

C-SCOPE Coastal Explorer Planning Task & Finish Group Agenda Thursday 11th November at 10am.

Sundeck Room, Weymouth Pavilion.

Present:

- Ken Buchan, Dorset Coast Forum Secretary & DCC Coastal Policy Manager (KB) (Chair)
- Ness Smith, Project Officer, Dorset Coast Forum (NS)
- James Feaver, GIS Officer, Dorset Coast Forum (JF)
- Jen Clarke, (JC)
- Nigel Osborne, Emergency Planning Officer, Dorset County Council (NO)
- Alan Frampton, Coastal Scientist, Halcrow (AF)
- Helen Knight, Assistant, Dorset Coast Forum (HK) (minute taker)

Apologies:

- Keith Cole, Director, Coast and Country Projects Ltd
- Sandie Wilson, Environment Manager,
 Portland Harbour Authority Ltd
- Helen Mann, Property Manager West Dorset, National Trust
- Rebecca Landman, Planning Officer, Planning and Regeneration Services, Borough of Poole
- Andy Elliot, Senior GIS Developer, Dorset County Council

1. Introductions

KB welcomed everyone to the group and officially opened the meeting. Apologies (see above). Started with minutes of last meeting. Everyone who attended last meeting agreed they were a true comment of what was said

2. **KB** the purpose of meeting is to bring everyone up to date with the project and its current state and future direction. Need to work on the structure of the tool. Questions raised - How can it be improved? Can the structure be made more beneficial to users? Future sustainability of tool? Terms and conditions of use of tool? **NS** – Talked about putting the project into context. The bulk of the project is marine planning. The Seabed mapping is nearly completed and in process of developing a sensitivity map.

Showed the Broad Scale Habitat map and we are hoping to resolve clusters of biotopes to make the map seamless.

Offshore renewable capacity report has been completed and there are 2 areas for potential wind and tidal renewable energy resources. Not enough wave action for large scale wave devices but ¾ scale demonstration devices may be placed in the area.

Land and Seascape Assessment have been completed.

NS then showed group the maps of the 5 seascape types.

Questions;

NO has sensitivity scores for pollution plans (shorelines), would we like access to them?

NS Yes, but ours are purely for seabed.

KB has **NO** work been updated by GIS team?

NO scores are still viable and relevant.

JC How does landscape sensitivity work?

NS The scores look at the vulnerability and impacts, example would be sediment, identifying how it impacts on habitats and biotopes.

NS then ran through a presentation showing updates.

NS Will be running 6 community work shops and anything relevant taken from them will be taken into consideration and fed into the tool.

There will also be a separate library set out in Excel.

NS is gaining information from temporal and spatial interactions to optimise compatibility. Will be using layers

to look at where there are hotspots and used to develop policy. SEA – socio-economics information is being brought together.

JC asked who will be using the interactive website.

NS the Interactive website will be used by tourists, visitors and local people, and also a tool for soft management – One Bright Space has been awarded the tender with a launch date of May 2011.

AF asked what is going in the website.

JF there will be links to clubs, information on where to hire kit, which providers are in the area, targeting any activity on the coast, both terrestrial and marine. There will be a safety aspect produced with the RNLI and Marine & Coastguard Agency. There will be links to real-time data including weather and web cams.

KB – Community events will also feed into the website

JF – Coastal Explorer Planning presentation:

JF first described the structure of the tool – See attached CEP Components.ppt.

JF then showed a PowerPoint mock-up to demonstrate how the tool will look and work. He demonstrated how it all links together i.e. maps into tables and summary of policies. See attached CEP Mockup Oct 10.ppt.

<u>Action</u>: Need to update SMP – Alan Frampton.

3. AF asked whether the site will be updated, sources of information to link to live websites?

NS/JF – Most parts of site will have hyperlinks to latest information.

AF this should be made obvious on the site. Will there be a feedback function?

KB Massive amount of policy needs to be kept to the point and relevant. Should conclude what policy/legislation is about i.e. a summary.

