

4 November 2014

**NOTES** of a meeting of the Marine Protected Area Working Group of the **KENT AND ESSEX INSHORE FISHERIES AND CONSERVATION AUTHORITY** held at The Best Western Clifton Hotel, The Leas, Clifton Gardens, Folkestone, Kent on Tuesday 4 November 2014 at 11am.

**Present:** Cllr J Lamb (Southend BC), Mr W Baker (MMO), Mr L Roskilly (MMO), Cllr A Wood (Essex CC), Ms A Jones (Natural England), Ms B Chapman (Kent Wildlife Trust), Mr T Noakes (Folkestone Trawlers and Folkestone Fishermen's Association), Mr I Humpheryes (Environment Agency), Ms K Bamford (Defra), Mr P McCleod (Defra), Ms S Ware (Cefas)

**In Attendance:** Dr W Wright (CIFCO), Dr J Heywood (LSCO), Miss E Lyons (IFCO), Mr M Hayes (IFCO), Mrs D O'Shea (Office Manager), Mrs K Woods (Admin Assistant)

**Apologies:** Mr J Nichols (MMO), Mr B Smart (MMO), Cllr D Baker (KCC), Dr J-L Solandt (Marine Conservation Society), Mr P Gilson (Leith & Southend Fishermen's Association, NFFO SE Committee)

**Present:** Mr P Beresford, Mr L Noakes, Mr R Bricker, Mr R Bricker, Mr H Mardle, Mr F Mardle (Folkestone fishermen), Mr M Spence (Dover fisherman), Mr R Goodsell, Mr M Caister (Rye fishermen), Mr D Collins MP

---

The meeting opened at 11.00

The meeting was convened at the request of Members of the Authority to discuss in detail the potential fisheries management options for the four Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) sites/ potential MCZ sites (Folkestone Pomerania MCZ, Dover to Deal and Dover to Folkestone and Hythe Bay recommended MCZ sites) and to discuss the data, process, regulatory options and timelines for delivery.

---

Members of the Group and officers introduced themselves for the benefit of the members of the public that were present.

The Group were provided with details of the background to MCZ process. As a result of the Balanced Seas Project, sites were recommended and identified in the South East to go forward to be considered for protection of rare and representative species and habitats. MCZs were designated nationally and take into account social and economic factors as well as best available evidence when designating them

There were ten sites in the Kent and Essex district that had been identified as potential MCZs. Of these, four were designated in November 2013 (Tranche 1), three were planned to go forward for consultation in Spring 2015 (Tranche 2) and three were in the planning stage for 2016 (Tranche 3). In addition the site of Hythe Bay, originally a Tranche 1 site, had been reviewed and had been subject to separate discussion with the Minister as to how it should be protected (whether as a MCZ or subject to voluntary management).

4 November 2014

The Group were advised that Defra was the lead regulator until a site had been designated. Once designated then Kent & Essex IFCA would take over as regulator. Throughout the process Natural England would provide advice.

Within Tranche 1 Folkestone Pomerania MCZ (34km<sup>2</sup>) was designated in November 2013 with a recover objective for:

- Fragile sponge and anthozoan communities (MCZ FOCI)
- subtidal rocky habitats (Broadscale habitat);
- Ross worm reefs (*Sabellaria spinulosa*) (MCZ FOCI); and
- Honeycomb worm reefs (*Sabellaria alveolata*) (MCZ FOCI)

The Group were advised that in order to meet this objective bottom towed trawling on this site would be required to be managed. They were shown a video taken by the patrol vessel Tamesis of part of this site showing a range of the species and habitats found there.

Within Tranche 2 two sites were proposed, Dover to Deal and Dover to Folkestone. Defra had already hosted a workshop to engage with stakeholders in June 2014 with the consultation process to begin in Spring 2015. This would be a 'maintain' feature objective for:

- Sabellaria reefs
- Moderate energy rock communities
- Blue Mussel beds
- Chalk habitat

Hythe Bay was within Tranche 3 with the original site covering 41km<sup>2</sup>. This had a recover objective for sub tidal mud with which towed gear would interact. The Group were advised that the site was considered important due to the presence of a spoon worm community found in the mud. These communities were rare and found in a further three sites only within English waters.

