



Poole Harbour Aquatic Management Plan 2006

Consultation Responses Summary and Actions

Table 1: Summary of Representation

This table lists all the representations received as part of the consultation process. It provides a summary of the focus of each representation but does not include any minor changes to style or any grammatical amendments that may have been highlighted.

				Focus of representation																
Representation Number	Name	Organisation	Support/ Object/ No Opinion	Section 1 Summary	Section 1 Matrix	Introduction	Management Framework	Guiding Principles	Nature Conservation & Landscape	Water Quality & Pollution	Commerce	Conservancy & Marine Safety	Transport Connections	Recreation & Tourism	Fisheries	Emergency Planning	Archaeology	Defending the Shoreline	Maps & Plans	General Comments
1	Miss M Parsons	Lake Residents' Association	No Opinion									1						2	3	4
2	Mr M Sturgess	Purbeck District Council	Support		1															
3	Mr J Sullivan	Local Resident	No Opinion						1											
4	Mrs L Bourne	Poole Harbour Association	Support		1					2			3	4	5	6				7
5	Mr B Clark	The British Marine Federation	Support		1				2	3										
6	Mr J Saunders	Cobbs Quay Berth Holders Association	No Opinion										1							
7	Mr M Goater	Purbeck District Council	Support															1		
8	Mr C Satchell	Cefas	No Opinion																	1
9	Mr S Terry	Borough of Poole	No Opinion		1															
10	Mr P Stebbing	Sandbanks Association	Support											1	2			3		

Representation Number	Name	Organisation	Support/ Object/ No Opinion	Section 1 Summary	Section 1 Matrix	Introduction	Management Framework	Guiding Principles	Nature Conservation & Landscape	Water Quality & Pollution	Commerce	Conservancy & Marine Safety	Transport Connections	Recreation & Tourism	Fisheries	Emergency Planning	Archaeology	Defending the Shoreline	Maps & Plans	General Comments
11	Ms A Smeaton	Friends of Hamworthy Park	No Opinion									1						2	3	4
12	Ms S Davis	Poole Yachting Association	Support						1					2					3	
13	Mr P Armstrong	Marina Developments Ltd	Support									1	2							
14	Mr D Harman	Dorset AONB	Support	1	2	3		4	5					6						7
15	Mr N Gidney	Dorset Wildfowlers Association	Object		1				2					3						
16	Capt. J Nicholas	Royal Marines Poole	Support		1				2											
17	Mr M Glover	Fisherman	Object						1											
18	Mr I Davies	Poole Oyster Company	No Opinion		1					2		3		4						
19	Mr D Cook	Society of Poole Men	No Opinion				2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			11	12	13
20	Dr S Burton	English Nature	Support	1	2			3	4									5		
21	Mr J Smith	Salterns Marina	Support	1	2			4			5			6						
22	Mr M Bailey	Fisherman	Objecting						1											
23	Dr C O'Gorman	British Association for Shooting & Conservation	Support		1				2											

Representation Number	Name	Organisation	Support/ Object/ No Opinion	Section 1 Summary	Section 1 Matrix	Introduction	Management Framework	Guiding Principles	Nature Conservation & Landscape	Water Quality & Pollution	Commerce	Conservancy & Marine Safety	Transport Connections	Recreation & Tourism	Fisheries	Emergency Planning	Archaeology	Defending the Shoreline	Maps & Plans	General Comments
24	Miss D Kochanowska	Dorset Environmental Records Centre	Support						1											
25	Mr B Dyer	Poole Harbour Heritage Project	Support														1			
26	Mr E Whelan	Royal Yachting Association	No Opinion		1									2						
27	Mr J Mitchell	Dorset Bird Club	Support		1	2		3	4											
28	Mr C Pater	English Heritage	Support	1	2			3									4			
29	Mr G Bloomfield	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	Support		1	2		3	4			5	6		7					8
30	Prof. V May	Purbeck Heritage Committee	Support		1				2	3				4					5	6
31	Prof. V May	Poole Harbour Study Group	No Opinion		1				2	3				4					5	6

Content of Representations

This document is a summary which highlights the key points and issues raised by each representation received as part of the consultation for the Poole Harbour Aquatic Management Plan 2006 and the actions and changes agreed by the Poole Harbour Steering Group. The consultation ran from the 24th July and finished on 01st September 2006, during which time the Plan was widely disseminated to a range of stakeholders and members of the public. As well as receiving press coverage, a copy of the Plan was placed in local libraries and was available to view on the project website:

www.pooleharbouraqmp.co.uk.

This document looks at the Plan chapter by chapter and details a summary of the relevant comments specific to each. However whilst the comments listed in this document provide an indication of the views expressed, they should not be taken as a verbatim representation of the original response submitted. A full transcript of all the representations received can be viewed at the Poole Harbour Commissioners offices.

Also this document does not include any suggested amendments to wording or grammar that may have been highlighted, where the overall meaning of the specific sentence or paragraph would remain unchanged. Such comments were greatly appreciated and the author has used his discretion in making the suggested amendments to the finalised plan.

All the comments submitted have now been considered by the Poole Harbour Steering Group and appropriate changes made to the Plan which will be published later in the year. Where appropriate, the agreed actions or changes to the consultation draft highlighted by the representations are shown in red. Where the action in red simply says "Agreed" then it can be assumed that the proposed changes have been made to the Plan. Where chapters, sections or specific pages within the plan are highlighted the Consultation Draft version of the Plan should be referred to.

Each representation is listed by number, as taken from the table above and where a representation raises more than one issue a secondary number is also used. For example comments received from The British Marine Federation relating to the Matrix in Section 1 would be numbered 5/1 but their comments on Water Quality and Pollution would be 5/3. Similarly comments from Dorset AONB on the Guiding Principles are numbered as 14/4.

Section 1: Summary

Representation 14/1 – Dorset AONB

1. Would like to see mention of AONB designation in summary

A reference to the AONB designation has been included.

Representation 20/1 – English Nature

1. This section needs to stand out better from the rest of the plan so that the reader who just wishes to read the summary can be easily guided to it.

The final Plan is being restructured and some design work will help to highlight the different Sections and Chapters.

Representation 21/1 – Salterns Marina

1. Under assets and activities there is no reference to motor boating or the use of motor cruises and luxury motor yachts as a major recreational and leisure activity. There are a very high percentage of motor boats as opposed to sailing yachts moored within the harbour on both swinging moorings and club and marina locations. This fact should be recognised in the summary section.

The activity of motor boating has now been included in the summary.

Representation 28/1 – English Heritage

1. Assets and Activities - in this section reference should also have been made to the historic environment resource of Poole Harbour.

It was felt that this was already sufficiently covered as the the summary already includes two references to the historic assets of the Harbour.

Section 1: Matrix

Representation 2/1 – Purbeck District Council

1. The Council supports its identification as a lead organisation in delivering some of the management actions.

Noted.

Representation 4/1 – Poole Harbour Association

1. We agree that the effectiveness and adequacy of launch sites around the harbour is a priority (pg 19 plan).

Agreed.

2. We also welcome the opportunity of education for yatching groups - but there is no planned activity against this action.

Poole Harbour Commissioners already hold liaison meetings with the Poole Yachting Association and also safety meetings. PHC are always looking at initiatives to improve communication.

3. In general the management plan is user friendly and easy to follow - however it would benefit from actual dates (once the plan is agreed) rather than short/medium/long term.

It is currently not possible to put exact timeframes against all actions but the title of the Matrix does give an indication of what is meant by short/medium/long term.

Representation 5/1 – British Marine Federation

1. Would like to see BMF listed as a joint Lead Authority for Capital Dredging, Use of Sacrificial Anodes, Recreational Activity and Motor Boating / Yachting. Would also welcome input to Pilotage and Marine Traffic Management.

BMF have now been included as a Lead Authority for Capital Dredging, Use of Sacrificial Anodes, Recreational Activity and Motor Boating / Yachting. Their input in matters relating to Pilotage and Marine Traffic Management is also welcome.

Representation 9/1 – Borough of Poole

1. May be need to clarify the difference between coast protection and sea defence.

The Matrix is being restructured to better cover Coastal Management.

2. You refer to the SMP but not the Strategy Study

The Strategy Study is now included.

3. Sea level rise - would it not be best to link this to management realignment

Agreed, this has now been changed.

Representation 14/2 – Dorset AONB

1. Where appropriate, the harbour's special qualities should be cross referenced within the impacts and issues under the management matrix. For example, the design and management of storage facilities will have some negative visual impact and should be designed and managed in sympathy with the wider character and qualities of the harbour.

The Plan and Matrix aim to highlight current impacts and issues whilst also identifying the special natural features of the Harbour. Some reference is also given to planning processes and where projects are to be undertaken it would seem reasonable to assume that due process and Habitat Regulations would be followed. It was therefore felt that the Matrix and Base Plan adequately covers the natural features and potential issues and impacts.

2. One tool which could be developed in the Management Matrix could be the production of a "seascape assessment". This will help identify the unique character zones, features and qualities around the harbour. This could provide context to management of habitats, recreation and access and wider planning work around the harbour's edge.

It was agreed that there may be some benefits to producing a "seascape assessment" however it was felt that this was something that could be developed as an action for the future after more discussion between the Poole Harbour Steering Group and Dorset AONB.

3. The Matrix could benefit from a wider integration of broader issues affecting the natural beauty of the Harbour and its setting. For example, the impact of industrial development along Holes Bay road does have some negative impact on the visual amenity of the Harbour.

