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# Background

This document presents the findings from the SEMS annual online monitoring survey that took place during May 2017. The purpose of this survey is to monitor changes in activities that take place within SEMS sites that may impact on the features of the sites.

The responses recorded in this document were made by the Solent’s Relevant Authorities (RAs) and have been set out verbatim. Analysis of the data takes place in the SEMS Annual Management Report; this report also sets out subsequent management measures and actions for discussion at the SEMS Annual Management Group meeting.

For 2017, the activities surveyed were changed so that they match the activity categories found in Natural England’s conservation advice packages for Marine Protected Areas. This means we can directly cross refer the survey results to the impacts of activities as published in this Advice. The conservation advice packages can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/conservation-advice-packages-for-marine-protected-areas>.

Locations of the Solent European Marine Sites can be found on Natural England’s Designated Sites System at <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/>.

# Survey Respondents

Of the 31 RAs, who were invited to respond to the 2017 SEMS monitoring survey, 22 responded. Those who did and did not respond are listed in Table 1 and Table 2 respectively. Table 3 identifies the types of RAs which responded. None of the 22 RAs which responded had experienced any change to their coastal and marine management responsibilities since the last survey, in 2016.

Table 1 RAs who responded to the 2017 monitoring survey

|  |
| --- |
| Response Organisations  |
| Associated British Ports  |
| Beaulieu River Management  |
| Chichester District Council  |
| Chichester Harbour Conservancy  |
| Eastleigh Borough Council  |
| Environment Agency  |
| Fareham Borough Council  |
| Isle of Wight Council  |
| Langstone Harbour Board  |
| Lymington Harbour Commissioners  |
| Natural England  |
| New Forest National Park Authority  |
| River Hamble Harbour Authority  |
| Southampton City Council  |
| Southern IFCA  |
| Southern Water  |
| Sussex IFCA  |
| Test Valley Borough Council  |
| West Sussex County Council  |
| Wightlink  |
| Winchester City Council |
| Yarmouth Harbour Commissioners  |

Table 2 RAs who did not respond to the 2017 monitoring survey

|  |
| --- |
| Organisations Who Did Not Respond  |
| Cowes Harbour Commissioners  |
| Gosport Borough Council  |
| Hampshire County Council  |
| Havant Borough Council  |
| New Forest District Council  |
| Portsmouth City Council |
| Portsmouth International Port  |
| Queen’s Harbour Master (Portsmouth)  |
| Trinity House Lighthouse Service  |

Table 3 The types of RA who responded to the 2017 monitoring survey

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Authority Type | Count |
| Government Authority | 3 |
| Harbour Authority | 7 |
| IFCA | 2 |
| Local Authority | 8 |
| Private Company | 2 |

# Activity summary

This section summarises the responses from the 2017 monitoring survey. Respondents were questioned on seventeen different types of activity.

Table 4 The number of RAs who reported that an activity was within their jurisdiction

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activity | Number of relevant authorities with activity within their jurisdiction  |
| Land Recreation - Dog Walking | 13 |
| Land Recreation - Walking (other than dog walking) | 13 |
| Land Recreation - Other | 12 |
| Recreation - Non-motorised Water Sports | 10 |
| Recreation - Powerboating or Sailing with an Engine | 10 |
| Mooring and/or Anchoring | 11 |
| Recreation - Light Aircraft | 7 |
| Fishing (including shellfisheries) | 10 |
| Fishing (shore-based activities) | 11 |
| Accidental Vessel Discharges /Emissions (including oil spill and clean-up) | 14 |
| Littering and Removal of Litter | 15 |
| Wildfowling | 6 |
| Operation of Coastal Flood and Erosion Risk Management Schemes, Barrages and Sluices  | 12 |
| Boat Repair/Maintenance  | 12 |
| Navigation (maintenance of infrastructure) and Operation of Ports and Harbours | 11 |
| Slipway and Jetty Cleaning and Maintenance | 10 |
| Grazing | 1 |

### Reported Change in Activities from 2016 to 2017

Table 5 shows if there has been a change in occurrence since last year for each activity. The numbers within the columns indicate the number of organisations which reported that an activity had occurred within their area of jurisdiction. Activities which have increased, remained elevated or decreased are highlighted in red, orange and green respectively. Only activities where change has been reported are included in Section 4.

A change in the level of activity compared to 2016 was recorded for 11 of the 17 activities monitored. For every activity, most of those who responded reported either ‘no change’ or ‘unknown’ for the level of activity.

Table 5 Reported changes in activity levels 2016-17

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | No change | Increase | Remains Elevated | Decrease | Unknown |
| Land Recreation - Dog walking | 3 | **1** | **2** | 0 | 7 |
| Land Recreation - Walking (other than dog walking) | 5 | **1** | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Land Recreation - Other | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Recreation - Non-Motorised Water Sports | 5 | **2** | 0 | **1** | 3 |
| Recreation - Powerboating or Sailing with an Engine | 5 | 0 | 0 | **2** | 4 |
| Mooring and/or Anchoring | 9 | **1** | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Recreation - Light Aircraft | 3 | **3** | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Fishing (including shellfisheries) | 6 | **2** | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Fishing (shore-based activities) | 7 | **2** | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Accidental Vessel Discharges / Emissions (including oil spill and clean-up) | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Littering and Removal of Litter | 7 | 0 | **1** | 0 | 7 |
| Wildfowling | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Operation of Coastal Flood and Erosion Risk Management Schemes, Barrages and Sluices  | 9 | **1** | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Boat Repair/Maintenance  | 6 | **3** | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Navigation (maintenance of infrastructure) and Operation of Ports and Harbours | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Slipway and Jetty Cleaning and Maintenance | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Grazing | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

# Response by Activity

Section 4 presents in greater detail the responses for individual activities where changes were reported in the 2017 monitoring survey. This data is presented verbatim; analysis of the data is set out in the SEMS Annual Management Report.