JF Need to put links to full text within summaries. AF thought that this would help with the sustainability of the site. JF said this was a good point assuming that the document stays the same. Need to look at how to keep it up to date. AF asked if it is possible to structure level of policy so you can look and chose which are relevant. KB suggested the use of key words.

Emergency Plans

NO is it feasible to link into plans, such as emergency plans? However, not all plans are written and finalised. **JF** asked if the plans are in the public domain. **NO** – They are but there are no data sheets. The recovery plan may be relevant and will be going on a website. **AF** talked about having a contacts page, but not just links to another page. Could include the names of owners of information and the names and numbers of people to contact. **KB** said that there could be issues with the maintenance of each department.

KB wanted to know about the geographic extent that plans cover. **NO** said that there are not always local area plans, but there are sectors for all part of the coastline. This information comes with access points and sensitivity scores. However, that is for pollution plans.

Policies

KB – Back to policy list. Can you specify if you just want local policy and not international? **AF** asked whether the information can be filtered, can you screen the information? **JF** said that it will be filtered by using the jurisdiction diagram. **AF** wanted to know if it is possible for someone within a sector to find specific information without having to read through large parts of information. **KB** suggested it would be useful to sort by sector. It was then discussed by the group if information should be sorted or filtered. It was agreed that information would be filtered.

KB – Back to first slide to discuss the power point.

AF suggested that we might adapt the approaches of:

- 1. The Channel Coast Observatory web site approach used there for data selection and subsequent download.
- 2. The future coast CD where textual information can be selected and accumulated before saving as a PDF file.

Here it would allow the user to accumulate policies and / or flowcharts then download them at the end.

<u>Action</u>: **JF** and **AF** meet and look at Channel Coastal Observatory web site / future coast CD and see their approaches and identify what concepts can be utilised.

Various other suggestions were made and a revised version of the mockup will be created to take on board most suggestions.

4. KB Discussion on future sustainability of site. The project will be wrapped up in 2012. It is not clear what will happen with the future use of the interactive tools. Need clarification from Interreg. Will there be a generation of income from the tool. The need for someone to work on the tool post 2012.

<u>Action:</u> Need some research on whether or not there will be a market for the tool in the future? Should the information be free?

NO asked if we had spoken to other counties about the future use of tools. **AF** wanted to know about expanding coastal groups. **NO** possibility of taking it further West into Devon and Cornwall. **NS** what about talking to Solent as they have a similar project. **KB** said that a lot more market research would be needed if the tool was to be expanded like that.

KB discussed the structure of the tool and whether or not people can populate it themselves? **AF** asked about sponsorship of the site. **NS** said there will be space for ads and banners on the interactive website **NO** asked if the tool will be tapping into the 2012 Olympics. **KB** said that there will not be specific information about the Olympics but possibility of some feeds. **AF** talked about the use of advertising. **KB** – Cannot take INTERREG logos out. Tool could be audited for up to 25 years.

<u>Actions:</u> Need to find out about rules on auditing records. What logos need to be kept on and length of time they need to be kept.

This was then followed by a discussion about the need of a prototype. A need to discuss how people react to the tool. Target E.A/DEFRA conference? Also talk to the MMO. **NS** Spoke about the need to be aware of our resources. Would talk to DCF members about whether or not they would be willing to pay to use the site. Talked about paying fees for downloading and sponsorship.

<u>Action:</u> Find out about maintenance costs. Look into sponsorship and local authorities paying for planning tool.

KB Continued discussion on sponsorship, subscriptions and licenses. Also in terms of data, new data cannot always be supplied, up-dating of links? Tool to provide layers that can be printed.

NS said that she would speak to DCF members to get an indication if people would sponsor it.

<u>Action:</u> Put together annual costs (**JF** to investigate) Also to look into how the interactive tools will be managed in the future, is it a full time job?

5. AOB

JC First meeting has been to and thinks the tool is fantastic, everything seems to be at a good level and impressed with how things are integrated.