It was felt that although the Plan seeks to take a more integrated approach to management of the Harbour that these points were rather beyond its scope.

4. In the pursuit of Integrated Coastal Zone Management principles, the plan could also benefit from a greater emphasis on visitor and destination management policies and actions to help ensure the unique qualities of the Harbour are not damaged by inappropriate visitor pressures.

This is partially dealt with under the Recreation and Tourism Chapter and the provision of launch sites.

Representation 15/1 – Dorset Wildfowling

1. Page 15 Activity: wildfowling

Managing bodies

Amendments: Remove RSPB & DWT. Retain DWASC, EN & The Crown Estate. Add BASC.

Agreed

Potential Impacts or Issues

Amendments:

Replace second bullet point “*possible displacement....*” with “*possible temporal displacement of birds from roosting and feeding grounds*”

It was felt that the addition of the word temporal was unnecessary as it should be accepted that all displacement by occasional recreational activities would be temporal.

Existing Management Initiatives

Amendments:

Replace first bullet “*clubs have...*” with “*DWASC have an existing management plan*”

Replace second bullet “*licence required...*” with “*Wildfowling takes place through a lease of sporting rights granted to DWASC by the Crown Estate*”

Replace third bullet “*permits required...*” with “*DWASC permits required to shoot*”

New bullet “*Bag statistics and visit numbers are analysed by BASC and reported on annually to EN and The Crown Estate*”

New bullet “*No-shooting areas are designated and managed by DWASC*”

New bullet: “*Wildfowling season is from 1st September – 20th February on the foreshore of Poole Harbour.*”

All agreed

Management Objectives

Amendments:

Replace bullet “*Wildfowling to be...*” with “*Maintain management procedures already in place*”

A compromise of the wording was agreed “*Maintain existing management procedures to ensure wildfowling continues to be undertaken in a sustainable and sensitive manner*”.

Proposed management Action

Amendments:

Remove all the current bullets – these actions are all in place.

Add one bullet “*Consult with other recreational users regarding the creation of refuge areas to coincide with the boundaries of the existing no-shooting areas managed by DWASC*”

Noted but it was decided that two of the existing management actions were most appropriate, these were

- Identify on a map, important areas for breeding & feeding birds which users could potentially disturb.
- Improve communication between wildfowlers, statutory bodies and conservation organisations

It was felt that there was still room for improvement in-terms of communication and that whilst no-shoot areas were welcomed there was concern that they did not necessarily constitute the most important bird areas.

Lead authorities

Background note: as for 'managing bodies section'.

Amendments:

Remove RSPB & DWT. Retain DWASC, EN & The Crown Estate. Add BASC.

It was agreed that BASC should be added but it was felt that the RSPB & DWT should be left as lead authorities as they would be involved in future conservation initiatives.

Timescale

Amendments:

Replace "Short term" with "Ongoing"

Agreed.

Representation 16/1 – Royal Marines, Poole

1. Low flying aircraft. Routing of aircraft is sometimes directed by Bournemouth Airspace Control. Some controls must exist to allow aircraft safety deconfliction and to minimise noise pollution levels to the civilian population.

Reference to Bournemouth Airspace Control and noise pollution has been included.

Representation 18/1 – Poole Oyster Company

1. On capital and maintenance dredging I feel a specific management objective should be to minimise impact on fisheries and fish farming. After the problems experienced during the recent capital dredge I think specifying this objective is important.

Agreed and now included.

2. I think it should be acknowledged that Ballast water comes not only from ships but also from shellfish transshipping vehicles on the terminal.

Agreed and now referred to under discharges from industry.

3. The potential impacts of chemical transportation should include a specific reference to fisheries.

Agreed and now included.

4. I believe a management objective in the sections on yachting and yacht racing should be to improve dialogue and dissemination of information to other harbour users prior to large events (such as Poole week, European championships etc).

Whilst PHC are always looking at improving dissemination of information and communication, it was felt that current initiatives such as publishing fixture lists, local notices to mariners and Harbour Control broadcasts, were currently adequate.

5. I feel that bait dragging should be included in the matrix as a separate activity. Bait dragging is unregulated and unlicensed, the boats are not subject to any inspections (unlike other commercial craft) and in the past there has been interest

shown by responsible baitdraggers to change this and even to have a code of conduct. I think this should be acknowledged.

Agreed and has now been included in Matrix and more reference to lack of statutory controls included in Fisheries Chapter.

Representation 20/2 – English Nature

1. We are concerned that at present it is not clear how the management matrix links to the rest of the document. The actions that come out of this matrix are key to the plan but at present do not stand out clearly in the plan but are lost amongst this matrix.

Wording in the Executive Summary has been strengthened and a summary of key actions will be included.

2. It is suggested that another column is included in the matrix headed 'Section Reference' which guides the reader to the section(s) of the plan which give more explanation as to how this potential impact or issue was raised. We believe that as the actions are a crucial part of the plan they should be listed/summarised separately at the end of the Section 1. A clear statement of how these actions are to be monitored and reviewed also needs to be included at the end of Section 1.

A contents page for the Matrix is to be included and each activity will refer to a section of the main plan. A summary of the most important actions, mainly those with a short term timescale will be shown at the end of the Executive Summary at the front of the plan. A stand alone Non-executive Summary will also be produced which will show the most important actions. The newsletter and website will be used to disseminate how actions are progressing to the public. Section 3.3 Plan Revision Review will be strengthened to explain how an annual project review plan will be set up to identify the most urgent actions and detail the mechanism for their delivery. A sub-section to 3.3 will focus solely on the EMS monitoring and review requirements.

3. Other Comments

P11 Maintenance Dredging:

Potential Impact – Impact of new maintenance dredging techniques to be used in the Harbour eg ploughing

- Potential for smothering of shellfish beds

Management Objectives – Ensure dredging does not result in a loss of important habitats and shellfish beds

It was felt that the section on maintenance dredging already covered this but reference to impact on fisheries has been added as a management objective.

P12 Pilotage & marine traffic:

Potential Impact – Wash resulting in erosion of mudflats and saltmarsh habitats

Already noted in text under impacts to saltmarsh.

Existing Management Initiatives – Oil Spill contingency plan

Agreed

Existing Management Initiatives – Continue exercises and annual review of the plans

Wording amended to "Continue exercises and review of plans in accordance with regulations."

Discharges from Industry

Proposed management action – Review of Consents under the Habitats Regulations

Wording amended to “Continue ongoing Review of Consents under the Habitats Regulations.”

P13 Discharge of waste:

Existing Management Initiatives – International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from shipping 1973 (MARPOL 73/78)

Agreed, also to include MCA as managing body.

Discharge of treated effluent :

Proposed management action – Review of consents under the Habitat Regulations

Wording amended to “Continue ongoing Review of Consents under the Habitats Regulations.”

P19 Motor boating:

Potential Impact – Pollution from oil and fuel

Proposed management Action – Promotion of The Green Blue CBMF/RYA

Agreed

P20 Marine & Terrestrial Littering:

Lead Authorities – MCS and DCF

Agreed to add MCS but not DCF, also include ENCAMS

P23 Drift Net Fishing:

Potential Impacts – Birds caught in unattended nets

Wording changed to include set net fishing

Add the following Activities:

Sea Angling

Angling from the Shore

These activities are referred to in the main fisheries chapter and it was felt that as there are no real issues at present there was no need to include them in the matrix.

P25 Management realignment should not be regarded as an activity but one outcome of the activity ‘Coastal Management’. Realignment of the coast is going to happen whether it is managed or not. Combine points made under coastal protection and management realignment under the heading – Coastal management’:

Potential impact – Direct smotheringdue to changes in sedimentation and erosion processes.

- Loss of habitat
- Sea level rise
- Deteriorating condition of tidal floodbanks

Management objectives – replace ‘Avoid potentially damaging changes.....’ with ‘Respond to coastal change and rising sea levels in the most sustainable way to comply with flood protection policy and the Habitat Regulations’ There are many socio- economic and environmental factors that need to be considered – impacts such as increased dredging and acceleration of currents would need to be considered alongside many other issues in order to reach the most sustainable solution.

P26

Shoreline & Intertidal Based Development:
Potential Impacts – Sea Level Rise

Sea Level Rise:

Remove this heading and list points under ‘ Shoreline & Intertidal Based development’ or ‘Coastal Management’

‘Sea level rise’ should not be listed as an activity it is part of the dynamics of the coast but perhaps one of the most important factors that will need to be considered with respect to the future sustainable management of the Harbour.

All comments relating to shoreline management have been agreed and the Matrix restructured accordingly.

Representation 21/2 – Salterns Marina Limited

1. The BMF’s role is only referred to under maintenance dredging and the use of anti-fouling paints. There are a number of other areas or activities where the BMF and its sister organisations could have a major role to play and act as a lead authority.

Agreed, see BMF Representation 5/1 above.

2. Under motor boating, it might be appropriate to differentiate between speedboats, those used for water skiing and the more leisurely activity of motor cruising.

Noted but it was felt this would only further complicate the Matrix.

3. Under moorings, the provision of adequate facilities as part of the proposed management action should be emphasised, although it is fully recognised that there is a need to minimise potential impact on EMS.

It was felt that this was sufficiently covered already, in the matrix and recreation chapter.

Representation 23/1 - BASC

1. The club have highlighted that the proposed voluntary winter refuge areas is a mistake and I would call on the steering committee to recognise this and take the objective step to remove these areas until an objective assessment is made for the needs of the birds/conservation objectives of Poole Harbour as a SSSI and SPA. (also see comments 23/2 under Chapter 5 Nature Conservation and Landscape).