Of equal importance was the habitat that the burrows of the spoon worm provided for other species, including molluscs, marine scale worms and burrowing shrimps. In addition Hythe Bay supported a number of key fish stocks at different stages of their life style.

The Group were advised that Defra had undertaken consultation with stakeholders in February 2012 regarding the site and that as a result the Minister instructed that further information be gathered to see if a management solution could be developed. Defra held a further meeting with stakeholders in March 2014 and as a result agreed to undertake further research on the location of the sub tidal mud in the south and west of the Bay and for the IFCA to develop interim protection and work with local industry to develop a fisheries management scheme. The minister issued a press statement on 7 April 2014 regarding the site which was provided to the Group.

Since this meeting a survey of Hythe Bay had been undertaken by Cefas and the EA in March 2014 with the draft report published 31 October 2014 (provided to the Group).

4 November 2014

The Group were informed that grab samples were taken at 36 points in the Bay from which three habitats were identified:

- Subtidal sand
- Subtidal mud
- Subtidal mixed sediment

The sampling was not designed to sample deep burrowing species but the species found within the samples provided confidence that the spoon worm biotope extended further into the bay.

A video of a survey of part of the site taken by Tamesis was shown.

The Group were advised that as the four MCZ sites were fished by the same people it was considered sensible to address potential management measures for these sites together. Local fishermen had been consulted and had expressed a wish for a legislative solution rather than a voluntary one. Officers had spoken to local fishermen during the summer 2014 and as a result the fishermen had made the following proposals:

Folkestone Pomerania MCZ

The whole site should be closed to bottom towed gear

Dover to Deal rMCZ

The whole site should be closed to bottom towed gear

Dover to Folkestone rMCZ

Half the site should be closed to bottom towed gear.

Hythe Bay

A permit system to allow the use of bottom towed gear would be operated within 99.7km<sup>2</sup> of the Bay with three specific areas (8.1km<sup>2</sup> in total) banned from using all bottom towed gear. Fishermen felt this would allow the whole bay ecosystem to receive protection and for specific sensitive features to receive additional protection from non trawling areas. In order to obtain a permit certain conditions would need to be met:

- Vessels would be limited to 12.5 metres in overall length
- Otter trawls only would be used
- Vessels would require equipment to enable them to broadcast Inshore Vessel Monitoring System (IVMS)
- Fishing gear ground rope would be limited to a maximum aggregate length of 48m (26 fathom)
- Ground ropes would be required to be enclosed by rubber discs with a maximum diameter of 10cm.
- The maximum chain link thickness throughout gear would be 10mm

4 November 2014

- No tickler chains would be used
- No attachments ahead of the ground rope would be allowed
- All ground rope attachments including weights would not exceed a diameter of 10cm

This would have the effect of stopping beam trawling, scallop dredging, cockle dredging and mussel dredging within the area.

The Group were advised that they should consider how they wished to proceed. If they agreed with the principles of the proposals of the fishermen then more detailed work would be required in respect of the potential restriction of the issuing of permits in the future, were the proposed no trawl areas sufficient to adequately test the impact of the gear and how would stakeholders sign up to management of the site without knowing the end result.

Four options were provided to the Group for their consideration:

**Option 1:** Develop management for Folkestone Pomerania MCZ and just discuss management options of the proposed Dover to Deal and Dover to Folkestone MCZ sites after Tranche 2 designation and Hythe Bay MCZ site after a possible Tranche 3 designation.

**Option 2:** To work with CEFAS to gather and review new data for Hythe Bay and to develop a greater understanding of the site, then to revisit the management options at a later date (whilst leaving enough time to meet ministerial commitments for Folkestone Pomerania MCZ management).

