



C-SCOPE Task and Finish Marine Spatial Planning Group
Tuesday 9 February 2010 – 10 am – 1 pm
Activity Hall, Dorford Centre, Dorchester

<p>Present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Goater, District Engineer, Purbeck District Council • David Carter, Member, Nautical Archaeology Society • James Feaver, Marine and Coastal GIS Officer, Dorset Coast Forum • Bridget Betts, Forum Coordinator, Dorset Coast Forum • Ken Buchan, Dorset Coast Forum Secretary and DCC Coastal Policy Manager • Peter Tinsley, Marine Conservation Officer, Dorset Wildlife Trust • David Sales, Fisherman, South Coast Fisherman's Council • Brian Richards, Development and Flood Risk Team Leader, Environment Agency • Simon Cripps, Chief Executive, Dorset Wildlife Trust • Peter Moore, Group Manager, Environment Planning, Environment Services, DCC • Ness Smith, C-SCOPE Project Officer, Dorset Coast Forum • Sandie Wilson, Environment Manager, Portland Harbour Authority Ltd • Tom Munro, Manager, Dorset AONB • Rachel Waldock, Maritime Advisor, Natural England • Vanessa Straker, Regional Science Advisor, English Heritage • Matilda Bark, Policy Assistant, Dorset Coast Forum 	<p>Apologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simon Williams, Regeneration and Sustainability Manager, Weymouth and Portland Borough Council • Vincent May, Academic • Victoria Copley, Senior Specialist, Marine Operations, Natural England • Nick Lyness, Wessex Flood and Coastal Risk Manager, Environment Agency • Jim Masters, Forum Coordinator, Devon Maritime Forum • Angela Cott, Brownsea Island Property Coordinator, National Trust • Richard Stride, Fisherman, South Coast Fisherman's Council • Janette Lee, GIS Analyst, CEFAS • Malcolm Turnbull, Trustee, Jurassic Coast Trust • David Tudor, Marine Policy Manager, The Crown Estate • Dr Steve Fletcher, Academic, Bournemouth University • John Hayes, Senior Ranger, DCC Countryside Ranger Service • Patrick Durnford, Land Manager, Lulworth Estate • Dr Chris Pater, Marine Planner, English Heritage
---	--

1.	Welcome and apologies
2.	<p>Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising</p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed. There was only one action for NS to invite members of the group to the Mick Bishop meeting – no members of the group were able to attend this meeting but it was a successful informative meeting.</p>
3.	<p>Draft Objectives for the MSP</p> <p>In the previous meeting we split up into groups to look at Defra's High Level Marine Objectives, reviewed whether these would be suitable for the Dorset MSP and would relate to our seven guiding principles. PM has taken the notes made in these groups and crafted eight objectives for the C-SCOPE MSP (distributed to the group as separate paper). PM then asked for comments from group.</p> <p>Objective 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC – thought that objective 1 should be about protecting habitats and species. Would like to include term 'critical species' would also like to amend objective to read 'A healthy, productive and diverse marine environment'. Group agreed that diverse should be included. <p>Action: SC to email information to PM so that PM can include critical species in objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PT – thought that the word 'efficient' can be interpreted differently. PM meant efficient use of resources. Group agreed to insert word 'Sustainable' to clarify meaning. <p>Objective 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SW - suggested including term 'quality of life' to objective. PM agreed, will also include 'aiming high' • SC – questioned phrase 'natural processes which shape the coast'. PM meant physical processes but could be seen as processes that shape communities. Group discussed but decided to keep as natural, but clarify meaning in supporting text.

Objective 3

- SW – questioned use of term “*green knowledge economy*’ this is a term local to Dorset. PM will remove relevant text from Scope to ensure the objectives are understandable nationally.

Objective 4

- BB- questioned term ‘safe’. Group felt should remain as want to promote people using coast safely.

Objective 5

- PT- ‘carbon, capture and storage’ should be included, group agreed.
- SW – suggested taking out word “particularly” as this is a global issue, and any opportunity to reduce our overall contribution to climate change should be taken, not just those that benefit the local economy and communities.

Objective 6

- BR – questioned section which reads ‘challenges and opportunities that may face the economy of coastal areas arising either from natural coastal processes or external factors (e.g. global/local market forces, patterns of migration, ageing population etc)’ – BR would like to see examples of natural coastal processes too.

Action: BR to write examples of natural coastal processes and send to PM.

- PT – would like to include ‘ocean acidification’, group agreed, PM to include.
- SC – felt that word ‘management’ could be inserted to read “the coastal environment, communities and the economy are well prepared for the physical, economic and management challenges they face’. Group agreed, PM to include.

Objective 7

- SC – Felt that objective could be used strategically or interpreted that Dorset could be considered as a strategically significant area. Wants to establish balance.
- VS – Likes the words ‘strong science and evidence base’ but SW would like to be changed as strong science not always available. PM to change to read ‘on the basis of sound science and evidence or robust assessment of risk where evidence not available’.
- KB – National defence not mentioned in objective – KB wants to ensure there is a balance between local priorities and national strategic significance. Cannot be NIMBY.
- DS – Highlighted that fishing is one of the biggest contributors to Dorset, fishing is therefore strategically important.

Objective 8

- DC – would like to include reference to protection or conservation of cultural heritage group discussed and concluded that they would change objective to read ‘value, understand and conserve the character and diversity of the marine environment.’
- DC – should the objective read ‘its’ or ‘their’ with reference to natural and cultural heritage and economic significance? PM explained that he was trying to convey that cultural heritage has its own value and economic value.
- VS – wanted to ensure that enjoying cultural heritage and making cultural heritage accessible were included
- PM – questioned term ‘cultural heritage’ agreed to add historic environment to objective.
- SW – questioned term ‘decision makers’ group discussed how this would be interpreted externally. PM will expand on meaning in supporting text and rephrase as ‘organisations and individuals’ in objective.
- SC – suggested taking out word economic as could be misinterpreted that only cultural heritage with an economic value should be conserved and valued. Group agree.
- TM – would like scope of objective 8 to include text on the need to ensure that funds are required nationally to carry these objectives out.
- PT – wanted to include text on cultural responsibility and ownership. PM to amend to include ‘individual and collective responsibility’.

Other comments

- MG – No reference made to pollution in objectives. Easy to put under first objective but putting it in objective 3 would ensure that pollution covered at source.
- TM – Also no reference to land management – sewerage and farming techniques – group agreed will be included in scope.
- DC – Also no mention of marine litter.
- KB – suggested an additional objective that that would look at land and sea integration, global, national and local perspectives and external influences. DC suggested including military.

Action: KB to draft new objective and send to PM.

