

Kent & Essex Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority

MINUTES of a meeting of the Authority held in the Marconi room, Chelmsford Borough Council, Duke Street, Chelmsford, Essex at 10.00am on Friday 22 January 2016

Present: Cllr J L Lamb (Southend BC), Mr J Nichols (MMO), Cllr J Jowers (Essex CC), Cllr A Wood (Essex CC), Cllr M Harrison (Kent CC), Cllr A Terry (Kent CC), Cllr S Liddiard (Thurrock Council) Ms I Chudleigh (Natural England), Dr L Fonseca (MMO), Mr A Rattley (MMO), Ms S Allison (MMO), Ms B Perkins (MMO), Mr E Hannam (MMO), Ms B Chapman (MMO), Mr P Wexham (MMO)

Apologies: Cllr P Channer (Essex CC), Cllr A Bowles (Kent CC), Ms B Perkins (MMO), Mr S Abbotson (MMO)

In Attendance: Mr P Wickenden (Clerk, KCC), Ms B Gibbs (Financial Adviser, KCC), Dr W Wright (Chief IFC Officer), Mr D Bailey (Assistant Chief IFC Officer), Dr J Heywood (Lead Scientific and Conservation Officer), Mrs D O'Shea (Office Manager), Mrs Katie Woods (Admin Assistant)

The following information was laid around the table:

- Comments from Mr A Craig re the whelk fishery – Agenda item B3
- Additional paper relating to Agenda item B3 detailing findings of research using different riddle sizes carried out since the Technical Panel meeting – Agenda item B3

The Chairman advised Members that he intended to alter the order of the agenda by taking the exempt items first.

50. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS (A1)

The Chairman requested Members to declare any interests on the Agenda item prior to it being dealt with and advised that those with a disclosable prejudicial interest may not vote on that Agenda item.

The following Members declared interests:

Ms B Chapman – agenda item B4 – personal interest (Kent Wildlife Trust employee)
Mr J Nichols – agenda item B3 – personal interest (Chairman, Thanet Fishermen's Association)
Dr L Fonseca – agenda item B3, B4, B5 – personal interest (Defra employee)

51. MINUTES (A2)

RESOLVED that the Minutes and the Exempt Minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2015 were correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

10:10am

The Chairman advised the public that under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public would be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds

that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 3 and 5 of Schedule 12A of the Act

- **AGENDA ITEM E1 – FPV NERISSA UPDATE**

Members were provided with an update on the results of sea trials undertaken on FPV Nerissa with the boatyard and the results of subsequent correspondence regarding concerns. Members were updated on the legal position and the options available to them under the terms of the contract.

Members resolved to accept delivery of the vessel.

- **AGENDA ITEM E2 – EXTERNAL AUDIT**

Members were advised of the steps taken to obtain expressions of interest in conducting an external audit of the IFCA.

Members approved the appointment of PKF Littlejohn as External Auditors

- Members resolved that the exempt minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2015 were correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman

10:50 Meeting opened to the public

52 BUDGET MONITORING 2015/16 (B1)

Members were provided with an estimated revenue outturn report as at 31 December 2015. This showed an estimated underspend of £67,610 although Members were advised that this was subject to change as the year progressed.

Members were provided with reasons for the variances under the individual budget headings

Members **NOTED** the estimated outturn position.

53. DRAFT BUDGET 2016/17 (B2)

Members were presented with the draft budget for 2016/17 showing a levy of £880,600 to be divided between the constituent Authorities. This levy remained the same as the previous year, as agreed by Members at a meeting of the Authority on 24 January 2014. The Financial Advisor informed Members that the Minister had now approved the continuation of an annual £3 million grant payable amongst all IFCA's until 2020

A 1% pay increase had been allowed for in the budget for all staff together with an allowance for career progression. The Research Officer post would continue for a further two years as Byelaws and Project Officer, partially funded by a grant from Defra and from general reserves. This post would carry out a review of all byelaws, including those inherited from other Sea Fishery Committees.

A total of £33,800 would be used from reserves as follows:

- Research £25,000
- Training £7,000
- GIS £1,800

Members were also informed that following payment for the replacement vessel for Ken Green the renewals reserve would stand at £513,059 although payment of £220,000 was expected to be received following the sale of the Ken Green. Members were reminded that it was important that the renewals reserve was kept as high as possible to enable the purchase of a replacement vessel in 10 years' time

The Chairman advised Members that the Association of IFCAs had lobbied the Minister regarding the continuation of New Burdens Funding and had made clear the implications should it not continue. He was pleased that the Minister had recognised and supported the stance of IFCAs and was happy to see that the grant would continue until 2020. He also stated that it was important that the IFCA investigated the possibility of opening up other work streams to see if there were any other methods of obtaining income, as there was no guarantee that from 2020 the grant would continue and it could be asked to take measures to reduce the budget.

THE AUTHORITY UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED that the draft budget of £889,600 and levy as set out in Agenda item B2 be approved. The total amount of levy payable by each Local Authority being as follows:

- Kent County Council £383,600
- Medway Council £67,200
- Essex County Council £383,600
- Thurrock Council £33,700
- Southend-on-Sea Borough Council £21,500

54. REVIEW OF WHELK PERMIT BYELAW (B3)

Members were reminded of the background to the introduction of the Whelk Permit Byelaw in April 2013. They were advised that they were required to review the technical specifications of the Byelaw at least every three years and that this year was the first large scale review.

The papers presented to and the notes of the Technical Panel that met on 7 January 2016 were provided to Members. Members were advised that a number of scientists, representatives from the fishing industry and other IFCAs had presented data to the Technical Panel. At that meeting the Technical Panel had made a series of recommendations which, following the meeting, the Industry expressed concern over to officers. As a result, officers had spent two days working with the Industry to understand the potential implications of the recommendations. This had led to the writing of a supplementary report which had been emailed to Members on 21 January and had been laid around the table.

The Lead Scientific and Conservation officer provided Members with a presentation. She advised them that in the last four years 12 times more whelks had been caught per annum than in any year for the last 20 years. Over exploitation of whelk stocks could cause fisheries to collapse which had been seen in the Southern Irish Sea, Jersey and France. Members were informed that the total number of pots hauled in the district in 2014/15 were 330,000, which was 18% of the potential number of pots that could be set. There were four distinct business models spread throughout the district; of these 13% fished for more than 100 days but caught 54% of the total whelks landed in the district.

Due to the concerns of the Industry following the recommendation of the Technical Panel, officers had spent the equivalent of 10 officer days at Ramsgate and Leigh on Sea with a whelk permit holder riddling whelks caught by them through a 22, 24 and 25mm riddle to look at the impact these different sizes would have on the retained catch. Members were advised that the 45mm EU minimum landing size (MLS) for whelks was based on the length of the shell, however riddles selected whelks on their width. The Lead Scientific and Conservation officer advised Members that this made whelks difficult to riddle although in general as the shell length increased then the width would as well.

The results of these two days indicated that there were larger whelks in Essex than Kent. It was suggested that this could be because there was less fishing effort in Essex so that the larger whelks could remain and that the larger whelks were more fished out in Kent. Other results reported were as follows:

- Fishermen using a 22mm riddle were landing undersized whelks in Kent and Essex
- Increasing the riddle to 24mm removed undersized whelks in Essex, although a small amount were retained in Kent
- Increasing the riddle to 25mm continued to remove undersized whelks in Essex and reduced the number of undersized whelks retained in Kent.
- Using a 24mm riddle reduced the catch as follows:
 - ❖ In Essex 9%
 - ❖ In Kent 33%
- Using a 25mm riddle reduced the catch as follows:
 - ❖ In Essex 21%
 - ❖ In Kent 54%
- Taking the district as a whole this resulted in a reduction in catch as follows:
 - ❖ 24mm riddle 21%
 - ❖ 25mm riddle 37%

Members were advised that the pots used had 22mm escape holes. If the riddle size increased then the escape holes would also increase, smaller whelks could escape and the impact could be less. Advice from Cefas and research from Universities had said that significant quantities of immature whelks were being removed from the fishery which they regarded as unsustainable. Members were informed that keeping the riddle at 22mm would allow immature whelks to be fished and undersized whelks to be landed.

As a result of these initial findings the Chief Officer suggested that Members may want to consider the following:

- Increase the minimum number of escape holes to 10
- Increase the size of the escape holes to 24mm
- Increase the riddle size to 24mm with a commitment to undertake further research
- Approve a long term whelk fishery management plan involving the Industry
- Work with fishermen to undertake a detailed research project to better understand the whelk population
- Seek grant funding to explore the possibility of developing better riddles

The Chairman invited Mr M Smith to address the Authority.

Mr Smith informed Members that he considered that more research was required. He felt the IFCA was being overcautious and that if the riddle size was increased and he lost 20% of his living, it would have an impact on his company and the fishing industry. He considered that the survey had been carried out too quickly and that at least 12 months more science was required. In the north side of the Thames only two boats fished and he felt there was not the need to change things now.

Mr Rattley informed members that he was the Chair of the Mollusc Committee of SAGB. He stated that whelks measuring 50 to 55mm could be returned back using a 22mm riddle if it were used correctly. He stated that research was required to standardise the riddle to make it more uniform. The MLS of 45mm was set to take into account the small size of whelks on the Thames Estuary and that although the research carried out in the last week was excellent the whelks found in the Thames Estuary were of an unusually large size which were not normally seen. He commented that at the Technical Panel meeting Cefas scientists had said very little research had been done. He proposed maintaining 300 pots and increasing the escape holes to 24mm but that the riddle size should remain at 22mm until further work had been carried out.

This proposal was seconded by Cllr Jowers and Mr Wexham

Dr Fonseca stated that she considered that there should be an increase in the number of escape holes and that the riddle size should be increased to 24mm. She was prepared to accept the proposal of the Chief Officer but had concerns over the number of pots that would be allowed to be set. She also stated that she considered the proposed research could not be approved unless the IFCA knew about all other projects that were proposed.

Cllr Jowers stated that he agreed with Mr Rattley that further research was required. If catch rates were to decrease by 20% by increasing the riddle size then the pot limit should be increased. He agreed with the proposal of leaving the riddle size as it currently stood.

Mr Nichols stated that he was concerned that the setting the riddle size at 25mm would cause the Ramsgate fishermen to lose 50% of their catch and considered this would result in a loss of employment. He suggested that within the next year efforts should be made to standardize the riddle. He believed that the number of pots allowed should remain the same, escape holes should be increased to 10 and their size increase to 24mm. He applauded the work carried out but felt it

needed to go a lot further and that the riddle should remain at 22mm for a further year to enable research with the Industry to be carried out.

Mr Hannam asked that the technical panel notes be amended to show that the recommendation of the panel with regard to the number of escape holes should show as "the number of escape holes remain at a minimum of 2 per pot". He also asked that the issue of trigger points be included as an indicator of any significant changes to allow the matter to come back rather than wait for the end of the 3-year cycle. He stated that he was concerned that there were proposals to change the recommendation of the technical panel and that Members should be aware that the Panel had spent time discussing all the issues which had been raised at this meeting with presentations from researchers who had attended. He felt the original recommendations of the Technical Panel should be considered.

The Chairman advised that the Technical Panel acted as an advisory panel to the full IFCA. Members had now been provided with an additional paper which had not been available at that meeting. A proposal had been put forward which was different to that put before them. This would be voted on first as it had been proposed and seconded. If it did not get passed then he would go back to the original proposal. This was supported by Cllr Harrison.

Ms Chapman stated that she was in favour of reducing the number of pots allowed because of the issue of latent capacity. She supported an increase in the riddle and escape hole size to 25mm and would be in favour of it being more than that as she believed the long term sustainability of the whelk fishery was in danger if the adult breeding stock was taken out

The Chairman stated that there was a recommendation before them from the report and on the screen. There was also an option that would be voted on shortly that changes to the riddle size be deferred for 12 months in order to carry out more research but that the Authority approved putting more escape holes into the pots and retained the 300 pot limit. It was important that Members had information which supported the sustainability of the whelk stock as well as the fishing community.

Members were advised by the Lead Scientific and Conservation Officer that although the work with the riddle sizes presented to the Members that day had been carried out over the previous two weeks the information provided to the Technical Panel contained research carried out over the previous two years and in some instances a lot longer. Research had shown that the size of maturity of whelks was over 45mm.

The Chief Officer advised Members that evidence had been provided that showed that stocks could crash and that the MLS was not sufficient. He advised that the precautionary approach should be considered if Members considered there was lack of evidence.

Members voted on the proposal by Mr Rattley, seconded by Cllr Jowers and Mr Wexham that the technical requirements of the byelaw be amended to show that:

- The number of escape holes be increased to 10
- A maximum of 300 pots be allowed per permit

- Defer any change to the riddle size for 12 months to allow for further investigation and reports.