## Land Recreation - Dog Walking

Definition: Activities that involve dogs, including when dogs are used for wildfowling

#### Change in activity since last year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No change | Increase | Remains Elevated  | Decrease | Unknown | Total Responses |
| 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 13 |

### Reports of an increase of Land Recreation – Dog Walking

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| EBC | Increases in visitor numbers noted by the parish councils and on Hamble point EBC reserve | Throughout the coastal areas | Winter visitors reported by previous surveys  | New housing  |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management measure in place |
| EBC |  SRMP Itchen Valley Country Park project  |

#### Has the increase in activity had a residual impact on SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 0 | 1 |

#### Suggested actions to address problem

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Suggested Actions  |
| EBC | It is hoped that wardening will decrease visitor numbers and that a scheme funded by the growth fund at Itchen Valley Country Park will detract winter visitors from the coast |

### Reports that level of Land Recreation – Dog Walking remains elevated

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| NE | N/A | Throughout Solent | Year-round. | N/A |
| CDC | Impact from pre-existing levels of dog walking due to pre 2010 development and growth of the district | All coastal areas around Chichester Harbour | All year round but mainly a cause for concern over-winter when SPA bird features are present | No change but an historical elevation, recent increases are address through mitigation programmes |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management Measures in place |
| NE | Participation in Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP). |
| CDC | Both the Graylingwell and Roussillon mitigation project locally and Bird Aware project over a wider area, seek to influence and change dog walking behaviour and locations. The aim of these projects is to mitigate additional impact from new development, rather then to address the pre-existing issue, but there will be knock-on benefits from the messages put across |

####  Has the increase in activity had a residual impact on SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 1 | 1 |

#### If yes:

#### Please elaborate on residual impacts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Elaboration  |
| CDC | The mitigation projects are designed to ensure no net increase is recreational disturbance, they are not designed or funded to address the impacts of pre 2010 housing development  |

#### Do you believe that this activity may cause the condition of the SEMS to change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 1 | 0 |

#### How might this activity cause the condition of the SEMS to change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Elaboration  |
| CDC |  Over time unmitigated recreational pressure could cause SPA bird species to decline |

#### Suggested actions to address problem

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Suggested Actions  |
| NE | SRMP definitive strategy is being developed and should be implemented by December 2018. |
| CDC | No response  |

## Land Recreation - Walking (other than dog walking)

Definition: Walking on upper shore or intertidal zone (other than dog walking)

#### Change in activity since 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No change | Increase | Remains Elevated | Decrease | Unknown | Total Responses |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 14 |

###

### Reports of an increase in Land Recreation - Walking (other than dog walking)

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| EBC | Increases in visitor numbers noted by the parish councils and on Hamble point EBC reserve | Throughout the coastal areas | Summer visitors reported by parish  | Recreation and new housing  |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management Measures in place  |
| EBC | SRMP wardening  |

#### Has the increase in activity had a residual impact on SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 0 | 1 |

#### Suggested actions to address problem

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Suggested Actions  |
| EBC | It is hoped that wardening will decrease visitor numbers and that a scheme funded by the growth fund at Itchen Valley Country Park will detract winter visitors from the coast |

## Recreation - non-motorised water sports

Definition: Windsurfing, kite surfing, kayaks, canoes, row boats, punts, paddle boards, dinghies, sailing boats. Includes all related activity - participation, launching/recovery (may include shore access and may be with trailers), practicing which may occur on the beach. Includes events and competitions, activity during travel, launching and when stationary (may be beached when not in use), including sailing races and events.

#### Change in activity since last year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No change | Increase | Remains Elevated  | Decrease | Unknown | Total Responses |
| 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 |

### Reports of an increase of Recreation - Non-Motorised Water Sports

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| NE | NE officers have reported an increase in kite surfing, canoes, kayaks and paddle boards in some areas of the Solent.  | Beaulieu River and associated coastline of North Solent National Nature Reserve; Hayling Island (incl. Virgin Kitesurfing Armada); Newtown Harbour.  | Year-round. | Unknown. |
| BRM | Increase in paddle boards, kayaks and canoes. A slight increase in kite Surfing | Paddleboarding, kayaking and canoeing have increased throughout the river. Kite surfing has been witnessed off Gull Island at the entrance to the harbour. | All year | Popularity of the sport and Beaulieu offers safe waters for a beginner to learn. |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management Measures in place  |
| NE | None at present. |
| BRM | Regarding the Kite Surfing, the association was contacted and asked if they would assist in passing on information to members reminding Kite Surfers of the restrictions around Gull Island. |

#### Has the increase in activity had a residual impact on SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 0 | 2 |

#### Suggested actions to address problem

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Suggested Actions  |
| NE | Continued monitoring with respect to potential environmental impacts.  |
| BRM | No response  |

### Reports of a decrease of Recreation – Non-Motorised Water Sports

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| ChHC | Total number of registered vessels paying harbour dues in 2016-17 was 10,401 (corresponding fig for 2015-16 was 10,815). Most of these will be motorised vessels, Canoes/kayaks were 864 (down from 893 in 2015-16). Paddleboards increased slightly from 33 to 46. | Chichester Harbour | This information is from annual harbour due payments and does not include day visitors, so numbers for kayaks, canoes and paddle-boarders should be treated with caution. | Possibly due to general decline in boat ownership. |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management Measures in place  |
| ChHC | Leaflet given to kayakers/paddleboarders to inform harbour users of sensitive areas - e.g. high tide roosts, seal haul out areas, etc. |

#### Are levels at an acceptable level – i.e. will not be causing damage to SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 0 | 1 |

## Recreation - Powerboating or sailing with an engine

Definition: Any motorised boat activity, including Personal Watercraft (PWC), hovercraft, powerboating and water-skiing. Launching or recovery i.e. slipway or beach/shore launching (this may include trailers), and participation i.e. when activity is underway or making way. Other novel uses of power boats such as flyboarding are also included. Impacts of different craft will vary and should be considered on a case by case basis e.g. sailing boats with low power engines moving at slow speeds are unlikely to pose a threat

#### Changes in activity since last year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No change | Increase | Remains Elevated  | Decrease | Unknown | Total Responses |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 |

### Reports of a decrease of Recreation – Powerboat or Sailing with an Engine

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| ChHC | Total number of vessels paying harbour dues in 2016-17 was 10,401, down from 10,815 in 2015-16. | Chichester Habour | 2016-17 annual. No information on frequency of recreational use.  | Possibly due to general decline in boat ownership. |
| YHC | It has been noted that fuel sales over the past 12 months have reduced which indicates a reduction in local activity around Yarmouth Harbour - particularly in relation to PWC. | Solent area in and around Yarmouth Harbour | N/A | Unknown |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management measures in place  |
| ChHC | Information on sensitive sites/areas given to harbour users via website, harbour news, handbook etc. |
| YHC | None |

#### Are levels at an acceptable level – i.e. will not be causing damage to SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 1 | 1 (ChHC) |

## Mooring and/or anchoring

Definition: Operational use of berths, moorings, anchorages including the presence of these structures and vessels using them. Includes consideration of vessels when berthing/berthed, mooring/moored, anchoring/anchored. Includes impacts from anchors and impacts of boat when at anchor or mooring. Does not include impacts from boats getting to and from moorings, these should be assessed in the relevant 'participation' category. The activity of anchoring generically and use of allocated anchorage areas where ships are permitted to anchor inside and outside harbours/ports. Includes consideration of vessels when anchoring, anchored or weighing anchor. There is a particular risk of damage from anchoring in seagrass beds.