**Option 3:** To work with CEFAS to gather and review new data for Hythe Bay and to develop a greater understanding of the site. Then to revisit the management options using the fishermen's proposal as a starting point and discuss at the January full Authority meeting or the next KEIFCA MPA working group (February 2015).

**Option 4:** Work with all stakeholders to develop more detail for the four MCZ site solution using the fishermen's proposal as a starting point and with the clear ambition to develop a detailed solution with accompanying draft byelaws within months of this meeting.

The Chairman then invited comments from the public.

Mr T Noakes – advised the Group that he had received the report at 9.30 on the evening of 31 October. Prior to this he had known nothing about it. He expressed concern over the accuracy of the information contained in it as Defra had originally said that fishermen representatives would be involved in the survey work and this had not happened. He also pointed out that the grab sample went to a depth of 6" whereas the burrowing animals were at a depth of 2'. He stated that four years ago they were informed that the sub tidal mud was to the north of the Bay and they were now being told it was elsewhere. Had they been lied to or misinformed four years ago? He also commented on the video shown which he advised was taken in an area that was fished. He pointed out that there appeared to be no damage, no scars in the area so could not see what the problem was.

Ms Ware advised that Cefas had been commissioned in 2012 to gather additional evidence to supplement that already held in order to increase confidence in the

4 November 2014

extent of the feature. Extensive mapping work and acoustic work had been undertaken using a multi beam survey to provide better evidence of the site with the EA providing ground truthing data. Cefas were required to better explore the context of the mud boundary to see if it extended to the south and south west of the current boundary. She was not aware that there was an intention for fishermen to be present.

Mr Noakes advised that at the meeting with the Minister it was stated that a representative would be on board.

Ms Ware (Cefas) also advised that although the fauna were deep dwelling and the grab dug down to 15cm, the evidence of the other fauna found to be present served as a proxy and evidence for deep dwelling fauna.

Mr Humpheryes (EA) advised that as bivalves only lived in these burrows then this was a good indication that the spoon worm was present.

The CIFCO informed the Group that at present no one knew what impact the gear was having on the spoon worm community but it was also important to recognise that other species live in these areas. A lot of research had been carried out on the impact that heavier gear had, but none on the impact light gear had. The proposal that the fishermen had made put forward the ability to see if by not fishing an area at all then what effect it would have on it.

The Chairman advised the Group that he had confidence in the report presented by Cefas. He stated that Cefas was a scientific body dealing in facts and would not be biased in any way.

Mr T Hills advised the Group that he had served on the Balanced Seas group on behalf of the recreational angling community. This group also consisted of representatives from the commercial sector and NGOs. At the time the recommendations of this group were based on evidence that was known could be faulty, but there was a need to design and plan. They were told that it was important that the economic effect on a community should also be considered. He felt that a review period was important and that he had no problem with the basic concept of the proposal but that the Group should be aware that the economic impact could be devastating to the community.

Mr D Collins (MP) informed the Group that they should take into account that the Minister had advised in his feedback that any proposal must work with a sustainable economic solution.

In response to a question as to whether there is a scientific paper on spoon worm, Mr Humpheryes advised the Group that, although no scientific research had been carried out on spoon worm communities in the Hythe Bay area, this had been carried out on communities in Scottish sea lochs and Celtic seas. If the community in Hythe Bay were the same then this research would be relevant. The Group were advised that this paper would be distributed.

Ms A Jones (NE) advised that their data was suggesting that historically there was a decline in spoon worm within this site since the 1980s when surveys had taken

4 November 2014

place and then more recently during the balanced seas process. Research had shown that this decline was not related to the sewage outfall.

Mr M Caister advised that although a sample could be taken, once there was a storm the ground changed and in fact would change each day. Spoon worms had not been seen or caught. He felt that the Group were trying to affect fishermen's livelihoods with hearsay.

