

**EXE ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PARTNERSHIP****MANAGEMENT GROUP MINUTES****Langstone Cliff Hotel, Mount Pleasant Road, Dawlish Warren****9:15am Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> June 2017****Present**

Chair: Councillor Jeffrey Trail BEM, DCC (JT)	Steph Davies, D&SIFCA (SD)
Cllr Michael Howe, EDDC (MH)	Neil Harris, SEDHRP (NH)
Cllr Pat A Graham, ETC (PG)	Cllr Humphrey Clemens, TDC (HC)
Cllr Martin Wrigley, DTC (MW)	Cllr Andrew Cadbury, SPC (AC)
Neil Downes, Forum Chair (ND)	Christopher Scanes, Bishops Clyst PC (CS)
Peter Chamberlain, DCC (PC)	Lynn Trout, Forum Vice Chair (LT)
Graeme Smith, TDC (GS)	James Chubb, EDDC (JC)
Colin Acton, ECC (CA)	Andrew Stanger, Natural England (AS)
Gavin Bloomfield, RSPB (GB)	Tim Faulkner, Powderham Estate (TF)
Alan Wood, RYA (AW)	Stephanie Clark, EEMP (SC)
Rowena Garne, DCC (RG)	

**09:30 to 10:15: Management Group Meeting****1. Welcome, introductions and apologies for absence – JT**

- JT welcomed those present. RG took the minutes.
- JT introduced himself to the Management Group as the new Chair of the EEMP and expressed his enthusiasm at being appointed.
- Introductions were given to two new Partners: Clyst St George PC and Bishops Clyst PC.
- Apologies were noted from: Cllr Ted Hockin (TDC), Cllr Margaret Baldwin (ECC), Cllr Terry Lowther (DTC), Cllr Graham Murrin (WPC), Lord Courtenay (Powderham Estate), Hugh Davey (Environment Agency), Clyst St George.

**2. Minutes and Action Log of Previous Meeting – JT**

- Minutes from previous MG meeting were agreed as an accurate record (Proposed: GB, Seconded: NH) and signed by the Chair.
- Actions from previous meeting distributed (see Action Log).

**3. Delivery Plan Highlight Report – PC & SC**

- PC – Introduced new format to highlight report using a different approach which is centred on the Delivery Plan. This uses a red, amber, green system.

**PC** – The first action that needs your attention is the Summer Festival which as you can see has been highlighted as a Red issue. This is due to a grant that SC applied for being unsuccessful and therefore we need to make a decision on whether the festival will go ahead. This has become an increasing concern due to the lack of time that we have to organise, due to the extension of the zonation work.

This item was discussed in detail at the Officer Working Group (OWG) meeting, with the overall consensus that the festival should be called off, with the EEMP stall instead attend a roadshow of events. Is the MG happy to agree to this suggestion by the OWG?

**JT** – Proposed: ND, Seconded: LT. Majority agreed: motion carried.

**PC** – The next item on the Highlight Report which requires your attention is the Exe Press newsletter which is currently seeing some budget issues. The suggestion, after hearing the views at the OWG, is to reduce the number from four per year to three.

**MW** – I am worried that would cause a significant reduction in public engagement when brought alongside the lack of festival.

**PG** – I don't think people will notice any significant difference, if they notice at all. Think a lot of people will just accept that there have always been three.

**MH** – What are we saving from going from four to three?

**SC** – Just over £700.

**PC** – Happy for us to investigate further advertising but for now reduce number to three?

**GB** – As long as part you look at how much control you would have over the adverts.

**PC** – Agreed.

**JT** – Proposed: PG, Seconded: GB. Agreed: motion carried.

**PC** – Any other actions that anyone would like to comment on?

MG agreed that there were no more actions that required their attention.

MG agreed that this approach to the Highlight Report was useful and should be continued at future MG meetings.

#### **4. Decision on New Partner: British Canoeing – PC & SC**

**JT** – Would like to propose deferring this to a future meeting, due to time constraints?

**Objection** – AW, LT.

**LT** – British Canoeing – very big part of the estuary, canoeing is becoming a growing activity on the estuary.

**PC** – The only issue is that it is clear that the request was made so that they could become part of the review process.

Normally we would take careful consideration before making a decision on a new Members. Increasing the Management Group isn't solving any financial issues. There is the option that anyone who asks we say yes to, but at what point does the MG become too large?

I think we need to take stock of membership and look again at the approach.

Potentially we could have a certain number of Representatives, e.g. two Reps for conservation and two from stakeholders. This way we could have a vote on who to include in each meeting.

**AW** – It does make it seem that only those who can pay get to have a say.

**LT** – Mainly land based representatives – only RYA represents water based recreation.

**GB** – I don't disagree that we need more representation from water user groups. Whether British Canoeing is the right choice or not is an issue. As a charity we make a contribution so I don't think it is unreasonable to ask them to also make a contribution.

**CA** – GS was saying that potentially the Port User Group who represents a wide range of water users would be a good choice to represent users?

**LT** – No, as they do not operate until Port Directions are put forward, not there to respond to other matters.

**MW** – Proposing – thoughtfully and considerately. Disagree with deference – will require cooperation from all users.

**PC** – There are two choices:

1. Defer decision, to review membership status and the structure of MG before decision is made and invite BC on an observer status.
2. Accept BC as new member now.

**JT** – Vote please.

1. Defer – 5 votes.
2. Accept – 8 votes, on the principle that it will be negotiated further. Suggested contribution should be £1,000.