Members voted as follows:

In favour 5
Against 8

The Chairman advised Members that that proposal had fallen and that they would then vote on the recommendation from the Authority shown on the screen (presentation from Lead Scientific and Conservation officer)

Members requested clarification on whether they were voting for a 24mm or 25mm size. The Chairman advised it was 24mm as shown on the screen and was a separate recommendation to the one proposed by the technical panel following additional work being undertaken:

Members voted on this proposal made by the Chairman and seconded by Cllr Harrison that the technical requirements of the byelaw be amended to show that:

- the minimum number of escape holes be increased to 10
- the size of the escape holes be increased to 24mm
- the riddle size be increased to 24mm with a commitment to undertake further research

In addition Members would:

- Approve a long term whelk fishery management plan involving the Industry
- Work with fishermen to undertake a detailed research project to better understand the whelk population
- Seek grant funding to explore the possibility of developing better riddles

Members voted as follows:

In favour 4
Against 7

The Chairman advised Members that the recommendation had failed and would not move forward and would need to come back to the Authority at a later date unless there was a further formal proposal from the floor. He advised Members that the proposal from the floor was required to be voted on in the first instance. When that failed the recommendation from the supplementary report presented to Members by officers was then taken. As the Technical Panel recommendation had not been proposed it had not been voted on.

Some Members were concerned that the recommendations of the Technical Panel had not been voted on and commented that they had not been aware that these would not be brought forward for them to consider. It was stated that there had been confusion on what had been voted on and following the clarification from the Chairman asked if a revote could be undertaken. The Chairman advised this would not be possible.

It was pointed out that the papers were not clear on the recommendations being made to Members. It was requested that the format of reports to Members be reviewed to show very clearly what the problem was, what the options were, including a null option, and very clear recommendations in order to make it clear to Members what they were being asked to decide. The Chief Officer informed Members that the matter could not be brought back to the Authority at the next meeting as the byelaw required that the technical requirements be reviewed on the third year. The matter could only be brought again in one year's time.

RESOLVED that:

- i) as the substantive and proposal had failed the Technical Permit Requirements of the Whelk Fishery Permit Byelaw remain unchanged; and
- ii) the format of papers and reports to Members be amended to clearly show what the problem was, what the options were, including a null option, and clear recommendations

55. MARINE PROTECTED AREAS UPDATE (B4)

The Lead Scientific and Conservation officer reminded Members that the deadline for assessing the impact, and where necessary introducing management, for medium and low risk interactions was at the end of 2016. All ten appropriate assessments had been completed and submitted to Natural England (NE) for review and advice. Members were advised that consultation would continue with NE, local fishermen and NGOs to continue to gather evidence and to discuss management measures.

In respect of Margate and Longsands SAC, Members were informed that meetings had been held with NE and the MMO regarding management of the site. There was a need to work with the MMO as the area entered into their jurisdiction. Members were advised that it was hoped to start to discuss management options for the site with stakeholders in late Spring, early Summer with a view to making a possible byelaw in the Autumn.

Members were advised that the statutory consultation process for the byelaw had been completed with no objections received. The next stage in the process would be to send the byelaw off to the MMO and Defra for them to confirm the legislation. Members were informed that it was intended to hold a launch event in Rochester to promote the signing of the byelaw by the Minister.

Members **NOTED** the report

56. BASS LEGISLATION FOR 2016 (B5)

The Assistant Chief Fishery Officer advised that in 2015 a number of emergency measures had been put in place by the EU in order to reduce bass fishing mortality. In 2016 additional restrictions had been put in place as follows:

For commercial fisheries:

From 1st January to 30th June 2016 there is a prohibition on commercial vessels fishing for bass except for; demersal trawls and seines which are permitted a 1% bass by-catch; fixed gill nets (not including drift nets) which are permitted 1,300kg per vessel in January, April, May and June. The fixed net fishery is closed in February and March.

From 1st July to 31st December 2016 monthly catch limits apply to all vessels.

1,300kg per vessel per month for fixed gill nets (not including drift nets) and 1,000kg per vessel per month for all other gears.

For recreational fisheries:

From 1st January to 30th June 2016 catch and release only permitted

From 1st July to 31st December 2016 one bass per fisherman per day

Members discussed the matter in detail and recognised the impact that the new measures would have on both commercial and recreational sectors together with the additional education and enforcement that officers would be required to undertake within these sectors.

Members **NOTED** the report

57. DRAFT STRATEGIC EVIDENCE PLAN (B6)

As requested at the meeting held on 4 September 2015, Members were provided with a draft plan which included the objectives, main evidence gathering themes and criteria for assessing new research projects for the next four to five years. Following comments from Members it was proposed that a final draft be presented to the Authority at the next meeting following which it would then undergo a 6 week consultation process with stakeholders.

Members commented that there were no limitations listed in the section for "strengths and weaknesses" and that they would like to see initiatives for the longer term. It was also suggested that the plan could be more specific on how the IFCA intended to prioritise the proposed projects.

RESOLVED that:

- i) the plan be amended to address the comments made by Members; and
- ii) a final draft be provided to Members for approval.

58. DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN (B7)

Members were provided with the draft annual plan for 2016-2017. The Chief Officer advised them that this plan was based on the new success criteria and also incorporated the research plan. Members were asked to comment on the plan direct to officers in order for the document to be submitted to the Secretary of State by 31 March 2016

Members **NOTED** the report

59. MATTERS FOR REPORT

Members received:

- Quarterly Report of the Kent IFCO (C1)
- Quarterly Report of the Essex IFCO (C2)
- Quarterly Report of the Patrol Vessel 'Ken Green' (C3) – Members were advised that the Ken Green had now been sold
- Quarterly Report of the Patrol Vessel 'Tamesis' (C4)
- Sea Angling Report (C5)
- Communication Update (C6)
- Enforcement Report (C7) – Members requested that they be provided with a list of the number of inspections that had been carried out

12:55 Members broke for lunch

Cllr A Wood left

Members reconvened at 13:35 in order to transact the following business:

60. ESSEX ESTUARIES SAC (B1)

Members were reminded that at their previous meeting they had requested that officers prepare management options for the Essex Estuaries SAC. Members were advised that since this meeting members of the fishing industry had been approached to ask if they wanted to work with officers to develop a management option to present to today's meeting, however they had indicated that they would be preparing their own assessment. NGOs had also been approached to see if they wished to work with the IFCA to develop management options and if they wished to present at today's meeting. They felt that no further meetings were necessary. Officers had met with NE to finalise management options for the site.

Members were reminded that they had been sent a draft Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) for the site. This draft had been sent to stakeholders and comments received in respect of the HRA had been included within Members' papers.

Members were reminded of the revised approach from Defra that required fishing activities to be assessed in the same way as all other activities within the EMS were assessed. They were also informed of the process that was required to be undertaken by the IFCA which involved conducting a test of likely significant effect. If a significant effect did occur as a result of a fishing activity then an Appropriate Assessment (AA) would take place. This would involve taking into account scientific literature together with expert knowledge and local factors. Members were reminded that different habitats were sensitive to different methods.

The Chief Officer advised Members that the IFCA were charged to work with best available data using national and local data together with local knowledge to make conclusions. The law also directed the IFCA to use a precautionary approach when necessary. The evidence base for trawling was not as extensive as that of local aggregate dredging, but there were significant national and international studies that were useful to help form general conclusions, one of which was that trawling did have an impact. The fishing industry and other local stakeholders had concerns that regional studies and local information had not been taken into account. The fishing industry had been approached and asked for details of the type of gear they used and when and where they used it. Some pictures had been received that could be used to update the paper, however the information required needed to be specific as to where and when they fished. The industry had asked that officers run tests to assist them with this. Members were advised that experience with Hythe Bay had suggested that because of the complexity involved, these would last three to five years at a cost of over £150,000 to be carried out correctly.

There were a number of sites that had been designated within the area which made it complicated to manage. As a result the management measures being discussed were in respect of bottom trawling only. The SAC was protected mainly for its estuaries and was designated because it was relatively underdeveloped. The features that had been designated were:

- Eelgrass
- Saltmarsh
- Intertidal mud
- Intertidal sand and gravel
- Intertidal sand banks
- Subtidal sandbanks
- Subtidal mud
- Subtidal mixed sediment.

Of these, subtidal mud and subtidal mixed sediment were the most sensitive and the conservation objectives were to maintain or restore.

A number of different activities occurred at this site:

- Clam dredging in the rivers – this was a localised activity that took place under an aquaculture licence administered by Cefas
- Native oyster dredging – on the public grounds none undertaken at the moment under existing IFCA byelaws
- Trawling – this was variable, low level all year round. Some areas were fished for a specific period for sole.
- Cockle dredging – this was regulated by existing byelaws

The impact of trawling on the site had been considered as the initial assessment had shown that this activity would not pass the Appropriate Assessment and was deemed as having a significant impact on the site. Natural England advice was to reduce the pressure from bottom towed gear on the site for these features.