Mr D Collins (MP) informed the Group that the data was discussed at the meeting held earlier in the year when Defra said there was not enough evidence to designate an MCZ. He felt there was a need to treat historic data carefully and remember that there had been a lot of changes since the 1980s and that there was a lot less fishing taking place.

Mr Roskilly suggested that early certainty on Hythe Bay would be beneficial to the fishermen who have to make decisions on investing in appropriate gears.

Fishermen expressed a concern at the proposal to ban the use of tickler chains behind the ground ropes as they used them only in the middle of their gear. They did not use heavy gear as they didn't want it being trapped in the mud and asked who had said that they should not use these chains.

The CIFCO commented that the proposal was to try to suggest a way of working that would have the least impact. Although the comment made by the fishermen was valid they had to be aware that these proposals would have an impact on the fishing industry and that they may have to try to change some of their techniques.

With regard to the four options the Group asked for clarification on options two and three in that if either were accepted as the preferred option of the Group then would any progression be made on the Folkestone Pomerania MCZ and Dover to Deal rMCZ. They were advised that the Dover to Deal site had not been designated as yet and that further data was required for Folkestone Pomerania on where the features were with the Authority working to a 2016 timetable. Fishermen's major concern was in knowing what was happening to Hythe Bay. This was a keystone for them and might be worth looking at concurrently.

Mr Noakes advised that at the meeting held to discuss the Dover to Folkestone and Dover to Deal sites fishermen had asked Kent Wildlife Trust (KWT) to provide them with areas which were important to them so they could suggest they were closed to bottom towed gear if they were not currently fished.

Ms Chapman (KWT) stated that she was not aware that the fishermen had requested this information from the Trust. The sites had features put forward for protection in the recommendation and further data had been collected. She believed there was not a great deal of trawling that was undertaken at these sites.

Mr Noakes advised that there was some fishing using rock hopper gear, but there were areas that were not fishable due to the presence of world war two wreckage. He asked if there were areas there which would not be of quite as much interest to the Wildlife Trust.

4 November 2014

Ms Chapman advised that the key features that were of importance were chalk and Sabellaria, but the role of the Wildlife Trust was not to provide information or evidence of where it was.

Mr Noakes informed the Group that he was reluctant to provide information on areas which were and were not fished as once this information was provided then that would be where the proposed conservation zone would appear.

Mr McCleod (Defra) stated that if the Minister decided to include these sites, then in the consultation process maps would be provided to indicate where these features were. At this stage stakeholders would have an opportunity to comment and make suggestions as to the decision to designate.

Mr P McCleod (Defra) advised that the aim was to start the consultation process in early January 2015 for a period of 3 months.

Ms Jones advised that although there was no statutory reason to look at Hythe Bay she would support the fishermen coming up with their own proposal. She was concerned that the proposed closed areas were not big enough to show whether a type of fishing had no effect or conversely would. She felt it might be necessary to tweak these areas, but that the proposals were good and it was necessary to work together. She also stated that as Tranche 3 was nearing and if an MCZ were to be proposed for this site with a different boundary then other management proposals could come into play.

Ms Chapman stated that she wanted an MCZ in Hythe Bay to protect the features and help reverse the decline. She wanted to establish what fisheries impacts were and to carry out research into that. She felt that it was a good move to have the Bay closed off to larger gears as this would benefit the local fleet together with the conservation objective. However she felt it important not to rush into the process and reiterated that a decision on MCZ designation had been deferred so more information could be obtained to understand where the MCZ should be, taking into account that the spoon worm community could be in a bigger area across the Bay. She felt that it was important to work on the Folkestone Pomerania site.