Agreed. Wording would be changed to “Promote awareness of Bird Sensitive Areas” and section in Chapter 5 has been amended to remove reference to winter refuge areas.

Representation 26/1 – Royal Yachting Association

1. Use of antifouling paints (page 11): The RYA actively promotes best practice guidance from its “Environmental Code of Practice” to boatyards, clubs and individuals. The Green Blue project has developed a range of materials to help educate yards, clubs and owners. The Green Blue is also working with a south coast marina operator on developing a boat washdown system. We anticipate that this system will form the basis of future “best practice” with regard to boat washdown.

Action added to “Promote the Green Blue initiative”.

2. Discharge of waste from recreational vessels (page 13): This is another topic that is tackled by our Green Blue project. We have recently published a national directory of pumpout facilities on our website which aids boat users with holding tanks to find a pumpout location.

<http://www.thegreenblue.org.uk/about/images/SouthEnglandPumpOut.jpg>

Action added to "Promote the Green Blue initiative".

3. Use of sacrificial anodes (page 13): The Green Blue recently commissioned a desk study which pulled together all the available research on the environmental interactions of the recreational boating sector. The research we found relating to the use of sacrificial anodes was not extensive, but the results can be viewed by following this link:

http://www.thegreenblue.org.uk/sciencematters/scientificpapers_results.asp

Action added to "Promote the Green Blue initiative".

4. All recreational activity (page 16): The RYA supports voluntary zoning as currently exists within Poole Harbour and also supports the use of byelaws to control speed limits. We do not believe however, that compulsory zoning is either desirable or necessary within the harbour. The RYA will continue to promote good practice and responsibility amongst boat users to ensure that their activities do not harm vulnerable habitats or species.

Noted

5. Motorboating (page 19): The RYA agrees with regulation through existing Harbour byelaws and speed limits and also with voluntary zoning of activities and speed restrictions in quiet areas. The RYA believes that education plays an important part in minimising any potential environmental impacts. Our Green Blue initiative has a particular emphasis on the effects that boating can have on wildlife and aims to make boaters aware of how to navigate safely and with due regard to any wildlife in the area.

Noted

6. Yachting (page 19): The RYA agrees with enforcement through existing byelaws. We also agree with the education of yachtsmen and clubs but believe that education should be for all boat owners – not just those who sail yachts.

Noted, motor boating added.

7. Yacht racing (page 20): The RYA agrees with all the existing and proposed management initiatives.

Noted

8. Windsurfing and Kitesurfing (page 20): The RYA agrees with the zoning initiative as long as it is in a voluntary capacity.

Noted

9. Moorings (page 21): The management objective listed is to review the moorings policy to ensure impact on wildlife is minimised. The Green Blue project has looked into this issue and can find little available research on the impact of moorings on wildlife

(http://www.thegreenblue.org.uk/sciencematters/scientificpapers_results.asp). The RYA therefore questions the basis on which a review of the mooring policy is needed. Are there specific concerns or examples of where moorings are suspected of harming local wildlife? On page 60 of the document you state that it is the Commissioners' policy to minimise the number of swinging moorings within the Harbour in environmentally sensitive and recreationally busy areas and to maximise the areas of open water for safe navigation. It is also stated that where additional

marina berths are made available, it is policy to reduce swinging moorings by the same numbers. The RYA is concerned about the loss of swinging moorings in Poole Harbour and believes that facilities for mooring boats are required across the socio-economic spectrum. If the trend towards marina berths increases, many boaters will find themselves priced out of the harbour as marina berths can be prohibitively expensive.

Within the text on p60 it is acknowledged that a range of facilities need to be maintained and it is also the Commissioners policy to retain the most suitable sites for moorings.

10. Anchoring (page 21): The RYA, through the Green Blue project, is committed to educating boaters about good anchoring practices. We are planning to carry out some primary research in 2007 into the effects of anchoring on eel grass beds and will use the results of this research to further improve our educational programmes. The RYA supports the proposed management action to identify anchorage sensitive areas and to promote awareness of them but would oppose a complete ban on anchoring in these sites.

Noted, there is no current intention to ban anchoring in eel grass beds, only to raise awareness of them.

Representation 27/1 – Dorset Bird Club

1. Suggest use of headers to group issues (eg port-related, recreation, pollution etc);

Matrix will now have a contents page.

2. Suggest grouping of very similar activities (eg personal watercraft and water - skiing/wakeboarding; windsurfing and kite surfing) – in these examples, the impacts, objectives and actions are the same and the repetition overly complicates the presentation; and

Agreed where possible.

3. Suggest use of a summary table to pull together the key groups of issues, plus a prioritisation of the issues.

Noted but it was felt that another table would simply overcomplicate the Plan, however a summary of priority actions will be included in the Executive Summary and in a stand alone Non-technical Summary.

Representation 28/2 – English Heritage

1. "Management Objectives" for Capital Dredging the following bullet point requires qualification: "Ensure dredging does not cause undue damage to archaeology." We add that the preferred means for a developer to avoid damaging material of archaeological interest is to plan the operation to preserve the material undisturbed and in situ. We therefore recommend that this bullet point is amended to "through prior assessment and consultation with archaeological curators ensure dredging does not damage archaeological interests."

The following wording was agreed, "Ensure dredging does not cause undue damage to archaeology, through prior investigation and appropriate mitigation."

2. Under activity "Bait Digging" for "Proposed management action", re-phrase bullet point to "Prepare map of known and potential areas of intertidal archaeology for the Harbour."

Agreed

3. Under activity "Coast Protection" for second bullet point under "Management Objectives" amend to: "Ensure coastal defence strategies and schemes do not adversely affect archaeological features, or ensure adequate mitigation and recording in consultation with archaeological curators if an alternative strategy to deliver the coast defence objectives is not possible."

After rewording of section the following Management Objective was agreed on, "Ensure coastal management schemes do not adversely affect archaeological features, or ensure adequate mitigation and recording."

4. Under activity "Sea level rise" for "Management Objectives" amend second bullet point to: "Understand what archaeological sites may be under threat and prepare appropriate mitigation strategies with archaeological curators".

The following Management Objective was agreed, "Understand what historical assets may be lost or damaged in the future, due to natural changes in the coastline and identify the mitigation measures necessary to protect the resource."

Representation 29/1 – RSPB

1. The Matrix does not relate activities to the Conservation Objectives for the European Marine Site set out in English Nature's Regulation 33(2) advice (November 2000). A management scheme should make these potential impacts on Conservation Objectives explicit, and this Matrix is the logical place to do this. Where appropriate, relate *Potential impacts or issues* and *Management Objectives* directly to the conservation objectives for the European Marine Site.

Noted but it was felt that adding additional text to the Matrix would overcomplicate it and would not necessarily add anything as these issues are covered in the main sections of the Plan. After discussions with Natural England it was agreed that the Matrix would be colour coded to highlight activities and issues of particular relevance to the EMS.

2. Capital Dredge: A capital dredge is a Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 Regulation 48(1) *project* and must therefore be considered under Regulation 48 and if appropriate 49. In the RSPB's view any capital dredge is likely to have a significant effect on the SPA and Ramsar site, and therefore an appropriate assessment of its implications would need to be made in light of their conservation objectives. Incorporate a Proposed Management Action to *Ensure compliance with Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994*

Proposed Management Action should in our view go further than simply monitoring, commissioning research, and reporting. For instance, if monitoring demonstrates that inter-tidal habitats in the Harbour are eroding, Management Action should seek to address as well as simply understand this issue. If sediment is being removed from the system, emphasis should be on seeking to ensure that it is retained within the system in order to mitigate inter-tidal erosion, and in our view the management scheme has a role in progressing that objective.

Incorporate clear remediation actions into the AqMP, should impacts that conflict with conservation objectives be identified.

Noted but it was agreed that as it is a legal requirement that any Capital Dredge should comply with Habitat Regs. that it was not necessary to state this in the Matrix. Also it would not be appropriate to initiate such an action without first undertaking appropriate monitoring and research. If issues were identified then, future Management Actions could be put in place.

3. Wildfowling: Since this activity has an intentional and direct impact on the birds for which the SPA and Ramsar site are notified, it is in the RSPB's view particularly important that the Matrix refers to the interest features of those sites in its *potential impacts or issues* and *management objectives* columns.

Relate *Potential impacts or issues* and *Management Objectives* directly to the interest features of the European Marine Site, in particular those relating to the internationally important populations of the regularly occurring Annex 1 species and internationally important assemblage of waterfowl including internationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species.

It was not felt necessary to highlight Annex 1 species beyond other interests of the Harbour. The Management Objective has been amended to "Maintain existing management procedures to ensure wildfowling continues to be undertaken in a sustainable & sensitive manner."

4. Neither *physical disturbance and damage to inter-tidal habitats* nor *long-term effects on non-target benthic invertebrates and the internationally important bird populations that feed on them* are listed as potential impacts or issues. The RSPB considers that both of these impacts could be occurring as a consequence of the current levels of shellfish dredging in the Harbour. We are extremely concerned that they have not been adequately assessed and that consequently shellfish dredging may be causing harm to the interest features of the SPA and Ramsar Site. See also RSPB's comments on Chapter 11.

List *physical disturbance and damage to inter-tidal habitats* and *long-term effects on non-target benthic invertebrates and the internationally important bird populations that feed on them* under *Potential impacts or issues*.