Members were advised that the main fishing ports affected by this were:

- Wivenhoe
- Brightlingsea
- West Mersea
- Leigh on Sea
- Southend on Sea
- Tollesbury
- Maldon
- Bradwell

Members were provided with a presentation showing the areas of fishing activity within the SAC. They were advised that this information was based on Officer knowledge and initial talks with fishermen. Between 2010 and 2015, from a total of 600 patrol vessel trips from Brightlingsea, 42 sightings of fishing vessels were observed with 13 of these over the areas where subtidal mud and subtidal mixed sediment were found. It appeared that the fishing intensity within the sites specified within the presentation was lower than outside of these sites.

Members were advised that the AA considered whether there was abrasion or disturbance of the sea bed, penetration or disturbance of the substrate underneath the seabed, was there removal of targeted species from the sea bed and was there a change in siltation rate.

Members were provided with information on the gear used by fishing vessels and advised that the type of gear and how it was rigged would depend on how it affected the seabed. Different types of seabed would be affected in different ways.

Members were advised that with regard to management options, it would be necessary to introduce a byelaw looking at closing areas and prioritising sensitive habitats within the riverine areas and also trawling in the sites specified within the presentation and provided within the papers. The Assistant Chief Officer informed Members that within the papers the recommendation referred to bottom towed gear. This was incorrect and should have read bottom trawled gear. Members were advised within the presentation where the sites within the SAC were (those areas where subtidal mud and subtidal mixed sediment were found). The data set would be improved although there was more confidence in the riverine area data.

Members were advised that the four areas referred to within their papers and the presentation represented a good balance of the more sensitive habitats in the site, it represented a good coverage of the site and of areas to be improved on in future surveys.

It was important to consider how the byelaw would be reviewed. Members could consider the use of:

- Permit – this would require an operator to apply and pay for a permit and then work within the requirements of the byelaw. Fishermen have advised that this option would cause them concern

- Byelaw that covers the whole site with the IFCA having the option to open and close individual areas as proved necessary. Feedback from fishermen has suggested that they did not want this option

As a result, officers' recommendation was that a regulatory byelaw be developed that would close the areas specified within Members papers (marked in red) to bottom trawled gear, with a clear review process of 3 or 4 years which synced with the Natural England review process.

The Member from Natural England was asked whether the legislation allowed a proportion of the habitat to be protected. Members were advised that it didn't specify a proportion and depended on the integrity of the site. Natural England felt the recommendation would satisfy and achieve the conservation objectives of the site.

The matter was discussed in detail and the following pertinent comments were made:

- A Member was concerned that there was not sufficient localised evidence to justify the recommended management plans. The Chief Officer advised that a number of national case studies had been applied to the local situation to come to that recommendation and that there was overwhelming evidence that trawling had an impact.
- There was a need to be flexible over the areas to be closed to bottom trawling. Some letters within the papers referred to larger areas being closed. These did not appear to have taken into account the effect of a new power station being built, aggregate dredging, jet skis, moorings and boats dropping their anchors. The suggested recommendation was a good compromise.
- If the recommendation were to be agreed then the research strategy should be amended to allow the Authority to monitor and gather information on the site
- In order to comply with legislation then all features within the site should be protected rather than just some of them

Ms Chapman proposed that the proposed areas within the byelaw be increased to cover sensitive habitat features within the SAC (marked within the papers with red, pink and brown shading) to bottom trawled gear.

This proposal was seconded by Ms Allison

Members voted on the proposal by Ms Chapman, seconded by Ms Allison that a regulatory byelaw be developed that would close the areas specified within Members papers (marked in red, pink and brown) to bottom trawled gear. This byelaw to be reviewed every 3 to 4 years and if required remade.

Members voted as follows:

In favour	2
Against	8

Members then voted on the recommendation as made in the papers, that a regulatory byelaw be developed that would close the areas specified within Members papers (marked in red) to bottom trawled gear. This byelaw to be reviewed every 3 to 4 years and if required remade.

Members voted as follows:

In favour 10

Against 1

RESOLVED that officers develop a byelaw as specified, to bring before the Authority to be made at their meeting in May 2016.

61 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Members requested that a paper be provided to them at the next meeting setting out the format for a proposed structure of papers which would be used for all papers.

Meeting closed 14:35