine Best Methods of Rejuvenation. Appendix 3, Newborough Warren. CCW Contract Science Report 1002.CCW, Bangor.

6.0 Tables

	1-D (height) quality control	2-D (position) quality control
Average	8.6 mm	5.4 mm
StDev	6.5 mm	4.7 mm

 Table 1. Average error reported by the instrument for all 1565 data points

Table 2. Measured location and height of Benchmark 2 (wooden post) in May 201-
--

	Easting	Northing	Height m
			OD
Surveyed with Smartnet corrections	242104.105	363335.967	14.099
(16 May 2013)			
Surveyed with base & rover	242104.134	363335.932	14.109
(13 March 2014)			
Error:	+29 mm	-35mm	+10 mm

7.0 Figures



Figure 1. Locations of March 2014 survey data points (black dots) within the three rejuvenation trial areas 2,3 and 4, overlaid on a 2009 LiDAR DEM



Figure 2. Locations of March 2014 survey data points (black dots) overlaid on June 2013 aerial photographs (flown by exeGesIS).



Figure 3. Locations of March 2014 data points (black dots) and cross-profiles (blue lines) in Area 2, overlaid on 2009 LiDAR.







Figure 5. Locations of field photographs 1 to 6 in Area 2 reproduced in this report. Arrows indicate direction of view; base 2013 aerial photography from Google Earth



Figure 6. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 1 and 2 in Area 2, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 16 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 6. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 3 and 4 in Area 2, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 16 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 6. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 5 and 6 in Area 2, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 16 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 6. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 7 and 8 in Area 2, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 16 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 6. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 9 and 10 in Area 2, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 16 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 6. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 11 and 12 in Area 2, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 16 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 6. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 13 and 14 in Area 2, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 16 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 6. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 15A and 16A in Area 2, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and 13 March 2014. Data have been interpolated from the ground survey on 16 May 2013 for profile 15A, but was not possible for profile 16A due to a lack of survey points.



Figure 7. Locations of March 2014 data points (black dots) and cross-profiles (blue lines) in Area 3, overlaid on 2009 LiDAR.



Figure 8. Locations of March 2014 data points (black dots) and cross-profiles (blue lines) in Area 3, overlaid on June 2013 aerial photographs (flown by exeGesIS). The limit of blown sand, standing water, and the main dune crest surveyed in March 2014 are also shown.



Figure 9. Locations of field photographs 7 to 10 in Area 3 reproduced in this report. Arrows indicate direction of view; base 2013 aerial photography from Google Earth



Figure 10. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 15 and 16 in Area 3, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 17 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 10. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 17 and 18 in Area 3, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 17 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 10. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 19 and 20 in Area 3, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 17 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 10. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 21 and 22 in Area 3, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 17 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 10. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 23 and 24 in Area 3, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12th May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 17 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 11. Locations of March 2014 data points (black dots) and cross-profiles (blue lines) in Area 4, overlaid on 2009 LiDAR.



Figure 12. Locations of March 2014 data points (black dots) and cross-profiles (blue lines) in Area 4, overlaid on June 2013 aerial photographs (flown by exeGesIS). The limit of blown sand and areas of standing water surveyed in March 2014 are also shown.



Figure 13. Locations of field photographs 11 to 14 in Area 4 reproduced in this report. Arrows indicate direction of view; base 2013 aerial photography from Google Earth



Figure 14. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 25 and 26 in Area 4, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12 May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 17 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 14. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 27 and 28 in Area 4, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12 May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 17 May 2013 and 13 March 2014



Figure 14. continued. Comparison of surface levels at profiles 29 and 30 in Area 4, indicated by LiDAR survey on 12 May 2009 (pre-works) and ground surveys on 17 May 2013 and 13 March 2014

8.0 Field photographs Taken 13 March 2014



Photograph 1. Central axis of the Area 2, looking NE



Photograph 2. View across deflation trough of Area 2, looking E



Photograph 3. Southern 'arm' of Area 2, looking seawards



Photograph 4. Deflation corridor of Area 2, looking W



Photograph 5. Central axis of the Area 2, looking SW



Photograph 6. Northern 'arm' of Area 2, looking seawards



Photograph 7. View north across deflation trough of Area 3.



Photograph 8. View seawards along deflation trough of Area 3.



Photograph 9. View north across the dune crest of Area 3.



Photograph 10. Oblique view towards the WSW across the deflation trough of Area 3.



Photograph 11. View west across the flooded 'deflation trough' of Area 4.



Photograph 12. View NE north across flooded 'deflation trough' of Area 4.



Photograph 13. The NE end of the 'deflation trough' of Area 4.



Photograph 14. View east across the inland part of the 'deflation trough' of Area 4.

Data Archive Appendix

Data outputs associated with this project are archived at 'Newborough Warren Dune Restoration; project 421, media 1489' on server–based storage at Natural Resources Wales.

The data archive contains:

[A] The final report in Microsoft Word and Adobe PDF formats.

[B] An Excel file named (Newborough Warren Survey 13-03-2014.xls) of data points (x,y,z)

Metadata for this project is publicly accessible through Natural Resources Wales' Library Catalogue <u>http://libcat.naturalresources.wales/webview/</u> (English Version) and <u>http://libcat.naturalresources.wales/cnc/</u> (Welsh Version) by searching 'Dataset Titles'. The metadata is held as record no [115840]

DO NOT DELETE THE SECTION BREAK BELOW



Published by: Natural Resources Wales Maes y Ffynnon Penrhosgarnedd Bangor LL57 2DW

0300 065 3000

© Natural Resources Wales [2014]

All rights reserved. This document may be reproduced with prior permission of Natural Resources Wales

Further copies of this report are available from the library

Email: library@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk