



**C-Scope Task and Finish Marine Spatial Planning Group
Thursday 7th October 2010 – 10 am
Coffee Lounge, Dorford Centre, Dorchester**

<p>Present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • John Hayes, Senior Ranger, DCC Countryside Ranger Service • Tom Munro, Manager, Dorset AONB • David Carter, Chairman, Weymouth LUNAR Society • James Feaver, Marine and Coastal GIS Officer, Dorset Coast Forum • Ness Smith, Dorset Coast Forum Officer 	<p>Apologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Tudor, Marine Policy Manager, The Crown Estate • Brian Richards, Development and Flood Risk Team Leader, Environment Agency • Peter Moore, Group Manager, Environment Planning, Environment Services, DCC • Sandie Wilson, Environment Manager, Portland Harbour Authority Ltd • Mike Garrity, Team Leader - Spatial Planning, Dorset County Council • Malcolm Turnbull, Trustee, Jurassic Coast Trust • Patrick Durnfold, Land Manager, Lulworth Estate • Dr Chris Pater, Marine Planner, English Heritage • Simon Cripps, Chief Executive, Dorset Wildlife Trust Richard Stride, Fisherman, South Coast Fisherman's Council • Dr Steve Fletcher, Academic, Bournemouth University • Jim Masters, Forum Coordinator, Devon Maritime Forum • Angela Cott, Brownsea Island Property Coordinator, National Trust • Fiona Wynne, Education Officer, The Crown Estate • Mike Goater, District Engineer, Purbeck District Council • Nick Lyness, Wessex Flood and Coastal Risk Manager, Environment Agency • Vincent May, Academic • Victoria Copley, Senior Specialist, Marine Operations, Natural England • Simon Williams, Regeneration and Sustainability Manager, Weymouth and Portland Borough Council
--	---

1.	Introductions and apologies KB welcomed all to the meeting, he explained that he would be chairing the meeting as PM was unable to attend.
2.	Minutes of the previous meeting There was only one action from the previous meeting; for NS to send out 42 key policies list. A revised list was sent out to the group as on reviewed, the C-SCOPE Team realised that the original list was not representative of policies needed.
3.	The Evidence Base NS gave a presentation on the evidence base that is being built for the MSP.
3.1	Seabed mapping - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Seabed Maps have been received from DWT. • We have a MNCR classification habitat map (equivalent to EUNIS level 3) from the Southampton study. • The contractors carrying out ground-truthing (Seastar) weren't happy with the backscatter images and, combined with the complexity of the seabed in this area, could not confidently produce a seamless biotope map. Biotopes are currently defined in narrow zones around the drop-down video surveys. NS asked PT to give an update on this. PT believed that the texture sheet can be used to create the biotope map but it will be very broad scale. PT and Katherine Dawson from DWT will be working to create this biotope map. JF offered his assistance in mapping if needed. <p>ACTION: NS, PT and Katherine Dawson to meet to discuss biotope map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biological features of interest map
3.2	Offshore Renewables Capacity Study - Now complete and available to download from the DCF Website.
3.3	Land and Seascape Assessment – This assessment has been carried out by LDA Design for the whole of the Dorset Coast. It is now complete. NS explained the methodology used to carry out the assessment. NS mentioned that LDA Design have recently been awarded the contract for the Natural England National Guidance for Seascape