The above issues are not currently well understood and in the RSPB's view the EMS management scheme should include a Management Action to ensure that data is collected to inform an assessment of the magnitude of these potential impacts.

Include a Management Action of *Ensure that data is collected to inform an assessment of the magnitude of the potential impacts of shellfish dredging on inter-tidal habitats and the benthic invertebrate communities they support*.

It was felt that this was sufficiently covered in the Matrix although reference to subtidal habitats has now been included and a Management Action of production of a code of conduct is listed.

Representation 30/1 – Purbeck Heritage Committee

1. Suggest moving list of abbreviations to the front of the Matrix

Agreed, list of abbreviations now sits at the beginning of the Matrix.

Representation 31/1 – Poole Harbour Study Group

1. Suggest moving list of abbreviations to the front of the Matrix as is common practice.

Agreed, list of abbreviations now sits at the beginning of the Matrix.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Representation 14/3 – Dorset AONB

1. The purpose and policy objectives of the AONB designation could be better reflected in the plan's **Strategic Aims, Objectives** and Principles. For example:

- Help promote thriving coast and marine ecosystems able to support sustainable harvesting and fisheries.
- Develop integrated initiatives which demonstrate the links between biodiversity, landscape quality and economic potential.
- Encourage sustainable access and recreation including integration with sustainable transport provision.
- Ensure adequate, sensitive provision of high quality information and interpretation.
- Describe and promote the diverse character and natural beauty of the Dorset AONB landscape.
- Remove eyesores, repair damage and mitigate the effects of intrusive developments and prevent further unsympathetic development

Noted, a review of AONB aims and objectives was made but it was felt that the current Aquatic Management Plan aims and objectives were sufficient for the requirements of the plan and to some extent covered some of those of the AONB. Reference to the AONB Management Plan has been included in Chapter 5.

Representation 27/2 – Dorset Bird Club

1. Emphasis should be given within the Strategic Aim to the role of the Plan in serving as a management scheme for the European Marine Site as set out in Regulation 34 of The Habitats Regulations 1994.

A new objective outlining this is to be included and the title of the plan will also mention the EMS Management Scheme.

Representation 29/2 – RSPB

1. The RSPB does not consider that the Strategic Aim on p.29 is adequate for a plan that incorporates an EMS management scheme. In our view there should be a much stronger emphasis on the internationally important wildlife that the Harbour is designated for.

Alter the Strategic Aim to incorporate explicit reference of the role of the management scheme, such as *To promote the conservation of the internationally important wildlife of Poole Harbour and where consistent to promote safe and sustainable use.*

It was not felt necessary to change the aim of the Plan but the Title and objectives have been altered to emphasise this function of the Plan.

2. Whilst the RSPB welcomes the objective to *protect and maintain the special natural features of the Harbour*, we consider that the Plan should incorporate an objective to enhance the Harbour's special natural features. Such an objective would be more in line with Government policy, which increasingly looks for environmental enhancement, not just protection.

Change this objective to *protect, maintain and enhance, the special natural features of the Harbour.*

It was not felt necessary to change the wording of the objective to include "enhance" as this was covered in the main text in Section 5.3 p36.

Chapter 3: Management Framework

Representation 19/2 – Society of Poole Men

1. P.31, 1st para. This says the plan has no legal powers and goes on to “expect” that planning authorities will take it into account when considering permissions etc. as the relevant planning authorities are members of the PHSG can the last sentence start with: “As members of the Poole Harbour Steering Group, these authorities in reaching their decisions will do so against the background

Agreed

Chapter 4: Guiding Principles

Representation 14/4 – Dorset AONB

1. The purpose and policy objectives of the AONB designation could be better reflected in the plan’s Strategic Aims, Objectives and **Principles**. For example:
 - a. Help promote thriving coast and marine ecosystems able to support sustainable harvesting and fisheries.
 - b. Develop integrated initiatives which demonstrate the links between biodiversity, landscape quality and economic potential.
 - c. Encourage sustainable access and recreation including integration with sustainable transport provision.
 - d. Ensure adequate, sensitive provision of high quality information and interpretation.
 - e. Describe and promote the diverse character and natural beauty of the Dorset AONB landscape.
 - f. Remove eyesores, repair damage and mitigate the effects of intrusive developments and prevent further unsympathetic development

Noted, a review of AONB aims and objectives was made but it was felt that the current Aquatic Management Plan guiding principles were sufficient for the requirements of the plan and to some extent covered some of the aims and objectives of the AONB. Reference to the AONB Management Plan has been included in Chapter 5.

Representation 19/3 – Society of Poole Men

1. Believe that the Principles applying to commercial and recreational use of the Harbour should be placed before environmental ones.

All the Guiding Principles should be read as one with none being given more importance than another. After some reordering of the Chapters the Guiding Principles have also been reordered.

2. Explain what the adverse impact of road traffic is in principle 13

Reworded to say “any adverse impacts of road traffic.”

Representation 20/3 – English Nature

1. Principle 5..... SSSI sites are maintained or restored to favourable condition

Agreed

2. Principle 24. Support initiatives that raise awareness of climate change and coastal processes and address their implication for the Harbour and coastal zone through

changes in policy and management. Need more than awareness need to respond by changing policy/management where necessary.

Agreed, word address added to Guiding Principle

Representation 21/4 – Salterns Marina Limited

1. Whilst reference is made in eight and nine to the commercial port and marine related industries for the benefit of the local regional national economies, it is felt that there should be a guiding principle that recognises and supports the need for the provision of facilities for water based activities not only to meet the growing need particularly for fixed moorings, but also to replace those that are clearly being lost as a result of other developments and loss of economic viability. This particularly applies to the central provision for large boat mooring within the main body of Poole Harbour,

Noted but it was felt that this point was sufficiently covered in the main text under moorings.

Representation 27/3 – Dorset Bird Club

1. DBC believes that Guiding Principle No. 8 (“Support the needs of the commercial port and marine related industries to the benefit of the local, regional and national economies”), No. 9 (“Support port related development proposals within the commercial port and maintain the ports ability to provide sites with deepwater frontage”) and No. 15 (“Support the safe and enjoyable use of the Harbour for recreational activity”) all require the addition of the same caveat as that applied to Guiding Principle No.17, ie “without compromising the nature conservation value of the Harbour”.

This would reflect the safeguards set out in The Habitats Regulations, 1994 which provide appropriate protection for internationally designated sites such as Poole Harbour.

Many of the Guiding Principles now include wording referring them back to Principle 5 which states. “To ensure that all development activities, plans and projects comply with relevant legislation requirements and that the nature conservation interest of the SPA, Ramsar and SSSI sites are maintained or restored to favourable condition.”

2. DBC believes that it is the role of the Plan to focus on the Harbour itself, and that the Plan’s remit should not cover a “supporting transport network” (eg Summary, page 8; Guiding Principle No. 13). DBC’s concern is that such statements could be used in the future to justify environmentally damaging transport proposals. These should be judged on their own merits, taking account of the need for the proposals and any resultant environmental impacts.

Noted, but plan seeks to take an integrated approach and it is felt that access to and from the region is relevant to the plan. However wording of Guiding Principles and text is clear that all development should follow due process and seek to minimise impact on EMS. Some additional wording has been included in the relevant chapters to clarify this.

Representation 28/3 – English Heritage

1. We support the general principles set out in No 1 and No 5, but request that the latter is amended to:
"Ensure that all development activities, plans and projects comply with relevant legislation requirements for the historic environment and that the nature

conservation interest of Poole Harbour SPA, Ramsar and SSSI sites are maintained in favourable condition."

It was felt that this is sufficiently covered under Guiding Principles 21&22

2. Guiding Principle No 17 should also be amended to "Support measures that maintain or improve public access to the waters edge, and facilities and services for marine recreation without compromising the historic or nature conservation value of the Harbour."

Again it was felt that this point was covered in Guiding Principles 21&22

3. We support No 21.

Noted

4. We recommend that No 22 is amended to: "Encourage best practice in terms of protecting archaeological material in situ and that if archaeological investigation is required in support of any proposed development that appropriate professional standards are adopted at all stages."

Agreed

Representation 29/3 – RSPB

1. The RSPB considers that Guiding Principle 8 is inappropriate without a qualifying caveat to make clear that the Plan does not support these issues if they would risk cause harm to the designated interests of the EMS.
Add the same caveat to Guiding Principles 8 and 15 as qualifies Guiding Principle 17 '*without compromising the nature conservation value of the Harbour*'

Many of the Guiding Principles now refer back to Guiding Principle 5

2. Guiding Principles 9 is inappropriate for an EMS management scheme. The RSPB does not consider that the AqMP should give support to port related development or maintenance of its deepwater frontage.
Given the Port's highly sensitive location, such issues may be likely to have a significant effect on the European Marine Site, in which case an appropriate assessment (referred to in para5.6 of the Draft AqMP) would need to be made before consent for them could be granted. In the absence of such an assessment, the AqMP should not in our view retain this Principle.
If the AqMP retains this principle, the RSPB considers that it could constitute a plan under the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations Regulation 48(1), and that an appropriate assessment of its implications for the conservation objectives of the SPA and Ramsar Site may need to be made.
Remove Guiding Principles 9

Many of the Guiding Principles now refer back to Guiding Principle 5 and additional wording has been included in the relevant chapters confirming the need to follow due process for any developments. Some additional wording has been included in the relevant chapters to clarify this.