#### Change in activity since last year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No change | Increase | Remains Elevated  | Decrease | Unknown | Total Responses |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 |

### Reports of an increase of Mooring and/or Anchoring

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| EBC | I suspect there is an increase in the applications for larger berths.  | Marinas  | N/A | Increases in demands for mooring |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management Measures in place  |
| EBC |  n/a |

#### Has the increase in activity had a residual impact on SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 1 | 0 |

#### If yes:

#### Please elaborate on residual impacts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Elaboration  |
| EBC | I do not think there is a rigorous policy in relation to the number of berths and moorings the SPA can contain before there is an impact on the SPA species  |

#### Do you believe that this activity may cause the condition of the SEMS to change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 1 | 0 |

#### How might this activity cause the condition of the SEMS to change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Elaboration  |
| EBC | More boating and other on water activities will lead to disturbance  |

#### Suggested actions to address problem

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Suggested Actions  |
| EBC | SRMP is doing some work on this with user codes developed |

##

See also Appendix 2 – Point 2

## Recreation - Light Aircraft

Includes all types of craft used for recreation in the air e.g. small planes and helicopters, microlights, paramotors, hang gliding, parascending (on beach), parasailing (by boat), drones, model aircraft etc

#### Change in activity since last year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No change | Increase | Remains Elevated  | Decrease | Unknown | Total Responses |
| 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |

### Reports of an increase of Recreation – Light Aircraft

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| NE | NE officers have reported a perceived increase in recreational drone use. | Throughout the Solent. | Year-round. | Increased affordability/popularity of recreational drones. |
| LHB | The majority of light aircraft types listed in the "Recreation Light Aircraft" activity have either remained unchanged, or not been sighted at all in Langstone Harbour. The notable exception to this is drones which have been observed regularly by harbour authority staff as well as members of the public. Additionally, LHB has received a number of requests from professional organisations for permission to fly drones as part of their work within LHB jurisdiction. | Most drone sightings to date have been reported at the harbour entrance, the Hayling Oysterbeds and in Broom Channel. It is likely that drone flight is taking place in many other locations around Langstone Harbour. | Frequency of drone sightings is variable, although there was a noticeable peak in early January (likely as people received drones as Christmas gifts). | Drone technology is becoming increasingly cheap and available to all. The high quality of footage and imagery which can now be recorded using drones, as well as the device's connective ability with smart phones, make them attractive as toys to members of the public as well as tools for recording data by professional organisations. |
| LHC | The use of drones has increased. | Within Lymington Harbour Limits | Varied - About 20 authorised requests from CAA licenced operators plus various unauthorised flights often with the person flying the drone being outside of harbour Limits.  | The authorised requests are usually from commercial organisations (promotional material) or environmental regulators (promotional material or monitoring). |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management Measures in place  |
| NE | None at present. |
| LHB | LHB requests that organisations wishing to fly drones over the harbour have a fully qualified drone pilot (the CAA issue permits to suitably competent individuals for commercial flight). Additionally, LHB requests drone pilots do not fly close to sites of particular sensitivity such as high tide roost sites and seabird breeding colonies - a map of these sensitive sites is provided to pilots. LHB is, in addition, collecting information about the reaction of harbour wildlife to drones by monitoring commercial flights as well as collecting ad-hoc information about private drone sightings. |
| LHC | No formal measures where the operator is within harbour limits but we have been successful in asking non CAA licenced persons or persons who have not asked permission to refrain when they were based on harbour property. If being flown from a location not belonging to Lymington Harbour Commissioners then we have no control as we do not have authority over airspace. However if we have seen drones being flown in contravention of CAA regulations, for example too close to vessels where we have found the individual we have drawn this to their attention. |

#### Has the increase in activity had a residual impact on SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 0 | 3 |

#### Suggested actions to address problem

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Suggested Actions  |
| NE | Continued monitoring with respect to potential environmental impacts.  |
| LHB | While I have stated I do not think there will be a residual impact on the site from drone activity, the truth is I don't know... Monitoring the reaction of wildlife to drones is essential to provide a greater understanding of potential impacts. In addition, it seems highly likely that if properly managed drones have the capacity to record data in the SEMS and elsewhere that has previously been uncollectable and could be extremely useful. Finally, although LHB has been providing advice and requesting pilots adhere to certain conditions while flying in Langstone Harbour, we do not have any powers to manage light aircraft of any kind within our jurisdiction. |
| LHC | I do not believe there are further actions we can take as airspace is controlled by the CAA.  |

## Fishing (including shellfisheries)

Definition: Anchored nets/lines, Electrofishing, Traps, Pelagic fishing (or fishing activities that do not interact with sea bed), Hydraulic dredges, Dredges, Demersal trawl, Demersal seines, Diving, Sea angling.

#### Changes in activity since last year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No change | Increase | Remains Elevated  | Decrease | Unknown | Total Responses |
| 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |

### Report of increases of Fishing (including shellfisheries)

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| LHB | The number of individual fishing boats recorded using the harbour in the past year increased to 34 (up from 20 the previous year). The number of fishing days increased to 269 this year (up from 208 the previous year). | Increased fishing activity occurred in the Sinah Lake region of Langstone Harbour. | Increased fishing activity occurred during November when 21 individual boats were recorded fishing in Sinah Lake for a combined total of 81 fishing days. This compares to 5 boats totalling 18 fishing days throughout the entire harbour during the previous November. | November marks the beginning of Oyster season. In the previous year Sinah Lake had been closed to fishing after 2 weeks as a result of sIFCA implementing a byelaw to limit oyster fishing Solent-wide in order to protect what remains of the collapsed oyster stock. Additionally, the shellfish beds within Sinah Lake were previously classified as "Class C" beds making the harvest of oysters commercially unviable during the time when the beds were open. This year, legal advice obtained by sIFCA prevented the use of the byelaw to protect stocks and the oysters were classified as Class B making them a highly localised and lucrative resource which the commercial fishing community took advantage of. |
| SxIFCA | Over the 2016 oyster season, the number of oyster fishing vessels exploiting Chichester Harbour increased to a maximum of 18, compared to 14 in 2015. Activity levels varied over the 2016 season, from 7 vessels, up to a maximum of 18 vessels over the first 2 days of the 9 days the fishery remained open. The 2016 season lasted for 2 more days than the 2015 season. Activity levels in 2016 remained lower than in 2014 and 2013 when a maximum of 21 and 31 vessels were present respectively. | Emsworth and Thorney Channels, within Chichester Harbour, West Sussex. | 1st to 8th Nov (closed over the weekend 4th-5th Nov) in Emsworth Channel. 28th to 30th Nov in Thorney Channel. A total of a 9 day season before the predetermined catch per unit effort threshold was reached, see below for management measures specifics.  | The success of the Chichester Harbour oyster fishery in 2015 may have encouraged more oyster fishers to purchase a permit in 2016. See below for management measures specifics.  |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management Measures in place  |
| LHB | LHB have no powers to manage fishing within our jurisdiction, however sIFCA have created a byelaw to protect sensitive features of the SEMS from damaging fishing activity under DEFRAS revised approach to fisheries management. This byelaw is currently with the Secretary of State awaiting confirmation and once in place will prohibit towed fishing gear in Sinah Lake as well as other sensitive areas of Langstone Harbour forever. |
| SxIFCA | In 2015 the Sussex IFCA Oyster Permit Byelaw was introduced. The byelaw covers the whole of Chichester Harbour and includes technical, spatial and temporal restrictions. The harbour has been split into three management units in order to manage sustainable dredging. The oyster season is closed when a catch threshold is reached, so that a sustainable population remains on the ground. Under the byelaw, the eastern part of the harbour containing Bosham and Fishbourne channels is closed to oyster fishing. This area has not historically been dredged, and protects parts of the harbour with less impacted, less impoverished and more sensitive habitats. |

#### Has the increase in activity had a residual impact on SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 2 | 0 |

##

#### If yes:

#### Please elaborate on residual impacts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Elaboration  |
| LHB | It is likely that the damage caused by the intense use of bottom towed gear in this small area of the SEMS will take some considerable time to repair. Although a byelaw is proposed to protect fragile subtidal habitats from damaging fishing gear within the SEMS it is not yet in force. Further delays by the government on the confirmation and introduction of this byelaw could result in further residual impacts. |
| SxIFCA | The small increase in the number of vessels and slightly longer season compared to 2015 has the potential to have impacted the EMS while the fishery was in operation. |

#### Do you believe that this activity may cause the condition of the SEMS to change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 1 | 1 |

#### How might this activity cause the condition of the SEMS to change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Elaboration |
| LHB |  Without the protection of a fully introduced byelaw sensitive subtidal habitats throughout the SEMS are potentially prone to damaging fishing activity. |
| SxIFCA | N/A |

#### Suggested actions to address problem

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Suggested Actions  |
| LHB | No response  |
| SxIFCA | As part of the government's revised approach to fisheries within EMS, an Appropriate Assessment was conducted for oyster dredging within Chichester Harbour. Whilst it is recognised that this activity has the potential to cause both physical and biological disturbance, the wide range of available evidence reviewed, including scientific literature, sightings data, features data, fishers interviews and IFCO expert intel, indicates no likely adverse effect on the integrity of the Solent Maritime SAC and Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA at current levels of oyster dredging activity. The rigorous management restrictions in place, the small spatial and temporal footprint, the site's physical environment and communities and the long recovery period combine to reduce the level of impact. Sussex IFCA will continue to monitor fishing effort through catch returns, sightings data and IFCO intel. Any management of the oyster fishery to protect the Solent EMS will need to be on an iterative basis, depending on the outcome of further research. Assessments will be reviewed and updated should there be any significant changes to the nature of existing activity, or if new evidence relevant to this gear/feature interaction becomes available.  |

|  |
| --- |
| See also comments from SoIFCA on fisheries in Section 7 – Other Issues |

## Fishing (shore-based activities)

Definition: Includes crab tiling, bait digging, shellfish collection (including seed mussel) eg by hand (with or without digging apparatus), rake or through the use of 'tiles'. Also includes rod & line angling, the setting of pots and nets from the shore and use of vehicles or vessels to access the shoreline.

#### Change in activity since last year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No change | Increase | Remains Elevated  | Decrease | Unknown | Total Responses |
| 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 |

### Reports of an increase in Fishing (shore-based activities)

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| RHHA | An increase in intensity of bait digging i.e. more occurrences witnessed.  | Mudflats (those which are accessible from the land) throughout the Hamble estuary. | Low water primarily from Spring to Autumn | Not known, although possibly due to displacement from elsewhere |
| SCC | There have been reports of groups of individuals collecting large quantities of shell fish. | Weston Shore | Unclear, but two groups have been recorded in the last month | Potential commercial collection |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management Measures in place  |
| RHHA | RHHA continues to enforce its byelaw regarding minimum digging distance from structures and moorings. Have presented at local fora on the topic to encourage residents to report sightings, thereby helping to build an evidence base. |
| SCC | Volunteers are collecting details of the groups including when, where, how many individuals and vehicles used. This information is then sent to the marine section of Hampshire Police. Port Health at SCC have also been notified as the area is a closed shell fishery. |

#### Has the increase in activity had a residual impact on SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 1 | 1 |

#### If yes:

#### Please elaborate on residual impacts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Elaboration  |
| SCC | Damage to the inter-tidal mudflat habitat. It will take some time before sufficient evidence is gathered to convince the police to take any action.  |

#### Do you believe that this activity may cause the condition of the SEMS to change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 0 | 1 |

#### Suggested actions to address the problem

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Please suggest actions that could address each issue you have recorded |
| RHHA | 1. Continued addition to evidence base by RAs. 2. IFCA could produce guidance for HAs and other RAs on how best to build the evidence base and what actions we can all take to help achieve improved management. 3. The Crown estate is a large land owner, guidance or a position statement from TCE on how to manage bait digging on their sites also would be helpful. |
| SCC | No response  |

See also comments from NE on Earth Observation Project in Section 7 – Other Issues

See also Appendix 2 – Point 5 and email from SxIFCA reporting a suspected increase in hand collection of shellfish

## Littering and removal of litter

Definition: Includes operational, incidental and accidental discharges from land, water, air, and from all types of vessels, of particulate or solid wastes e.g. plastics, microplastics, marine litter and other flotsam and jetsam (other than vessel discharges ). Includes strandline clearance and beach management. The toxicity and damage caused by materials should be considered as should the clean-up of toxic debris.

#### Change in activity since last year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No change | Increase | Remains Elevated  | Decrease | Unknown | Total Responses |
| 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 15 |

### Reports that level of Littering and Removal of Litter remains elevated

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| SCC | Large amount of small items of litter present at Chessel Bay Local Nature Reserve. Litter appeared to have arisen from both marine and terrestrial sources.  | Chessel Bay, River Itchen | All year round | Unclear |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management Measures in place  |
| SCC | Twice yearly litter pick |

#### Has the increase in activity had a residual impact on SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 1 | 0 |

#### If yes: Please elaborate on residual impacts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Elaboration  |
| SCC |  It is impossible to recover al the litter so there is potential for pieces to be consumed by wildlife or to break down in the environment. |

#### Do you believe that this activity may cause the condition of the SEMS to change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 1 | 0 |

#### How might this activity cause the condition of the SEMS to change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Elaboration  |
| SCC |  Long term pollution risk to species and habitats. |

#### Suggested actions to address the problem

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Suggested Actions  |
| SCC | Education and enforcement activities are required. |

|  |
| --- |
| See also comments from on Earth Observation Project in Section 7 – Other Issues |
| See also comments from NFNPA on litter in Section 7 – Other Issues |

## Operation of Coastal Flood and Erosion Risk Management Schemes, Barrages & Sluices

Definition: Operational effects of coastal defence schemes including accretion of sediment, erosion of intertidal, coastal habitats, on-going sediment recycling schemes, coastal squeeze, operation of sluices etc. Includes consideration of vessels/machinery/vehicles associated with activity

#### Changes in activity since last year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No change | Increase | Remains Elevated  | Decrease | Unknown | Total Responses |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 |

#### **Reports that level of Operation of Coastal Flood and Erosion Risk Management Schemes & Barrages remains elevated**

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| EBC | Application for defence from cliff erosion gabions on the SPA | Netley | Over the last two years  | Sandstone cliffs encroaching on peoples’ property  |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management Measures in place  |
| EBC | We are concerned that the natural progression of the erosion will cease and the rare mining bees habitat will disappear. SPA is also being lost due to unofficial defences. On officially permitted schemes we have required ,manual clearance of the cliffs |

#### Has the increase in activity had a residual impact on SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 1 | 0 |

#### If yes:

#### Please elaborate on residual impacts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Elaboration  |
| EBC | Scrubbing up of cliff habitat likely |

#### How might this activity cause the condition of the SEMS to change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 1 | 0 |

#### How might this activity cause the condition of the SEMS to change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Elaboration  |
| EBC | As above |

#### Suggested actions to address the problem

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Suggested Actions |
| EBC | Guidance from statutory agencies on how to deal with the issues. Long term scheme for clearance  |

##

|  |
| --- |
| See also Appendix 2 – Point 3 |

## Boat Repair /Maintenance

Definition: Vessel maintenance and repair on land and afloat, hull cleaning. Includes consideration of vessels/machinery/vehicles associated with boat repair/maintenance

#### Changes in activity since last year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No change | Increase | Remains Elevated  | Decrease | Unknown | Total Responses |
| 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 |

### Reports of an increase in Boat Repair/Maintenance

#### Change in activity - how, where, when and why

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent | How | Where | When | Why |
| ABP | Hull cleaning permitted by use of ECOSubsea cleaning mechanism that removes biofouling from vessels | Port of Southampton | Approx 2 vessels per week | Assessment of collection rate. Removes biofouling and potential for NNIS from marine environment |
| NE | NE officers have reported infrastructure improvements/expansion to a number of boatyards in the Solent.  | Beaulieu River; Yarmouth Harbour. | N/A | N/A |
| EBC | appears to be an increase in application for boat repair facilities  | Coastal marinas  | N/A | Maybe there is an increase in demand |

#### Management measures in place for this activity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Management Measures in place  |
| ABP | Assessment of collection rates; records maintained by ECOSubsea |
| NE | N/A |
| EBC | Anti pollution measures  |

#### Has the increase in activity had a residual impact on SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 0 | 3 |

#### Suggested actions to address the problem

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Suggested Actions  |
| ABP | This is regarded as a positive management action |
| NE | Continued monitoring with respect to potential environmental impacts.  |
| EBC | No response  |

# Plans and Projects which May Result in an Increase in Activities

Section 5 of this document presents the response to the 2017 SEMS monitoring survey questions relating to plans or projects which could be increasing the occurrence of activities. This section simply identifies the number of respondents who reported that they were taking part in said plans or projects, and then explains theses plans or projects in more depth.

### Number of organisations taking part in plans or projects which may result in an increase in activities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Response | Count |
| No | 13 |
| Yes | 8 |
| TOTAL | 21 |