It was suggested that as there was a wider area of the spoonworm community, there could be more flexibility as to where the control areas and the MCZ would be. At the time of the Balanced Seas Project the only evidence available of the distribution of the community was in the north side of the Bay, resulting in the rMCZ being placed here. The Balanced Seas documents had recorded that this side was more important to fishermen for income. It was this understanding that had led to Defra commissioning additional survey work this year in the south of the Bay. Recent landings data also indicated that the north of the Bay was more important financially than the south. Ms Chapman suggested there was a need for economic evidence as well as ecological evidence to feed into the discussions.

Mr Noakes commented that the fishermen considered that the areas put forward in their proposal were sufficient and that the entire Bay was of importance to them from an income point of view.

4 November 2014

Mr Collins, MP, commented that it was important not to lose this opportunity to take forward an alternative solution. He stated that there may never be an MCZ in Hythe Bay, but he felt that the fishing industry could not live with that uncertainty. The original designation did not go ahead as there was not enough evidence to do so. The proposal made by the fishermen could be the best plan for the industry. With ongoing monitoring it could be a good model for the rest of the coast and he would strongly support Option 4.

Ms Chapman agreed that the Authority should go ahead with looking at the Fisheries Management Zone and research proposals provided by the fishermen but she did not favour any of the four options provided for the way forward as they stood. She felt it was important that Hythe Bay should not be tied to management of other MCZs. She was very keen to carry out research but it should not be tied into the management of other sites.

The Chairman asked members of the Group to vote on the four options provided to them.

In respect of Option 1 – no members were in favour of this option

In respect of Option 2 – no members were in favour of this option

At this stage Ms Chapman advised that she did not agree with the options as proposed and that she would prefer Option 4 but only if it were clarified that management of Hythe Bay was not tied in with the management of the other designated and recommended MCZs, and did not preclude an MCZ in Hythe in Tranche 3. Ms Jones agreed with Ms Chapman in that she felt that the other three sites were less contentious and that Hythe Bay should be dealt with separately and in more detail.

The CIFCO advised that under Option 4 a permit scheme for Hythe Bay would be developed at the same time as a byelaw for Folkestone Pomerania being drawn up. Option 3 and Option 4 would achieve the same result, but Option 4 would allow that result to be achieved more quickly as fishermen had wanted a commitment that plans would be developed quickly.

Mr McCleod commented that although Option 4 was quicker there was a degree of uncertainty that it would achieve what it needed to do.

The CIFCO advised that the proposed management plan submitted by the fishermen was well researched. A draft byelaw and Impact Assessment had been drawn up by officers and in his view the Industry needed to come to a point where they know what was going to happen.

The Chairman then continued with the vote on the four options:

In respect of Option 3 - no members were in favour of this option

In respect of Option 4 – this proposal was accepted by Cllr Lamb, Cllr Wood, Mr Roskilly and Mr Baker. Mr Noakes also supported this proposal

12:35 meeting closed to members of the public

4 November 2014

13:05 meeting of Working Group only

The CIFCO advised Members that although the notes of the previous working group had been circulated to members of the Authority and published on the IFCA's website he was aware they had not been circulated to non Members of the Authority. In future notes of the Working Group meetings would be circulated in draft form prior to being provided to the Authority for comment. In addition any letters written on behalf of the Group would be circulated prior to their being sent.

The Group were advised that in respect of the four different sites (Hythe Bay, Folkestone Pomerania and the two Dover sites) individual pieces of work would be required to be carried out.

#### Step One – November 2014 to February 2015

##### Hythe Bay

Three areas of work were required to be undertaken:

- a) Initial Management –
  - ❖ develop permit byelaw limiting vessel sizes and gear
  - ❖ consult with stakeholders
  - ❖ Make byelaw
- b) Gear feature impact study –
  - ❖ develop scientific study of very light otter trawls on mud
  - ❖ consult with stakeholders
  - ❖ develop research group with fisherman/NGOs/Cefas/NE/IFCA
- c) Future management –
  - ❖ develop management plan for the site detailing the actions, then future management options based on research
  - ❖ consult with stakeholders
  - ❖ stakeholders sign up to the plan before the byelaw is made

It was important for the fishing industry to have an input into these areas of work. As a result it would be necessary to develop a research group which could meet to discuss the data and evidence as it was received.