3. The RSPB considers that it is inappropriate for the Aquatic Management Plan to support unspecified transport network improvements. See also RSPB's comments on Chapter 9.
Remove Guiding Principle 13

Noted, but plan seeks to take an integrated approach and it is felt that access to and from the region is relevant to the plan. However wording of Guiding Principles and text is clear

that all development should follow due process and seek to minimise impact on EMS and additional wording has been included in the Transport Chapter to further strengthen this point.

Chapter 5: Nature Conservation & Landscape

Representation 3/1 – Local Resident

1. Concern over disturbance to wildfowl in Holes Bay by RNLI hovercraft.

Noted.

Representation 5/2 – British Marine Federation

1. Page 43 Eel Grass Beds

To reduce the potential impact that anchoring has on these sites; the Harbour authority should set up strategically placed anchor points and encourage vessels to use them.

Noted, but this is a not current initiative. This could be reviewed following a further investigation into the extent and health of eel grass in the Harbour.

Representation 12/1 – Poole Yachting Association

1. Page 41 Proposed Anchorage Sensitive Zones for the Conservation of ell grass. We are concerned that the area is amongst Club moorings and we would like confirmation that the moorings would not be affected.

Noted, there are no current plans to move existing moorings.

Representation 14/5 – Dorset AONB

1. To ensure the effective conservation and enhancement of the harbour's unique natural beauty, the plan would benefit from a greater understanding of the harbour's special qualities. For example, factors such as tranquillity, the type of habitats, wildlife and important views should be identified.

It was felt that this was slightly outside the scope of the plan but that the plan already highlighted the important habitats and wildlife. The existence of the AONB management Plan has now been highlighted with the expectation that the plans should work together for a more integrated management approach.

Representation 15/2 – Dorset Wildfowlers

1. Page 39. Some Notable Species, Background note: DWASC outline in the wildfowling section (10.9) that the club have helped with the construction of gravel nesting islands on the Brownsea Island lagoon. No reference is made to this work in section 5.8.2

Amendments:

2nd para , 6th line - sentence beginning "*The Dorset Wildlife Trust have...*". Amend sentence to begin "*The Dorset Wildlife Trust in partnership with wildfowling members of DWASC have...*"

Agreed.

Representation 16/2 – Royal Marines

1. Page 40, disturbance by low flying aircraft. Routing of aircraft is sometimes directed by Bournemouth Airspace Control. Some controls must exist to allow aircraft safety deconfliction and to minimise noise pollution levels to the civilian population.

Noted and text amended.

Representation 17/1 – Local Fisherman

1. Page 41, objection to proposed winter refuge area on basis of loss of livelihood.

Noted. Emphasis on Refuge Areas is being amended due to discussions with other users.

Representation 19/4 – Society of Poole Men

1. Should Guiding Principle 7 be included?

Agreed.

2. Suggest a matrix showing which regulations are UK, EU etc

It was felt that this was sufficiently covered in the existing text.

3. Page 39, line 17 explain where a copy of reg. 33 might be obtained.

Explained that it is an English Nature (Natural England) document.

4. Page 40 what is the evidence to support the disturbance to birds by windsurfers at Whitley Lake which sail at high tide and the birds feed at low tide. What is the evidence to support the disturbance of birds on Brownsea Lagoon and beaches by Personal Watercraft.

There is evidence of a decrease in the value of this site and English Nature are supplying an appendix to the document to support the section on Birds Sensitive Areas (formerly winter refuge areas.)

5. Page 40 para 4 if there is no problem with entangling can this be deleted?

There have been some reported incidence and the wording of this paragraph is being amended.

6. Page 44 Mammals of the Harbour. Suggest this could include some discussion on Sika deer which could be taken out of the Birds section.

Agreed, and section now includes this.

7. Page 45 Amend first management objective to read “To consider deer management to alleviate damage to salt marsh and reed bed bird habitats.”

Agreed but amended slightly as some initiatives are already in place.

8. General Comments: Closed seasons are enforced to protect many species at vulnerable times. The proposals for winter refuges and restrictions on anchoring are therefore reasonable. In addition refuges should be established to more estuarine and marine flora.

Noted

Representation 20/4 – English Nature

1. 5.4 Ramsar Site Line 1 - Remove 'Especially As'

Agreed

2. Line 6 – Replace Habitat Regulations with ‘The Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994. These are the Regulations which translate The European Union Habitats and Birds Directive into law in Great Britain.’ This is the official title of these Regs. and where Habitat Regulations mentioned elsewhere in plan should replace with this.

Agreed

3. (Under Appendix 8 Glossary: Add 'Habitats Directive - The abbreviated term of Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora. It is the aim of this Directive to promote the conservation of certain habitats and species within the European Union.)

Agreed

4. 5.6 Under UK regulations.....Habitat Regulations form the basis for establishing, protecting and managing SPAs. (Remove 'fulfil the requirements of the European bird directive' – as competent authorities still need have regard to the European directives they can't ignore the directive and just use the Habitat Regulations)

Agreed

5. p40 5.8.4 para 2 Add ' Proposals for increasing coastal access to Poole Harbour from the landward side are also of concern as increased access to important bird roosting and breeding sites could result in significant disturbance.' And 'Recreation and tourism are discussed further in Chapter 10'

Agreed

6. para.3 Add ' Fisheries and bait collecting is discussed further in Chapter 11.'
para 8 Add ' Managing the shoreline in the face of sea level rise is discussed further in Chapter 13'.

Agreed

7. Prior to final para. Add' Toxic contaminants such as heavy metals could affect palatability and the abundance of prey items while seabirds are subject to the accumulation of toxins through the food chain. Organic or nutrient loading can result in eutrophication effects such as the growth of algal mats in the intertidal area which can lead to difficulties in birds accessing prey items. Although in some cases increases in nutrient loading can result in an increase in prey abundance and biomass. Further studies are required as to how contaminants may be affecting birds in Poole Harbour.

Agreed but last sentence removed as already included in paragraph at the top of page 41.

8. P 44 Management Objectives
Ensure all developments.. to minimise.... – to minimise is not consistent with the Habitat Regulations – need to ascertain no adverse effect on interest features ie no loss of habitat unless regarded as deminimus.

Agreed and now reworded to, "To ensure that any development can demonstrate no adverse impact on the designated site and fully complies with the Habitat Regulations."

'Investigate appropriate measures to ensure that harvesting activitiesdo not adversely effect...waders and wildfowlers...' Other Harbour nature conservation interests could also be effected by these activities eg eelgrass, saltmarsh, etc

Agreed and wording amended

The objectives listed do not seem to relate to the threats eg if jetties and slipway development is a problem need a policy to prevent cumulative effects. A better summary is needed of the nature conservation objectives and better link to the matrix.

The consistency of the Management Objectives of the whole document are being considered.

Representation 22/1 – Local Fisherman

1. Page 41, objection to proposed winter refuge area on basis of loss of livelihood. Suggests that there is no evidence that fishermen cause disturbance to birds.

Noted. Emphasis on Refuge Areas is being amended due to discussions with other users.

Representation 23/2 – BASC

1. It was a mistake to define boundaries of proposed voluntary winter refuge areas on a map in this consultation document without due consideration for the actual relevance of these areas, particularly when existing no-shooting areas and refuge areas exist in the harbour but are not highlighted.

BASC supports the management of refuge areas on estuaries in the UK, given the UK's importance as a winter stopover for migratory birds – which is reflected in many of our estuaries being designated at national and European level. However, 'refuge areas' should not be equated to no-shooting areas. A refuge area by definition should be a site designated as an area with minimal or no disturbance from all human activity. A nature reserve is an area where human activities are controlled – ie. dog walking, bait digging, sailing, birdwatching, wildfowling etc. take place but the levels of use are managed.

Noted. Emphasis on Refuge Areas is being amended following discussions with wildfowlers. The Plan and map will now just highlight Bird Sensitive Areas. An appendix is being added to the Plan which will give justification as to why certain areas of the harbour are considered as Bird Sensitive Areas. Wording suggesting that all human activity be restricted from these areas over the winter months has also been removed.

Representation 24/1 – Dorset Environmental Records Centre

1. The plan needs to address and acknowledge the existence of seahorses in the Harbour.

Agreed, now referred to under section on eel grass.

2. Page 43, question over the extent and health of eel grass beds as no recent in-depth studies have been carried out. Suggests the plan recognises the need for a comprehensive survey to include biotope and habitat mapping and marine flora and fauna surveys. The results may provide a protected study area which can be monitored.

Agreed

Representation 27/4 – Dorset Bird Club

1. DBC welcomes the description provided in Sections 5.2 to 5.7 setting out the protection afforded to the nature conservation interests of Poole Harbour.

In particular, DBC strongly supports the designation of all the main bays and inlets within the quiet zone, the north of Holes Bay, the north-west of Lytchett Bay and an area at Keyworth Point as refuge areas for overwintering birds. DBC agrees that the designation of "these bays as winter refuge areas would be seen as a positive and proactive step to further protecting the important bird life of the Harbour against increasing levels of human activities throughout the winter months".

It is particularly important that winter high-tide roosts are adequately protected from disturbance because birds' energy requirements come under the greatest stress

during winter. Disturbance often results in birds being displaced from roosts, and wasting valuable energy in flight.

Noted

Representation 29/4 – RSPB

1. The RSPB welcomes Chapter 5 of the Draft AqMP, and in particular the thorough review of the birds for which Poole Harbour is nationally and internationally important and the habitats on which they depend.