### Details of plans or projects

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Details |
| CDC | Review of the Local Plan for Chichester is beginning this year, to be adopted by 2019. It will be subject to its own Habitats Regulations Assessment |
| LHB | We have been consulted upon the proposed "England Coastal Path" which is being led by Natural England and is a provision of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. Although Langstone Harbour already has a path around its perimeter, we are concerned that the inclusion of "spreading room" in the new coastal path proposals will encourage walkers on to the intertidal zone which is likely to have both disturbance and damage implications to the fragile and sensitive features of the site.  |
| NFNPA | Liaison with NE over coastal access route (see above comment). Several Local Plan allocations may have potential for increased recreation activities and boat movements but these are still being considered so no decision has been reached. They would be subject to consultation and Habitats Regulations Assessment in any event.  |
| LHC | Lymington Harbour Commissioners have consented work undertaken by the RSPB as part of the Roseate Tern Life project. This consisted of creating three nesting areas on the eastern breakwater and artificially raising the height of and enlarging a chenier on Cockleshell Marsh. The purpose is to create nesting/roosting habitat higher in the tidal frame to try and encourage terns to use. Additional activity will be generated locally as part of the RSPB monitoring of these areas. Lymington Harbour commissioners have undertaken the final year of a three year trial to beneficially reuse dredged mud to recharge/raise the level of inter tidal mud habitat at Boiler Marsh. There will be a low level of monitoring activity associated with a bathymetric survey in the summer. |
| SCC | A number of residential developments have been approved within Southampton. |
| EBC | Numerous developments within the Eastleigh area |
| WSCC | Involved in proposals to improve the A27 around Chichester & associated junctions/local road network, including a Stockbridge Link Road. Such schemes could affect visitor access & pressure on the SEMS, as well as some direct impacts on ecology. However, proposed improvements to the A27 itself around Chichester have currently been dropped by government. |
| IOWC | The planning applications with respect to SEMS were approved this year: P/00886/16 - Kingston Marine Park land south of Beatrice Avenue East Cowes Isle Of Wight PO32 Removal of conditions to allow for alterations to the design and scale of the building and amendments to the layout of the site including the removal of zone 1 and the position of the hoist dock. P/01465/15 - land west of Kiddies Corner off Colwell Chine Road Freshwater Isle Of Wight PO40 Proposed 20 no. beach huts. P/00042/16 - land between Yellow Sands and Commodores Court Duver Road Seaview Isle Of Wight PO34 Variation of condition to allow the use of beach huts for holiday accommodation within the months of April to October each year and to allow overnight sleeping. P/00702/16 - Dolphin Cottage Bluett Avenue Seaview Isle Of Wight PO345HE New slipway P/01226/16 - Yarmouth Pier Pier Street Yarmouth Isle Of Wight PO41 Replacement of 24 piles and repairs to the pier head. P/01476/16 - car park at Hanover Point Brook Newport Isle Of Wight PO30 Construction of a temporary ramp and repair of the drainage pipe  |

### Any other comments on plans or projects taking place

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Details |
| EBC | SRMP will hopefully alleviate these issues  |

# Current Monitoring

Section 6 illustrates which organisations are currently undertaking monitoring; it includes information about what is being monitored, where the information is held, and if organisations are collaborating. Please also refer to the Solent Forum’s Solent Information Database to search for published reports in the Solent on a wide range of topics at <http://www.solentforum.org/publications/sid/>.

### Number of Relevant Authorities currently undertaking monitoring

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Response | Count |
| No | 10 |
| Yes | 12 |

### Table 6 Summary of current monitoring (Table corrected and omissions re-instated)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Details |
| RHHA | 1. Ongoing log of bait digging activity seen during routine river patrols in the Hamble, combined with any reporting by members of public. 2. 'Hamble sediment management & saltmarsh restoration study 2016' compared change in extent of saltmarsh area up to 2014. |
| NE | Natural England undertook the following monitoring projects during the 2016/17 financial year: 1) Solent Saltmarsh Survey: to assess the condition of saltmarsh in the Solent Maritime SAC (ongoing); 2) Solent EMS Fishing Impacts Study: to investigate clam dredging impacts and sediment recovery in Langstone Harbour (ongoing); 3) Lymington Intertidal Mudflats Survey: to monitor the effects of beneficial dredge disposal and inform a condition assessment for the Solent Maritime SAC (completed); 4) North Solent National Nature Reserve: a programme of annual monitoring which includes a ground nesting bird survey, WeBS, ringing projects, shoreline nest survey and invertebrate survey work (completed).  |
| CDC | CDC let the monitoring contracts on behalf of the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership for winter 2016-17. SRMP’s monitoring programme is at <http://www.birdaware.org/monitoring>. There have been two pieces of work this past winter:1. Disturbance levels at rangered sites.  This work looks at: to what extent does the presence of wardens change people’s behaviours and the subsequent disturbance of over-wintering birds compared to the same sites when no ranger is present?
2. Car park counts and vantage point watches.  This report gives information on the size, type and occupancy levels of formal and informal car parking throughout the Bird Aware Solent coast though the winter at different times of day and weekday / weekend.  The intent is to establish a baseline against which future repeat monitoring can be undertaken, to see if visitor numbers at the coast are increasing or decreasing.

The reports (both by Footprint Ecology) will be made available in due course on the webpage above.  |
| LHB | LHB monitors numerous water based activities in the SEMS. In addition LHB monitors a variety of wildlife interests. All of this monitoring work is on-going and further details are available upon request. |
| LHC | There will be a low level of monitoring activity associated with a bathymetric survey in June/September to monitor the Boiler March recharge scheme mentioned above (about 4 hours work in total). |
| EA | Ongoing Environmental Monitoring of chemical and biological elements in transitional and coastal waters for EU Water Framework Directive. Biological elements include saltmarsh, seagrass, opportunistic macroalgae, phytoplankton, benthic invertebrates and estuarine fish (excluding coastal fish). Monitoring includes recording for invasive non-native species. |
| W | We have been monitoring vessel speeds in the Lymington River and have been monitoring the effect or not, of the operation of our vessels on the protected areas. It has been ongoing but due to a lack of any evidence of any harm it has been concluded by the Environment Management Panel, to defer the next report for five years. |
| SxIFCA | Small fish surveys - ongoing, with surveys conducted over 2016. Oyster monitoring with EHO 4 times/year for length frequency data collection, with CPUE obtained monthly. Further data gathered in 2016 as part of the partnership oyster dredging impacts study. Information on bait and hand collection activity is being collected in MPAs throughout the district, from partners and through IFCA shore patrols. |
| EBC | monitoring of the saltmarsh erosion on sw of Hamble common 0.7m The warden suspects the erosion is worse on the eastern side but this is not monitored |
| SoIFCA | Oyster Survey ongoing (annual) Small fish Survey to include most major Solent estuaries for the first time.  |
| ChHC | Monthly waterbird counts under WeBS scheme. Ongoing. Breeding seabird monitoring. Annual/ongoing. Seal counts (annual/ongoing). Brent goose monitoring 2016-17 & 2017-18 |
| YHC | Ongoing photographic monitoring of saltmarsh |

### Do you have a template for recording the results of monitoring undertaken in the SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Response | Count |
| No | 2 |
| Yes | 10 |

### Who will hold the data and/or monitoring the report once the monitoring is complete?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Details |
| RHHA | RHHA and SIFCA for bait digging |
| NE | Natural England |
| CDC | SRMP |
| LHB | LHB |
| LHC | Lymington Harbour Commissioners & MMO |
| EA | Marine Team, Analysis & Reporting teams, Fisheries and Biodiversity teams. Records for invasive non-native species are held on an external national website. |
| W | Published on Wightlink website |
| SxIFCA | Sussex IFCA and relevant partners hold full datasets and reports. Metadata with MEDIN. |
| EBC | Kevin Young |
| SoIFCA | Southern IFCA |
| ChHC | BTO, CHC, HIWWT |
| YHC | Yarmouth Harbour Commissioners |