<p>3.4</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.7</p>	<p>Assessments, which validates the methodology used for the C-SCOPE Land and Seascape Assessment. TM has read the report, thinks it is very good, well researched. NS thanked everyone at the meeting who had helped input into this Assessment.</p> <p>Collation of spatial and temporal maritime sector data –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C-SCOPE have exchanged data with Cefas, Crown Estate and Seazone. • A gap analysis has been conducted. • Will add community data from Coastal Community Engagement Events that will take place in late November/December. NS asked members of the group to spread the word about these meetings closer to the dates. <p>Existing Policies, Strategies & Agreements –</p> <p>There were around 200 policies in the policy library, this list has been refined considering which will be most relevant for marine planning (via policy workshop and SEA) and now there are around 70 policies.</p> <p>Interactions Matrix –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of this exercise has been to capture information on the nature, extent and intensity of interactions among sectors within the MMA (user-user interactions) • Results will help to inform policy to enhance safety, reduce conflict and optimise compatibilities • Over 40 interviews have been completed. There are now only a few outstanding which will be completed shortly. • JF has now been working to display the results spatially. NS presented an example of how this is being done (see attached power point presentation). • NS explained that MMO Officers have recently been shown the interactions matrix and they were impressed. The Scottish Government have also announced that they are using interactions matrices for their marine plans. • PT questioned why the positive (green) and negative (red) interactions were overlapping on the mapped exemplar that NS presented. NS explained that one interactions layer will be displayed at a time, the red and green are not an amalgamation of interactions. • NS commented that a great number of insightful comments were made by the people that were interviewed for the Interactions Matrix. These comments can be used to inform the codes of conduct for the Interactive Website. The comments will not be published as some can be obviously attributable to certain people but the matrix will be published. <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socio-economic review is underway and will be completed by November 2010 • Stages 1 and 2 (Scoping and Environmental Baseline) almost complete. DS questioned what data was being used for this baseline as some data used is very old and the fishing industry needs to be considered properly. NS questioned where C-SCOPE should be getting the latest data from. DS suggested Seafish, Local MMO and Local Sea Fisheries Committees. • Consultation will take place to agree the SEA objectives and environmental baseline with Natural England, the Environment Agency and English Heritage. PT questioned why only these organisations. NS explained this was standard procedure for the UK. • NS mentioned that the next C-SCOPE Conference/Seminar will be looking at socio-economic aspects of coastal and marine planning. This will take place on Friday 19 November 2010 at The RLNI Lifeboat College, Poole. Bookings will be open next week. • PT asked whether the socio-economic review will put a price on ecological goods and services. KB mentioned that Bournemouth and ABPmer have just written a report on this that could feed in. NS mentioned that Steve Fletcher from Bournemouth University will be speaking on this at the conference. • DS highlighted how important socio-economics studies are for future management and how CSCOPE is ahead of the game in this.
<p>4.</p>	<p>Review high level policy</p> <p>NS recalled the work carried out at a previous T&F meeting when members of the group review the National High Level Policy and thought about how they could be adapted to apply to Dorset. PM, NS and KB took the revised objectives away to build a policy framework for the MSP. KB explained that two of the original objectives have been consolidated as it was felt that Climate change should run through as a theme rather than be a separate objective. They have also been consolidated because there was much emphasis on coastal change, and although this is considered an important aspect of coastal management the relevance to marine planning compared to other objectives had perhaps been over stated. One objective has been added (objective 8 – Using sound science and data). The group ran through each objective in turn and made the following revisions:</p> <p>Objective 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group felt that it was good to consider the long term but that there is a need to know what the baseline is and what level the objective is aiming at. • TM felt the objective was too wet and not coastal enough. NS acknowledged this but felt that there are certain things a marine plan cannot do, want to add value though and look at land and sea integration. Intertidal and land/sea interface is to be emphasised more in the objective.

Objective 2:

- DC felt that assessment of risk and impact of SMP policy could be added.
- DS mentioned issues experienced by small Dorset fishing boats due to the present quota system. TM therefore suggested that “equitable opportunities” should be added to the objective 3. KB suggested that one role of MSP could be the establishment of fisheries enhancement areas that support local fishing.
- Group discussed second policy within this objective. It was felt that content of this policy was covered under other objectives.

Objective 3:

- Agreed that equitable added to text in Policy SME 1 within this objective to read: Making productive, equitable and efficient use of marine resources.
- PT highlighted the wording used in Policy SME 1 within this objective (“safe biological limits”). PT felt that the objective should be more aspirational than this. TM felt that it is good to have a minimum limit too though. KB will make sure it is noted that “safe biological limits” is a minimum requirement.
- DC questioned what “maritime excellence” means (Policy SME 2). KB explained that this is a term that W&PBC have used to promote the area to marine industry. Group discussed using “maritime business clusters” or “encouraging recreational maritime enterprises” instead.
- DS mentioned how excellent Portland is for Shellfish according to the owner of the Mussel farm there. NS asked whether she could get the contact details for the owner from DS.

ACTION: DS to pass on contact details of Portland Mussel Farm Owner to NS if possible.

- JH questioned what is meant by “safe marine enterprises” (Policy SME 4). KB felt that this policy needs to be reviewed and possibly cut. TM felt that this policy could come under objective 4.

Objective 4:

- Group felt that this objective was more about access and the last was more about the economy.
- PT felt that bullet 3 of Policy REA 2 could be worded differently as it reads that the MSP is positive about slipway, jetties and car park developments. KB felt that there is a general need for more of these along the Dorset coast. TM felt that advocating more car parks does not tie in with sustainable access.
- Appropriate car parking designs are also mentioned within this policy. JF highlighted that AONB had produced guidelines for this.
- DC questioned whether “current disability and diversity policy/fair access to all” was needed in this policy. Group agreed that disability and fair access to all was needed.
- PT questioned why “marine environment” mentioned only in two policies and not “coastal environment”.
- TM mentioned that AONB had carried out some work this year that looked at visitor management along the coast, which would tie into bottom bullet of policy REA 2.
- JF questioned whether a policy to support waterbourne transport could be added. NS explained that this is covered under the climate change objective. TM questioned whether it would be more relevant under Objective 4.