Noted

2. The *Potential Threats* considered in para 5.8.4 are a helpful summary of some of the most pressing conflicts that have arisen between different values and uses in the Harbour. It is, in the RSPB's view, on these threats that the Management Scheme needs to focus.

Noted

3. In light of this, the RSPB fully welcomes and supports the proposal in 5.8.5 for voluntary refuge areas/anchorage sensitive zones as specified. We would emphasise that these are, as stated, a positive recognition of particular sensitivity, but that the international designations cover a much larger area, and are all internationally important and legally protected.

Noted

Representation 30/1 – Purbeck Heritage Committee

1. Would like to see greater emphasis placed on the AONB designation as the AONB Management Plan has a statutory status and would help to reinforce the landscape objectives of the Aquatic Plan. This would also help to address any land-sea divide management issues.

Agreed and the wording in 5.1 will be strengthened to reinforce the role of the AONB and the existence of its statutory management plan.

Representation 30/2 – Poole Harbour Study Group

1. Page 41 and Figure 2 recommend Winter Refuge Areas. Although we support this proposal, we would suggest that a monitoring programme is established to assess if these areas as defined on the basis of the past patterns of wintering are robust or large enough to cope with changes of numbers and of habitats under conditions of climate and water level changes.

Following discussions with other users the winter refuge areas will now simply highlight bird sensitive areas and an appendix will be included to justify why they are being highlighted.

Chapter 6: Water Quality and Pollution

Representation 4/2 – Poole Harbour Association

1. There is no reference to the detrimental effects of dredging (reference PHC recent evaluation report)

Noted. A full report on the dredging is currently being compiled and results will be analysed to fully understand its effects.

Representation 5/3 – The British Marine Federation

1. Section 6.7 BMF does not support the suggested impact on the environment from recreational craft sewage discharge as in your plan you make reference to waters in Poole Harbour having always met EU bathing standards. It is agreed that in confined, low flow areas such as a marina, the discharge of sewage from any vessel is not best practice and is often prohibited under the berthing contract. However in open, high flow waters, the volume of sewage discharged by a recreational craft at any one time is so small that there is a rapid dispersion and dilution. The BMF, through the Green Blue, encourage all boaters to use shore side facilities when possible and pump-out their holding tanks. The Green Blue has produced a "Pump-out" chart of all navigable waters highlighting all pump-out stations. www.thegreenblue.org.uk

Noted.

Representation 18/2 – Poole Oyster Company

1. It should be acknowledged that Ballast water comes not only from ships but also from shellfish transshipping vehicles on the terminal.

Agreed and additional wording included.

Representation 19/5 – Society of Poole Men

1. Page 49 6.8 Defra passes data to EU, but what happens then, is any action taken?

Wording amended to include "for consideration"

2. Management Objectives, suggest rewording first one "To understand and educate users of the effects of the transfer of ballast water to the marine environment."

Noted but felt that although the plan could raise awareness it was not currently its role to educate.

3. Page 50, Sacrificial Anodes, suggest expanding management objective to say "To investigate the effects of sacrificial anodes on water quality"

It was felt that this would limit the objective as there may be other effects.

4. Last objective, change word "sensitive" to "friendly"

Sensitive is a recognised and well used term when referring to farming techniques.

Representation 30/3 – Purbeck Heritage Committee

1. Concern has been expressed that bathing water sampling only occurs over the summer months but recreational activity now occurs all year.

Noted, a comment will be placed in the plan under section 6.8 on monitoring but more discussions need to be had before any specific action can be identified.

Representation 30/3 – Poole Harbour Study Group

1. Page 47 refers to the potential remobilisation of heavy metals as a result of dredging or other works but does not comment on the potential for this to occur under natural erosion of the saltmarshes.

Agreed and wording relating to this will now be added

Chapter 7: Commerce

Representation 19/6 – Society of Poole Men

1. Some indication of the existence of the longevity of its existence in maritime trade should be acknowledged. Para should start, “Poole Harbour has been a centre for maritime trade since at least the Iron Age. Today the port of Poole is an important...”

Agreed

Representation 21/5 – Salterns Marina

1. Whilst general services provided by local companies within boat yards, marinas etc are recognised as part of the commercial life of the harbour and the building of luxury motor yards for both domestic and international clients is clearly very important, the provision of permanent moorings capable of accommodating the luxury motor yachts within Poole Harbour has not been addressed hitherto and should be recognised as an objective for the future subject of course to the need to balance this against the other critical interests associated with the Harbour.

Noted, this is to some extent covered in the moorings section in Chapter 10

Chapter 8: Conservancy and Marine Safety

Representation 1/1 – Lake Residents’ Association

1. Concern over conflict between beach users and swimmers at Hamworthy park with windsurfers and PW. There is no safe swim zone and there is an accident waiting to happen.

Noted, a section on swimming in the Harbour is included in the recreation chapter and safety issues have been noted by the Steering Group.

Representation 11/1 – Friends of Hamworthy Park

1. Concern over conflict between beach users and swimmers at Hamworthy park with windsurfers and PW. There is no safe swim zone and there is an accident waiting to happen.

Noted, a section on swimming in the Harbour is included in the recreation chapter and safety issues have been noted by the Steering Group.

Representation 13/1 – Marina Developments Limited

1. As a marina owner / operator MDL routinely undertake maintenance dredging. It is critically important for our business to ensure that this operation continues on a rolling programme of works, as has been carried out in the past

Noted

2. The sediment management plan is an area which we are aware and support on the basis that intertidal habitats are protected. However, until such time alternative dredging techniques and beneficial use of material has been evaluated, we are not in a position to fully comment.

Noted

Representation 18/3 – Poole Oyster Company

1. In the sections on capital and maintenance dredging I feel a specific management objective should be to minimise impact on fisheries and fish farming. After the problems experienced during the recent capital dredge I think specifying this objective is important.

Agreed

Representation 19/7 – Society of Poole Men

1. Need to explain difference between Capital and Maintenance Dredging

Agreed

2. Not clear why PHC are singled out in last Management Objective. Suggest rewording to, “To continue and monitor present management plans and to develop improvements when deemed necessary.”

Agreed

Representation 29/5 – RSPB

1. The RSPB considers the Sediment Management Plan and the beneficial use of dredged material that we hope will result from it, to be essential to the long-term integrity of the Harbour’s inter-tidal habitats, on which much of its nationally and internationally important birdlife depends.
The Management Scheme should ensure that this is progressed and implemented as an imperative.

Noted

Chapter 9: Transport Connections

Representation 4/3 – Poole Harbour Association

1. Should make reference to the Bridge Operating Board as a member to whom the BoP will refer regarding the opening of the existing and planned bridge.

It was not felt that this added anything and was not really a matter for the plan

Representation 6/1 – Cobbs Quay Berth Holders Association

1. Can I ask about page 58? Point 9.2.3 para 2 says :-

“Twin Sails’ will be a lifting bridgeoccasions when both bridges will need to be opened together to facilitate the safe movement of vessels, for example when there are large numbers of boats leaving the marinas in Holes Bay over and above the capacity of the ‘basin’ between the two bridges.’

Is this a definite ‘plan’ regarding the lifting of both bridges in the circumstances you indicate? As a ‘Twin Sails’ bridge objector I think this is essential for safe passage in the Backwater Channel and Quay/Bridge approach.

BoP have responded directly and the section relating to the bridge has been reworded.

Representation 13/2 – Marina Developments Limited

1. Further to construction of the 'Twin Sails' Bridge it is our opinion that there will be frequent occasions throughout the boating season that both this bridge and the existing Poole Bridge will have to be lifted simultaneously to accommodate the large volume of boating traffic.

For Health & Safety purposes we seek reassurance that this matter has been properly addressed and effectively managed.

This section of the Plan has been reworded to clarify the situation as it currently stands.

Representation 19/7 – Society of Poole Men

1. Suggest rewording of first sentence as not everybody would agree “Poole Town and Harbour are relatively well connected. “Poole Town and Harbour are connected to the main road network and are served by national rail links connecting the town with Southampton and London to the east and Weymouth to the west.”

Noted but the Steering Group are happy with the existing wording

Representation 29/6 – RSPB

1. In the RSPB’s view, this Chapter of the AqMP is inappropriate, particularly in view of its management scheme function.

However, if it is accepted that the AqMP should include a section on transport connections, it should not make specific points in relation to proposals that have yet to be determined, or advocate subjective views, such as (9.2.1) ‘*some improvements to the strategic highway network are necessary*’, on the existing arrangements without supporting these with evidence. The RSPB does not consider it appropriate to include reference to the A31 Poole link road (9.2.2) or to the local council’s commitment to it, in the AqMP. Decisions on highways improvements are determined by processes unrelated to the AqMP, and in the RSPB’s view second guessing these, or seeking to influence them through the plan, is inappropriate.

Remove Chapter 9 on transport connections. If its removal is not deemed appropriate, remove all unsubstantiated views and references to particular transport schemes that have not yet been determined.

Noted, but plan seeks to take an integrated approach and it is felt that access to and from the region is relevant to the plan. However wording of Guiding Principles and text is clear that all development should follow due process and seek to minimise impact on EMS. Where specific statements are made they are simply highlighting the policies detailed in other statutory local plans.

Chapter 10: Recreation and Tourism

Representation 4/4 – Poole Harbour Association

1. Chp10.8 states that there is no additional access point being progressed at the moment. However within the DoT inspector's report on the twin bridge it states that an alternative to the facilities at Wilkins and Dee Way must be provided before these ways can be withdrawn from use. BoP are planning alternative/improved access points in BWC. There seems to be little or no reference to providing access for the elderly and disabled users of dingies.