The Group were advised that byelaws had the ability to have management plans which could be used to detail what decisions needed to be made should evidence show an action is having an effect on the site.

##### Folkestone Pomerania

- a) Develop byelaw banning bottom towed gear
- b) Consult with stakeholders
- c) Make byelaw

##### Dover sites

Wait for MCZ Tranche 2 consultation

4 November 2014

Step Two – two to three years, 2016/2017

Hythe Bay

- a) Initial management –
  - ❖ Enforce permit byelaw limiting vessel sizes and gear
- b) Gear feature impact study –
  - ❖ Fishermen's boats are used to study the impact of their gear. Research group meets 2 to 3 times pa to plan and review data
- c) Future management –
  - ❖ Use management plans to develop a flexible permit byelaw that will replace limiting vessel byelaw
  - ❖ Consult with stakeholders

Folkestone Pomerania

Enforce byelaw banning bottom towed gear

Dover Sites

- a) Once T2 consultation complete develop byelaw banning bottom towed gear
- b) Consult with stakeholders
- c) Make byelaw

Step Three – 2017/2018

Hythe Bay

- a) Initial management
  - ❖ Rescind permit byelaw limiting vessel sizes and gear
- b) Gear feature impact study
  - ❖ Use final results of the study to inform package of management for flexible permit byelaw
- c) Future management
  - ❖ Use management plans to develop a flexible permit byelaw that will replace limiting vessel byelaw
  - ❖ Consult with stakeholders
  - ❖ Make byelaw

Folkestone Pomerania

Enforce byelaw banning bottom towed gear

4 November 2014

### Dover Sites

Enforce byelaw banning bottom towed gear

In response to questions asked from the Group the CIFCO advised that the cost of the IVMS for the Hythe Bay site would be between £300 to £400 per boat, an overall capital cost of £10,000 to £12,000. Defra would be approached to see if assistance could be received with this outlay.

Any byelaw for Hythe Bay would be brought in as a fisheries conservation measure

Concerns were raised that the number of years that monitoring would take place over were not sufficient and that there was a need to further discuss the practicalities of the proposed steps. Also that although fisheries management measures were supported, an MCZ was needed to enable the feature to be protected.

It was suggested that the work be carried out as if it were an MCZ as good practice and to work with the Industry to manage the seas.

The CFICO advised that it was necessary to use fishermen's knowledge and to work closely with them. The IFCA had the ability to undertake research using the patrol vessel Tamesis which could take samples using a day grab and videos with an underwater camera. It was expensive to analyse each sample point, normally £400 to look at individual species. He proposed that the research group met within a month with the aim of looking at what science was required and the costing out of options. The results of this meeting could then be presented to Defra and the members of the Authority. The research group would also look at the size of the areas that were proposed to be closed to all bottom towed fishing in Hythe Bay.

Resolved that the research group would consist of Cllr Wood, Ms A Jones, Mr I Humphreyes, Ms K Bamford, Mr T Noakes, Ms B Chapman, Mr L Roskilly, Mr W Baker and Ms S Ware.

In answer to a concern raised over the timeframe for obtaining meaningful research in respect of a management plan for Folkestone Pomerania, the CIFCO advised that he intended to discuss the research under a management plan that would then be circulated to the Industry for comment. He proposed to send any draft byelaw and associated Impact Assessment to the Industry and NGOs before circulating it to the Group and then taking it to the Authority.

### Next steps- Officers would:

- Draft permit byelaw for Hythe Bay
- Arrange meeting for research group
- Draft a management plan for Hythe Bay
- Draft bottom towed gear byelaw for Folkestone Pomerania
- Make best efforts, working collaboratively with stakeholders to put final versions of the byelaws to the Authority for the January 2015 meeting.