Objective 5:

- TM felt that Policy CAM 1 should run through all objectives. KB agreed but thought it does need to be said, whether or not it is right under this objective was questionable.
- KB didn't feel that policy 3 would be relevant if waterbourne transport transferred to Objective 4.
- JF felt that “planning for emergency and extreme events” does not just mean climatic events, could mean oil spills etc. KB agreed and felt that the whole of objective 5 needs to be reviewed.

Objective 6:

- JF felt that Policy SS 3 duplicates the last policy of objective 5.
- NS felt Policy SS 3 covered purely climate mitigation and sits slightly apart from other policies.
- DC highlighted that the Policy SS 1 assumes that the MOD firing range is essential. TM suggested that the text should be altered from “recognising importance to national interest of” to “recognising existence of”.
- NS to read Byelaw to look at wording for Policy SS 1 in more detail.
- JH questioned whether port security needs to be considered. KB will look into this.

Objective 7:

- TM felt there was room in this objective to say more about national significance of the marine and historic environment.
- PT felt that Natural Heritage needs to be clarified
- Group felt that more aspirational wording is needed in this objective. TM offered to revise wording

ACTION: TM to revise wording of objective 7.

- DC questioned what Archaeological Planners are. TM suggested that Historic Environment Professionals might be better wording.

Objective 8:

- TM questioned whether the Policy SDM 1 is just describing the process that the Marine Plan is going through. KB acknowledged that it does state the obvious but important to include as Marine Plans are revised every few years so this is a reminder for future planners.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC questioned the phrase “encouraging non-destructive scientific research” in Policy SDM 2. Agreed to change wording to “responsible scientific research”. • PT suggested that some text about “efficiency, collaboration and sharing data” should be added to this objective. <p>Next steps: ACTION: NS and KB to take away comments from meeting, revise and send out to the group again. Some policies will sit as they are, some will need further policies below. ACTION: NS to encourage feedback from others that were not present at today’s meeting.</p>
5.	<p>Marine Plan discussion NS explained that the C-SCOPE team have been working on different ways to express policy spatially. Originally the team thought they might use the Seascape Character Areas as plan ‘sub-areas’. It was thought that this would work close to the shore but not further out (Inshore Waters). NS explained that the team felt that within the marine plan it made sense to show the resources that are likely to be used alongside the policy for that resource. NS showed the initial thoughts on how the marine plan might look and welcomed comments.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TM slightly uncomfortable with the policy area approach that has been used. Liked the opportunity mapping but felt that the High Level Policy should be across the whole of the MMA or for a specific activity if it only happens in one location. • TM went on to talk about use of hierarchy and unwittingly promoting something in one area. KB explained that the marine plan will be used by developers too, not just planners. TM felt that having a separate opportunities map might be a better way to show it. • NS explained that this example is meant to show that there is a policy that can be applied in this area, but it could be applied everywhere. • TM felt that could have general policies over the whole area and then identify where the resource exists. <p>ACTION: KB, NS and TM to meet to discuss comments made above and how policy should be displayed spatially.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JH asked how the SAC would sit with this example. KB explained that the SAC will be integrated within the marine plan. The SAC Management Scheme will be fed in. • PT questioned whether the Conservation Area would have been in this location had there not been an SAC? PT concerned as the SAC only represents one habitat. KB felt that there could be more opportunities to suggest conservation areas if the group feels this is needed. PT highlighted that other areas outside of the West of Wight Zone had been identified and that the same could be done for conservation. NS felt that the Marine Conservation Zones would designate for different habitats and species and these will be incorporated into the marine plan too. <p>It was agreed that this presentation would be distributed to the group for comments. ACTION: NS to distribute the “Next Steps” presentation. ALL to feed comments back before the next meeting.</p> <p>NS felt that there are two ways in which the marine plan can be approached.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy to Zones • Zones to Policy <p>TM felt that steer from the group was that it should be policy led and that this would be the precautionary approach. KB appreciated this but felt that there needs to be a spatial context to policy so that we are moving on from a system of decision making that already exists.</p>
7.	<p>AOB TM commented on the good work that the C-SCOPE Team have been doing.</p>