Agreed and additional wording added to section.

Representation 10/1 – Sandbanks Association

1. The loss of a slipway at Sandbanks is of great concern. We have fought hard for the need of the Sandbanks Yacht Company site to be kept for boating use.

Noted, Management Action in Matrix to review adequacy of existing launch sites.

Representation 12/2 – Poole Yachting Association

1. North Haven YC are also concerned that the windsurfing area does not extend into their moorings and would like confirmation on this.

There is no formal boundary to the windsurfing area which is simply defined as Whitley Lake. There are no current plans to review or change any existing moorings in this area.

Representation 14/6 – Dorset AONB

1. In the pursuit of Integrated Coastal Zone Management principles, the plan could also benefit from a greater emphasis on visitor and destination management policies and actions to help ensure the unique qualities of the Harbour are not damaged by inappropriate visitor pressures.

Noted but it was felt that this was rather outside the scope of the plan but could become an objective / action after further work with the AONB. However concerns over increased access have been touched on in the plan and additional wording added.

Representation 15/3 – Dorset wildfowling

1. Page 63 Section 10.9 Wildfowling Background note: it is more appropriate to refer to no-shooting areas rather than refuge areas when referring to these areas. Refuge areas are only thus when there is no human activity permitted.
Amendment: replace use of 'refuge area' with 'no-shooting area' in para 4, line 1.

Agreed

2. Page 64 Management Objectives box Background note: DWASC have detailed management prescriptions already in place. It is not appropriate to single out wildfowling as being an 'issue' here needing special attention as a management objective. Coverage in the wildfowling section on page 15 and in section 10.9 are more than sufficient in this context.

Amendment: Remove bullet "Wildfowling to be undertaken in a sustainable & sensitive manner"

Agreed, reworded to say "all recreational activity to be undertaken in a sustainable & sensitive manner"

Representation 18/4 – Poole Oyster Company

1. I believe a management objective in the sections on yachting and yacht racing should be to improve dialogue and dissemination of information to other harbour users prior to large events (such as Poole week, European championships etc.

See comment under Matrix above for Representation 18/1.4.

Representation 19/9 – Society of Poole Men

1. Page 61 para 4 lines 4-9, suggest rewording, "Some benefits will accrue from such developments, such as reducing the number of swinging moorings in the Harbour, providing better facilities for yachtsmen and bringing revenue to the town. On the other hand there will be environmental concerns which the planning authorities will have to take into account when considering any planning application.

Agreed.

2. Can bylaws be listed in the plan or say where a copy may be obtained.

Reference to where copy can be obtained to be included.

3. P62, Water ski boats are encouraged to launch from Baiter, what about Lake Road, Rockley Point, Redclyffe & Wareham?

Baiter is the only recognised public slipway, and the preferred launch point for use by most small craft. Other launch points mentioned may be under private ownership or areas where increased activity may cause conflict with residents.

4. P64 Management Objective 2 should read wildlife not just birdlife.

Agreed

5. P64 Management Objective 6 reword "To continue to educate racing yachtsmen on the rules for avoiding collisions and to reduce possible conflicts between racing yachts and commercial vessels."

Noted but it was felt that this was already sufficiently covered.

6. General comments: There is a need for more launching points for small boats and PW. Baiter is already overloaded and points Hamworthy and Holes Bay should be considered in order to spread the load.

Noted, Management Action in Matrix to review adequacy of existing launch sites.

Representation 21/6 – Salterns Marina

1. 10.2 The claim that whilst there may be benefits in connection with the construction of marina berths designed to improve facilities for more affluent yachtsmen, the claim that this is unlikely to benefit the wider community as a whole is an assumption not in our view based on the facts since both the investment and the future use bring substantial benefits to the economy, provides jobs and a large number of other social and economic benefits to the community in the area. It is fully accepted that such provision has to be made in a carefully planned and sustainable manner but the fundamental failure to provide for permanent moorings for luxury yachts such as those as are built locally seems to be unwise and to some extent contradictory.

Local manufacturers and providers of the appropriate services should be encouraged to continually improve and upgrade local facilities so that local community interests can be properly served.

Section has been reworded to recognise the economic benefits of marina developments and plan recognises the need to provide mooring facilities for craft of varying size.

Representation 26/2 – Royal Yachting Association

1. The RYA is concerned about the loss of swinging moorings in Poole Harbour and believes that facilities for mooring boats are required across the socio-economic spectrum. If the trend towards marina berths increases, many boaters will find themselves priced out of the harbour as marina berths can be prohibitively expensive.

Noted but plan recognises the need to provide mooring facilities which cater for all types of yachts and budgets. PHC will always look to retain the most suitable mooring sites and the policy is to provide swinging moorings for smaller boats.

2. We particularly support the concept of voluntary zoning and are pleased to note that the zoning scheme has been successful in managing recreational activities.

Noted

3. We note that the Commerce section of the Plan quite rightly refers to the commercial value of the port to the local economy. However we would also suggest, to present the full picture, that the economic value of recreational activity within the harbour, the number of jobs provided, and the financial value of visitor spend by cruising yachtsmen and other water sports enthusiasts, is also relevant to the plan and should be included.

Noted. Although specific figures are not easily available for use in this Plan a general statement is to be included recognising the economic value of recreational activity.

Representation 30/4 – Purbeck Heritage Committee

1. The Committee supports the Quiet Areas and Winter Refuge Areas but feels it is important for the Plan to emphasise that increased land access to these areas would not be supported.

Noted, wording will be added to highlight the concern of increased recreational activity and additional access.

Representation 31/4 – Poole Harbour Study Group

1. Although access to the harbour is essential for many of its users, we would like to see a stronger emphasis on ensuring that the sensitivity of the southern parts of the harbour and its natural occupants to disturbance is understood and that access to these areas is kept to a minimum. Open access is likely to be extremely damaging.

Noted, wording will be added to highlight the concern of increased recreational activity and additional access.

Chapter 11: Fisheries

Representation 4/5 – Poole Harbour Association

1. We welcome the clamp down on illegal fishing - particularly as this contributes to the dumping of waste in the water and on the 4 Ways in West Quay Road. However action to date by MFA has been extremely disappointing.

Noted

Representation 10/2 - Sandbanks Association

1. Concern about over fishing of cockles by dredging which will eventually destroy the cockle beds, which will not only affect the individual collecting of cockles for personal use but also remove food for birds.

Noted

Representation 19/10 – Society of Poole Men

1. Who is the lead authority to eliminate illegal fishing?

It was felt that this is sufficiently covered in final section of the Chapter.

2. In final Management Objective insert “bait digging” after “illegal fishing”

As there is a public right to dig bait this cannot be included in Management Objective

Representation 29/7 - RSPB

1. Pump scoop dredging for clams and cockles within Poole Harbour is likely, in the RSPB’s view, to be harming the Poole Harbour SPA and Ramsar site. This potential harm is reflected by the Southern Sea Fisheries District Committee (SSFDC) restricting licensed dredging for clams to outside the more sensitive bays and inlets of the southern Harbour. However, dredging in these sensitive areas continues, purportedly for cockles.

In terms of the impacts of the activity on the intertidal muds which are such a critical resource for the Harbour's internationally important populations of birds, it is of little consequence whether cockles or clams are being fished – disruption to the mudflats, disturbance from the physical presence of boats and fishermen and noise from their engines, and potential effects on benthic infauna, all continue to take place.

Whilst the RSPB fully supports current SSFDC management initiatives, it is in our view imperative that a long-term solution to this issue is developed through, for example, the introduction of a Byelaw (as per 11.1).

The AqMP, and in particular the EMS management scheme is, in our view, the appropriate mechanism to rigorously investigate this issue and to support the development of a mechanism to ensure that it is permanently addressed.

Noted

Chapter 12: Emergency Planning

Representation 4/6 – Poole Harbour Association

1. Chp12 there is no contingency for emergencies arising out of the boats that are intended to hold station between the 2 bridges - on the busiest days over 130 boats exit back water channel at any one time and access to the bridge area by emergency vehicles needs to be considered, particularly during regeneration activities and following the building of the 2nd bridge.

Noted but it was felt that this was not currently a matter for the Aquatic Management Plan but an issue for BoP as details of the new bridge are finalised.

Chapter 13: Archaeology

Representation 25/1 – Poole Harbour Heritage Project

1. 13.1 Background: Omit last 2 sentences of this paragraph.
Add "A comprehensive study of Poole Harbour's heritage is currently being undertaken by the Poole Harbour Heritage Project under the following four group of headings:
 - Natural Changes in the Harbour
 - Man-made changes in the Harbour
 - Settlements in and around the Harbour
 - Industry, Trade and Recreation associated with the Harbour.

This study takes full account of available archaeological information and, where necessary, is actively extending it."

Additional wording added but it was not felt necessary to delete the last two sentences of the paragraph as they help to reinforce the importance of the Harbours historic assets.

2. 13.5 Reporting Protocol: Need to include reference to the broader aspect of planned investigations and the context and interpretation of all archaeological work. PHHP is attempting to produce a central database and from this promulgate such information to the public.