### Are you coordinating with any other organisation/s on monitoring in the SEMS?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Response | Count |
| No | 2 |
| Yes | 10 |

### Details of coordination

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Details |
| RHHA | SoIFCA |
| NE | - Environment Agency: Solent Saltmarsh Survey - Bournemouth University and Southern IFCA: Solent EMS Fishing Impacts Study  |
| CDC | SRMP monitoring sub-group |
| LHB | SoIFCA, UoP, RSPB, CHC,  |
| LHC | The bathymetric surveys are part of the Marine Licence requirements for the beneficial use trial. A report will be submitted to the MMO. We will also co-ordinate with the RSPB to facilitate their monitoring work related to the Roseate Tern LIFE project |
| EA | Natural England, Harbour Authorities, Cefas, IFCAs, Wildlife Trusts. |
| SxIFCA | CHC, SIFCA, NE, NOC, EA, Cefas, Havant and Chichester Councils, local fishermen |
| EBC |  member of the SRMP |
| SoIFCA | Solent Oyster restoration project  |
| ChHC | BTO (WeBS), RSPB (breeding seabirds). Langstone Harbour Board (seals), HIWWT (brent geese). |

### Number of organisations considering monitoring in the SEMS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Response | Count |
| No | 15 |
| Yes | 5 |

### Details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Details |
| NE | Natural England has commissioned the following monitoring projects for 2017/18: 1) Continuation of Solent Saltmarsh Survey; 2) Continuation of Solent EMS Fishing Impacts Study; 3) North Solent National Nature Reserve: installation of salinity and water level monitoring equipment across the site, alongside the annual survey/monitoring schedule. |
| LHB | See previous answers |
| SxIFCA | See above. |
| EBC | SRMP disturbance monitoring and Brent geese and wader strategy Saltmarsh erosion will continue |
| NFNPA | Recreation activity linked to new coastal access |
| ChHC | Several projects that may occur  |

### Are there any new monitoring of impacts of activities which you are aware off?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Details |
| TVBC | Monitoring undertaken through Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership. |
| SxIFCA | See above regarding the oyster dredging impacts research |
| IOWC | Through the SRMP monitoring on people’s behaviour and how this affects SPA bird disturbance will be collated by both the rangers working seasonally through the winter and through research commissioned by the Partnership. The IWC have not seen any outputs from monitoring work yet. |
| EBC | 0.7m erosion of saltmarsh to sw |
| SoIFCA | Solent Oyster Survey Solent Small Fish Survey  |

# Other Issues Reported

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Respondent | Details  |
| TVBC | For information, 2 studies are underway by Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) local authorities that may be of interest - Integrated Water Management Study and Air Quality Impact Assessment. Neither includes new data collection but analysis provided may be of interest. |
| NE | Natural England has been invited to participate in an Earth Observation project co-ordinated by Gordon Watson at the University of Portsmouth. The aim of this project is to use remote sensing to identify and monitor anthropogenic impacts (including fishing and recreational activities) upon intertidal habitats.  |
| NFNPA | Happy to provide further clarification as required for any of the above. Although the Park Authority does not have direct jurisdiction over litter, it is an issue that we work in partnership with others e.g. NFDC - more based on terrestrial areas but potential to extend to marine areas if SEMS partners were looking to develop projects around the issue (e.g. micro-plastics/litter). |
| SoIFCA (see also Section 4.7 Fishing (including shellfisheries) | <https://secure.toolkitfiles.co.uk/clients/25364/sitedata/files/BTFG-byelaw.pdf> <https://secure.toolkitfiles.co.uk/clients/25364/sitedata/files/SDF-byelaw.pdf> Following an assessment of the risk to the objectives of the Solent European Marine Site posed by commercial fishing activity in the IFCA District the IFCA, in consultation with Natural England, has concluded that management is required for certain fishing activities within the European Marine Sites and has made, and consulted upon, two byelaws; Solent Dredge Fishing and Bottom Towed Fishing Gear Byelaw. These byelaws are intended to manage specific high risk fishing activities. Presently (June 2017) the byelaws are with the Secretary of State for confirmation. The new proposed Solent Dredge Fishing Byelaw introduced temporal restrictions to prohibit dredge fishing activities within all areas of Langstone and Portsmouth harbours and Southampton Waters between 1 March and 31 October each year. These measures would support the recovery of infaunal communities from the effects of dredge fishing and maintain the structure of intertidal and subtidal habitats, as well as supporting breeding shellfish populations. During November, December, January and February daily fishery closures would also be introduced between 1700 and 0700 the following day. This byelaw, combined with the introduction of the Bottom Towed Fishing Gear byelaw 2016 was considered, by the IFCA, to be the most effective approach for Southern IFCA to meet their objectives under the Habitats Directive and Birds Directive, The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. The byelaw was made in accordance with the government’s revised approach to the management of commercial fisheries within European Marine Sites. The Bottom Towed Fishing Gear Byelaw 2016 introduces additional permanent spatial management for bottom towed fishing gears over sensitive features within the areas of the Solent European marine sites and MCZs in the west of the District.  |
| YHC | We are currently working on The Pier's Tale which is a HLF funded project to restore Yarmouth Pier. Part of the project is to increase our understanding of the coastal waters around Yarmouth, improve public engagement with the underwater world and to set up a small monitoring station at the seaward end of the Pier. All information gathered by the project will be available and it is hoped that a facility will be set up that will enable researchers to use the Pier for any future work. |

# Appendix 1 – List of Abbreviations

**Authority Abbreviations (those who provided online monitoring responses)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Authority  | Abbreviation  |
| Associated British Ports | ABP |
| Beaulieu River Management | BRM |
| Chichester District Council | CDC |
| Chichester Harbour Conservancy | CHC |
| Eastleigh Borough Council  | EBC |
| Environment Agency | EA |
| Fareham Borough Council | FBC |
| Isle of Wight Council | IoWC |
| Langstone Harbour Board | LHB |
| Lymington Harbour Commissioners | LHC |
| Natural England | NE |
| New Forest National Park Authority | NFNPA |
| River Hamble Harbour Authority (Hampshire County Council) | RHHA |
| Southern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority | SoIFCA |
| Sussex Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority | SxIFCA |
| Southampton City Council | SCC |
| Southern Water Services Ltd. | SWS |
| Test Valley Borough Council | TVBC |
| West Sussex County Council | WSCC |
| Wightlink | W |
| Winchester City Council | WCC |
| Yarmouth Harbour Commissioners | YHC |

**Other Abbreviations**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solent European Marine Sites  | SEMS |
| Solent Recreation Mitigation Project  | SRMP |
| Special Protected Area | SPA |
| Civil Aviation Authority  | CAA |
| Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs  | Defra  |
| Harbour Authority  | HA |
| Government Authority  | GA |
| Marine Management Organisation | MMO |

# Appendix 2 – Comments from Management Group

Some members of the SEMS Management Group were telephoned at the end of July to see if they had extra information or comments to add to concerns they had raised in their online monitoring responses. The following is a summary of these phone conversations.