4 November 2014

Update on Blackwater, Crouch, Roach and Colne MCZ

The Group were reminded that the Essex Estuaries SAC of which the Blackwater, Crouch, Roach and Colne MCZ was part of covered a total of 460km<sup>2</sup>, designated for benthic habitats. This MCZ was designated Tranche 1 in November 2013 for native oysters and native oyster beds.

Since the last meeting the following activities had taken place:

- For a period of three weeks in August 2014 KEIFCA and NE had conducted a survey of the site. Two hundred and thirty five sample stations were undertaken using 100m dredge tows to record the number of native oysters, where they were found, the number of dead oyster shells and the number and type of predators in the area. Samples taken from the Crouch and Roach estuaries showed a large number of dead shells, although these areas were not historically fished and the shells did appear to be very old. There were instances of very high populations of slipper limpets which were of greater threat to the native oyster than the pacific oyster.
- The sediment removal trial was continuing with three boats carrying this out doing two days each for six hours per day.
- The Essex Native Oyster Restoration Initiative (ENORI) had met to discuss experimental areas to trial cultch with a further meeting due to be held on 12 November. Two areas had been identified which would be split into three sites as follows:
  - ❖ Site 1 – lay cultch
  - ❖ Site 2 – cleaning trial
  - ❖ Site 3 – control
- Development of a grant proposal for laying cultch
- Advertised for a PhD student to work jointly with University of Essex and Essex Wildlife Trust on the Native Oyster at the MCZ. This post would start in September 2015
- KEIFCA and NE had met to discuss the interaction between the EMS and the MCZ objectives for the site as the management and working of the ground, necessary to allow the recovery of the ground for the cultivation of native oysters, would affect the EMS objectives.

Update on the screening of fishing activities in EMS

The Group were advised that to date 210 tests of likely significance had been carried out which assessed 886 interactions between the 13 different EMS and 13 different fishing activities.

4 November 2014

As a result of the tests, 14 appropriate assessments were found to be required.

These appropriate assessments would be undertaken on a prioritised basis and will involve close working with NE.

#### Any Other Business

It was requested that it be made clearer within any future notes of the meeting whether a statement or decision of the Group was made by the whole Group or whether it was not agreed by all members.

In the notes of the previous meeting the statement "the Group agreed to combine both sites" implied the entire Group had agreed when it had not.

In addition the MCZ figures mentioned on Page 2 were asked to be checked to ensure they were correct.

Aside from these matters the notes of the meeting were agreed to be correct.

Mr Noakes showed members a video taken by his son fishing in Hythe Bay on 31 October 2014 which showed the crew putting back into the sea approximately 200lbs of thornback ray that had been caught in a 80 minute trawl as there was no quota for it. The Chairman asked for a copy of the clip to be provided to the IFCA for them to pass to Defra.

14:20 meeting closed

#### **Recommendations of the MPA Working Group**

1. Adopt Option four - Work with all stakeholders to develop more detail for the four MCZ site solutions using the fishermen's proposal as a starting point and with the clear ambition to develop a detailed solution with accompanying draft byelaws within months of this meeting.
2. Set up a research group to consist of Cllr Wood, Ms A Jones, Mr I Humpheryes, Ms K Bamford, Mr T Noakes, Ms B Chapman, Mr L Roskilly, Mr W Baker and Ms S Ware to discuss the scientific aspects of the work required in more detail and the costing out of options; arrange a meeting for this research group within one month of the date of the MPA Working Group meeting.
3. Officers to draft a permit byelaw for Hythe Bay.
4. Officers to draft a management plan for Hythe Bay.
5. Officers to draft a bottom towed gear byelaw for Folkestone Pomerania.

4 November 2014

6. Officers should make best efforts, working collaboratively with stakeholders, to put final versions of these byelaws to the Authority for the January 2015 meeting.
7. To note the continuing work of officers in respect of the Blackwater, Crouch, Roach and Colne MCZ.

DRAFT