	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: PM to go through and make amendments discussed at meeting • KB, BR and SC to carry out actions. • Action: PM to cross reference within objectives to check consistency of wording throughout. • Action: PM to circulate once revised. • A glossary of terms will be created.
4.	<p>The Planning process; a brief review of how it all fits together</p> <p>NS gave a PowerPoint presentation to remind why we are creating an MSP and the process. NS gave a few project updates in this presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seabed mapping – biotope (habitat) maps coming soon • Land and Seascape Assessment – will not have lines on maps, will have recommendations to conserve, enhance and restore. • Offshore Renewables – Royal Haskoning appointed minimum operating conditions and hard constraints identified at inception meeting. • Data collection – ongoing will be narrowing down to ensure all relevant. • Sectoral interactions - Full sectoral interaction analysis will be used to capture information on the nature, extent and intensity of interactions among sectors within the MMA. Will be carrying out interviews with around 50 key stakeholders. • Strategic Environmental Assessment – A statutory requirement for MMO plans and will help ensure we create a good plan. An MSc. Student from Newcastle University will be helping with this. <p>BR requested copy of power point – now available to download at http://www.dorsetforyou.com/index.jsp?articleid=389409</p>
5.	<p>Demonstration of Coastal Explorer Planning Tool</p> <p>JF demonstrated tool. KB explained that it is important to see links between different elements of C-SCOPE project. Policies from the MSP will link into the Coastal Explorer Planning tool.</p> <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC asked whether there is potential for the data to be ‘realtime’ like that on marine transport website. JF explained that could be added as link to data once active. • DS questioned whether oil survey data had been added. All information from DERC database has been added. <p>Action: All If any members of the group would like to access the tool (held on web browser) please contact JF or NS.</p>
6.	<p>Issues we need to address with the C-SCOPE MSP</p> <p>Group divided into smaller groups to consider the following questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the main things going on in the MMA that should be addressed by the MSP? 2. What do we need to plan for in the future; current trends and likely changes? Timescale: 20-25 years 3. What opportunities could the MSP help realise?
7.	<p>Review of different MSP structures</p> <p>NS gave presentation on the structure of existing MSPs including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two Brooms Coastal Plan • Balance (Baltic Sea) • Great Barrier Reef Marine Park • Clyde SSMEI MSP
8.	<p>Group Discussion of C-SCOPE MSP Structure</p> <p>Following NS’ presentation, KB gave some initial thoughts on the structure of the C-SCOPE MSP. KB felt that MSP needs to be bold, consider overarching policies, consider zones for areas and develop more detailed policy for within those areas. Hopefully this will make the plan more back and white for developers. KB does not want to be too prescriptive, wants to find balance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SW felt that would be difficult to create zones as there are so many zones already. • SC looked at differences between the plans NS showed, questioned what C-SCOPE MSP will be based on – sensitivity? activity? • TM felt that Clyde SSMEI project is very vague and the objectives discussed at the beginning of the meeting – defined policies underneath. Rather than zones, policies apply to some or all areas. Therefore policies should lead to zoning. • DS explained that fishing is governed by quota arrangements; these quota arrangements are different in different areas. Therefore, where these things exist and are already working, we should work with them. KB commented that these are happening internationally and not locally but that there could possibly be fisheries enhancement zones in the C-SCOPE MSP. • BR felt that we need to consider policy but that these policies need to be workable and enforceable. • KB questioned whether we are going to create a ‘development control’ plan or a user management plan. • SC felt that the Marine and Coastal Access Act moves away from sectoral activity management to spatial management, therefore we should be consistent by looking at areas and policies for activities within that area rather than looking at activities and then areas. KB questioned how SC would visualise

	<p>this in a plan. SC would identify needs in terms of sensitivity, this would give the areas. Similar to Great Barrier Reef approach, almost a characterisation approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MG questioned whether the plan will look at which activities are inappropriate or which activities are appropriate. • TM emphasised that we should not duplicate zones or policies that are already out there. • Need to be careful that if one policy fails they wouldn't all fail. Policies will be reviewed though. • MG – need to have something that is geographically understandable • SC – will need an element of pragmatism. <p>PM then gave a summary of the discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group want plan to be objectives lead • Need a good understanding and ability to characterise – which Coastal Explorer Planning will provide • Objectives lead to policy areas – being mindful of what is already in place. • Spatial element should be overarching
9.	<p>AOB</p> <p>NS and KB have been approached by Steve Fletcher, Bournemouth University, about a study to compare and contrast stakeholder engagement within C-SCOPE and the Solent Forum's SoMap Project. NS handed out a proposal paper to group. Steve Fletcher would like to interview members of the group to gauge understanding of MSP now and at the end of project via telephone.</p> <p>Action: NS to email group with more detail.</p> <p>KB talking to the group about decision support tools that can be used to produce a series of scenarios. More information about these tools will be given at the next meeting.</p>
10.	<p>Dates of next meeting - Wednesday 12th May 2010 - 10 am - 1 pm - Dorset Room, Colliton Club, County Hall, Dorchester</p>