Chichester District Council – Tom Day – 26/07/17

1. Discussed item 4.2 – Land Recreation – Dog Walking

Nothing to add

Eastleigh Borough Council – Debbie Salmon – 26/07/17

1. Discussed item 4.5 – Mooring and/or Anchoring

Emphasised that applications for berths are increasing – including host docks (which are not covered by MMO licensing). With the rapid increase in berths the effects on the SEMS might increase quickly too. Suggested that the group discuss how to deal with the number of applications that are being received.

1. Discussed item 4.1- Operation of Coastal Flood and Erosion Risk Management Schemes, Barrages and Sluices.

Mentioned that there was one application for defences, and this seems to be leading to more. Might be up to NE to take more of a stance, and review the applications better. More of a local issue – but relevant to the bigger picture of the area.

1. Comment on the loss of saltmarsh (a Solent wide issue). EBC are wardening one side of their area. Think that the loss is linked to dredging for marinas.

Southampton City Council – Lindsey McCulloch – 26/07/17

1. Discussed item 4.8 - Fishing (Shore-based Activities)

Issue should be responsibility of Port Health – but do not have the capacity to deal with it. Clearly non-personal use. Wildlife officer at police has been notified – but difficult – need to be in the right place and the right time. Similar issue to that of bait digging. Birdwatchers have been monitoring and collecting details.

Could there be a central point for data – others dealing with same issues. If can bring together a database of cases might be able to make a case to police.

Could be having large impact on area – if offenders are moving around the SEMS area

Email from Erin Lawes, Sussex IFCA on 3 July 2017

Following submission of our annual online monitoring response, it’s come to my attention from colleagues that there may have been an increase in shellfish hand collection within Chichester Harbour following FSA classification of 3 areas for clams and cockles. To view the classified areas, see the Chichester Harbour maps within the link below:

<https://www.cefas.co.uk/cefas-data-hub/food-safety/classification-and-microbiological-monitoring/england-and-wales-classification-and-monitoring/classification-zone-maps/>

Intel reports have been received regarding increased gathering activity in the Nutbourne area, which has a Class C classification. Subsequent patrols observed 4 clam/cockle gatherers collecting in the area. Patrols have also been conducted at beds to the south of Thorney and Nutbourne, with a gatherer observed at the former site.

Email from Alison Fowler, River Hamble Harbour Authority, August 2017

Suggestion - add an entry to the questionnaire to require a statement of whether the response is based on fact/evidence or is anecdotal.  Note that some responses which state there is increase in an activity or there is a residual impact on the SEMS then qualify this with the use of ‘think’, ‘suspect’. ‘might’ or similar.  This requires a different level of interpretation from those increases or impacts which are based on facts and data.  Individual assertions based on supposition, conjecture and a lack of empirical evidence, do not enable reliable conclusions to be drawn. Although they do offer some information, they should be interpreted differently.

Email from Louise MacCallum, Langstone Harbour Board, August 2017

I have listed a few points I have picked up below.  In addition to these points I thought I also might mention that as I completed the on-line survey some time ago it is hard for me to remember the intricacies of my responses and thoughts on the functionality of the new survey format.  I remember that the new survey allowed me to go back to all previous answers before submission (unlike to old version) which was a great improvement.  However, the old survey allowed me to save a copy of my response immediately after submission which is a function I am definitely missing now.  While I am sure Liz has done a good job of collating the responses I have nothing to check against now except my memory.  And next year, when I fill out the 2018 on-line form, I will need to look through the lengthy collated document to remember what I said last year, rather than just my own response.  As the SEMS Monitoring Report will contain everyone’s answers I wonder whether it might be possible to return to a system where we can save just our own response in future years?

Comments on collated response document:

1. Page 3 – the full stops inserted after the links mean the links are not functional
2. Page 8 – Section 4.1 Walking (other than dog walking) – there are a total of 14 responses listed, but in table 4 on page 6 only 13 RAs reported having this activity in their jurisdiction.  I have not been through the rest of report to check whether these numbers tally in other sections.
3. Appendix 8 is a useful list of abbreviations, but might be better placed before Section 4 where these abbreviations are actually used (possibly the RA abbreviations could be combined with Section 2?).
4. Page 14 – I really like how you have mentioned comments in Appendix 2 for the corresponding activities throughout the document.
5. Page 17 – in the “Definition” on this page one of the listed activities is “unlicensed shellfishing such as clam dredging in Langstone Harbour”.  Clam dredging is currently legal in Langstone Harbour and carried out by licensed commercial fishing vessels. I can’t recall if this wording was also present in the on-line survey, but if so needs altering both in this report and in the survey.
6. Page 27 – table 6 – LHB’s monitoring is not listed.  I am fairly sure I filled this in on the survey.  12 RAs state that they undertake monitoring, however only 9 have details of that monitoring listed after their name.

I wonder whether it may be sensible to add a tick box or similar feature into each section of the report where respondents can state whether the evidence of changes in activities that they are reporting is based upon data collection or whether it is anecdotal.

I think collection of anecdotal evidence (or perceived changes) in the SEMS is important as it may highlight potential problems and possibly inspire collection of hard data in the future.  This is, after all, how the SRMP was born.

Anecdotal evidence is, however, quite different from hard data.  As the SEMS Monitoring Report is a document which is in the public domain and a source of inspiration for generating projects and work streams for the Solent Forum as well as the Universities based in the Solent region I think it is important that we can discern between evidence of activity changes based on data, and anecdotal evidence.
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