## **5. Report on zonation proposals for endorsement of Management Group – SC**

**SC** gave a summary of amended proposals.

This process was commissioned through the South East Devon Habitat Regulations Partnership (SEDHRP). It has been ongoing since Dec 2016. The OWG had an extended discussion, in which a long time was spent reflecting on the detail of amended proposals.

### **Dawlish Warren –**

#### **Initial Proposal**

- All year, All tidal states.
- Eel grass beds fully protected.
- The area is a high tide roost.
- Key issues with the area at the top.
- Concern of safety in navigation channel.

#### **Amended Proposal**

- Since the initial proposal and concerns we have reduced the area down and brought it inwards by 100m. By bringing the zone down we have also allowed access to the wreck for anglers.
- Codes of conduct will also be created.
- Suggestion to call them Wildlife Refuges.
- There are still outstanding concerns with many users saying that they would prefer the IFCA byelaw line to be followed as well as gig club issues.
- We will also have signage at entry points and buoyage in place.
- Existing restrictions will not be affected such as the IFCA byelaw line and dog walking areas.

- The current angling voluntary exclusion zone will be superseded.
- There are nine existing crab tilers who will continue to use the area.

### **Exmouth – Initial Proposal**

- All tidal states.
- September to March.
- Duck pond was highlighted as an important area for the birds.
- Issues with safety.
- Some clubs would prefer a tidal exclusion zone as they use the bottom of the duck pond for beginners – however it is important to note that this area is both an important high tide roost and a feeding area at low tide.

### **Amended Proposal**

- Covers a lot but not all of the eelgrass.
- The zone has been moved east from kite surfers with an approximate 750m buffer from navigation channel.
- Allows some area in sheltered zone.
- We have reduced the season down to mid-September to end-December which is a significant reduction as the birds do start arriving in early September but reach a peak in mid-September.
- With regards to dog walkers we have opted for the suggestion to turn left off the slipway as they can be one of the most disturbing events especially if dogs are off lead.
- Imperial Recreation Ground slipway can still be used.
- Current kitesurf voluntary exclusion zone will be superseded.
- The powerboat and water ski areas will have continued use.
- The wildfowling will also have continued use of the Exe however they are under lease agreements and permits so are regularly checked.

**GS** – Difference between Exe Estuary Management Partnership and SEDHRP needs to be clear – may seem that they are affecting our neutrality creating a damaged brand by running the consultation and therefore driving the conservation through.

**PC** – We are following our Management Plan and have endorsed zonation in past

- This is not a new approach
- The only difference this time is that it has been commissioned
- Today is just a recommendation
- Tried to achieve balance of benefits for conservation with user interest
- Not possible to get all views in – not everyone is going to be happy

**GS** – Need clarification of EEMP role – neutrality and brand challenge. Need retrospective effort to communicate this to correct stakeholder views.

Correct that SC been employed to present findings, not recommendations?

**NH** – Contracted agreement states that the EEMP needs to provide recommendations.

**JC** – Trust could take a long time to rebuild.

**PC** – Comments on these maps still need to develop codes of conduct, approach to wardening, signing and practical steps on the ground. We will also have recommended an annual review process.

**MW** – Voluntary removed from the name – has the voluntary element gone?

**SC** – Still voluntary, but users suggested this name instead of the other, which was considered too stern.

**SC** – We have a drop-in event on the 29<sup>th</sup> June – SEDHRP will officially take over and have a six week online survey, with their own report to reflect this additional feedback, with the EEMP report included in an annexe. In the meantime we will be reviewing the codes of conduct and using knowledge from local clubs and national bodies to do so.

**MH** – Strategic plan states we have to build homes.

**AW** – Rebuilding trust is not going to be easy.

**SC** – We have tried hard to communicate well with users.

**LT** – Maintain neutrality – need to be firm in handing our proposals over and clarify roles.

**PC** – Do we want to endorse or defer?

**GS** – Ensure wording within EEMP report is correct: proposed results from consultation.

**PC** – Proposals for next stage of consultation.

**CA** – If endorsed, need to indicate risks.

**TF** – Suggestion that housing people and nature people help with education.

MG indicated that with endorsement, there should be a strong recommendation about risks, i.e. who are affected.

Endorsement or Deferral?

**Endorsement – 12 votes**, on the understanding that this is a strong recommendation

**Deferral – 2 votes**

**Abstentions – 2**

**JT (Chair) – Motion Carried**

**HC** – Informed the group that Cllr Ted Hockins had recently lost his wife. The Management Group sent their sincere commiserations to Cllr Hockins.

#### **6. Dates of next Management Group Meetings:**

- 2pm on Thursday 14 September 2017 – Starcross Yacht Club (TBC). (Note: not SFCC)
- 2pm on Tuesday 5 December 2017 – Committee Suite, County Hall
- 2pm on Tuesday 6 March 2018 – Committee Suite, County Hall

**10:30 to 14:00:**

**Coastal Practitioner Conference 2017:**

**Dawlish Warren Beach Management Scheme Update & Site Visit**

10:30 to 10:45: Dawlish Scheme summary/site visit  
- Richard Cox/Martin Davies/Lawrence Jones

10:45 to 11:00: Dawlish Scheme design  
- Dr Paul Canning VBA

11:00 to 11:15: Dawlish Scheme geomorphology/HRA Challenges  
- Oli Burns/Martin Davies – EA Advisors

11:30 to 13:00: Dawlish Warren site visit x 4 -5 groups.  
- Groups to be led by Martin Davies; Richard Cox; Lawrence Jones