Noted

Representation 28/4 – English Heritage

1. 13.4 Potential Threats - we recommend amending the text under "Salvage and Diving" to: "A minority of recreational divers regard a visit to a wreck as an opportunity to remove items of value or interest. This can cause damage to sites as objects are removed without being recorded or properly conserved, it should always be remembered that all recovered wreck has an owner and therefore all such material must be brought to the attention of the Receiver of Wreck; and failure to do so is an offence under the Merchant Shipping Act 1995. For wreck considered to be of historical, archaeological or artistic importance designated is possible under the Protection of Wrecks Act, 1973. Close to Poole harbour, two wrecks are afforded statutory protection under this Act which means that access to these sites is only possible through licences granted by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport. Further information about these sites should be obtained from English Heritage Maritime Archaeology Team. To ensure that recreational scuba divers are aware of the importance of the marine historic environment and how such material should be treated it is important for the Poole Harbour Aquatic Management Plan to support initiatives that provide education and further public understanding and appreciation of underwater heritage."

Agreed

2. Under the heading "Fishing" amend text to: "Heavy fishing gear such as beam trawling can damage archaeological sites and trawling has inadvertently caused wrecks to be discovered through attempts to recover trapped or lost fishing gear. Sites where fishing nets are prone to catch might be submerged wrecks and investigation of them has led to the finding of previously unknown wrecks such as the Studland Bay wreck. However, it is crucial that if such a discovery is made that appropriate measures are taken to implement an archaeological investigation. Further information about the appropriate techniques to be adopted should be obtained from local archaeological curators."

Agreed but removed reference to beam trawling as this does not occur in the Harbour.

3. Under "Development", amend text to: "Development of the intertidal and marine areas, such as construction of jetties and marinas has the potential to damage archaeological sites. Recently there have been moves to ensure that approved development proposals take adequate steps to ensure the survival of both marine and terrestrial archaeology. The Government's Planning Policy Guidance Note 20: Coastal Planning recognises the need to protect and enhance the archaeological coastal heritage. In particular, works such as capital dredging can also significantly impact marine historic assets but also have potential to discover new sites, as was the case with the Swash Channel wreck. Overall best practice and guidance recognises that detailed historic environment assessment prior to development, and liaison with archaeological curators, offers the best means to manage a project that seeks to avoid damaging the historic environment."

Agreed

4. 13.5 Reporting Protocol - amend English Heritage reference to "English Heritage South West Regional Office (Bristol)"

Agreed

5. Under "Management Objectives", amend first bullet point to:
 - Ensure coastal flood risk management strategies and schemes do not adversely affect archaeological features, or ensure adequate mitigation and recording in

conjunction with archaeological curators if an alternative means to deliver the the objectives of the strategy or scheme is not possible.

Agreed on principle but it was felt that that the existing Management Objectives and the rewording of others sufficiently covered this point

Amend final bullet point to:

- Ensure dredging projects are planned and managed to avoid damage to archaeology.

Wording of “through prior investigation and appropriate mitigation”

Chapter 14: Defending the Shoreline

Representation 1/2 - Lake Residents' Association

1. Sand on Hamworthy Park beach is diminishing and the promenade is gradually being undermined. Requests were made for replenishment but this was refused on the basis of difficulty in feeding the pipe ashore. Suspect that the deepening of the channel is causing the flow of tides to drag sand from the beaches as the channel begins to reinstate itself.

Noted and it is understood that some replenishment work is to be undertaken as agreed by BoP. The following wording has been added to the chapter on Defending (Managing) the Shoreline: “As part of the Poole regeneration initiative it is also hoped that Hamworthy Park will fulfil a wider recreational role and the need to maintain the promenade and provide for a measure of beach replenishment above the strand line will be considered. However as with all coastal defence schemes in the Harbour any works would need to be consistent with the maintenance of the integrity of the Special Protection Area.”

Representation 7/1- Purbeck District Council

1. Section 14.2 is entitled Coastal Defence. This combines the aspects of both coast protection works to protect against erosion where generally the land is above any flood level and sea defence where the land is protected against flooding. I don't think the document draws out the difference between these and currently the distinction is significant as it relevant as to the consenting authority

Agreed and section has been reworded to clarify this.

2. The Borough of Poole and Purbeck District Council are operating authorities under the Coast Protection Act and since Poole Harbour is not excluded by virtue of schedule 4 of the Act then consent would be required from these authorities for any works in their areas.

Sea Defence is more related to flooding and the Environment Agency (EA) would be the consenting authority.

Councils do of course have powers to undertake sea defence works if desired but would require the EA's consent.

Noted and relevant points included.

3. Regarding the comments about maintenance I think the Councils would generally accept responsibility for maintaining any works they had undertaken.

Noted and wording amended to reflect this.

4. The second round of SMP's has amended the SMP boundaries and the SMP to the west will now be from Durlston Head to Rame Head. This does not, of course, affect Poole Harbour where there will be no change to the SMP boundary.

Noted.

5. The Durlston Head to Rame Head SMP has been given DEFRA approval but the SMP which involves Poole Harbour has not and as DEFRA has committed its funding for the next few years I think completion of a second round SMP for Poole by 2010 is more than optimistic.

Noted and amendments made.

Representation 10/3 – Sandbanks Association

1. Concerned about erosion of the Harbour side by the changed course of the tidal flow and its increased speed.

Noted

Representation 11/2 – Friends of Hamworthy Park

1. It appears that sand is being “sucked off” Hamworthy Beach at an even greater rate than previously. Such sand loss is undermining the stability of the promenade. Could the recently dredged deep water channel be contributing to this scenario?

Noted and a full report on the impact of the dredging operation is being undertaken.

The following wording has been added to the chapter on Defending (Managing) the Shoreline: “As part of the Poole regeneration initiative it is also hoped that Hamworthy Park will fulfil a wider recreational role and the need to maintain the promenade and provide for a measure of beach replenishment above the strand line will be considered. However as with all coastal defence schemes in the Harbour any works would need to be consistent with the maintenance of the integrity of the Special Protection Area.”

Representation 19/11 – Society of Poole Men

1. 14.1.1 para 2, line 3 Whose guidance is PPG Note 25?

PPG Note 25 is a Government issue and this has now been highlighted in text.

2. Page 77 para 2, who has responsibility for maintenance of Coastal Defences?

This has now been clarified in the text

3. Proposed Management Objective – To sort out who has responsibility for maintenance and repair of coastal defence works.

This has now been clarified in the text

Representation 20/5 – English Nature

1. 76 Chapter 14 Remove 'Defending the Shoreline' Not a good heading! Defending the shoreline is an out of date attitude to managing coastal processes. Replace with 'Managing the Shoreline'.

Agreed

2. It was strongly felt that this chapter should come at the beginning of the plan after the Guiding Principles as its subject fundamentally affects many other areas – it appears here almost as an after thought.

This Chapter has now been moved to Chapter 7, although the order of the chapters should not be taken as having any priority. Other requests have been made to change the order of the chapters but as all are different it is not possible to accommodate all requests.

3. 14.1 Climate Change and Sea Level Rise

There is more information available that could be added to this section. Halcrow have produced maps showing predicted changes in the saltmarsh area while the EA have maps showing areas of potential flooding.

The Chapter will refer to some of the other information available however it was not felt appropriate to include additional maps.

4. 14.2 Replace 'coastal defence' with 'coastal and flood defence'

Para 1 – Muddles coastal protection and coastal defence

Replace sent 1 with 'In Poole Harbour coastal protection developments prevent erosion of the land while flood defence tidal embankments protect low lying areas from flooding and encroachment of the sea.'

Section has been reworded to clarify difference between terms.

Maps and Plans

Representation 1/3 – Lake Residents' Association

1. Combined Map – The stretch of coastline from Rockley Point to Poole Yacht Club Marina wall is shown as mudflats but is in fact a length of sandy beach.

The intention of the map was to show the key intertidal habitats but the key of the map has been changed from mudflats to foreshore.

Representation 11/3 – Friends of Hamworthy Park

1. The stretch of coastline from Rockley Point to Poole Yacht Club Marina wall is shown as mudflats but is in fact a length of sandy beach. Request that Plan is amended to include this very significant recreational feature.

The intention of the map was to show the key intertidal habitats but the key of the map has been changed from mudflats to foreshore.

Representation 12/3 – Poole Yachting Association

1. North Haven YC are also concerned that the windsurfing area does not extend into their moorings and would like confirmation on this.

There is no formal boundary to the windsurfing area which is simply defined as Whitley Lake. The zone shown on the map is a simplified visual representation of the area and has been reduced in size on the final map, however there are no current plans to review or change any existing moorings in this area.

Representation 19/12 – Society of Poole Men

1. All maps need to be larger and clearer and more contrasty.

Agreed. All main maps will now be shown on a whole side of A4.

Representation 30/5 – Purbeck Heritage Committee

1. Concerned that figure 1 does not show the full extent of the intertidal habitats.

Noted but as info was taken from existing GIS layers recognised by DERC it is not possible to easily amend the map. Wording will explain that extent of habitats is only approximate.

Representation 31/5 – Poole Harbour Study Group

1. We are concerned that Figure 1 does not show all the intertidal habitats. Figure 2 in *The Ecology of Poole Harbour* shows more extensive areas of mud- and sand-flats than your Figure 1, as do several other Figures.

Noted but as info was taken from existing GIS layers recognised by DERC it is not possible to easily amend the map. Wording will explain that extent of habitats is only approximate.

General Comments

Representation 1/4 - Lake Residents' Association

1. State of the beaches at Hamworthy. The beach was cleaned up until three years ago but now with receding neap tides the strand line debris dries and rots in the heat of the summer sun. Debris, insects and dog faeces are a health risk to all beach user including holidaymakers, many with children.

Noted. It is understood that English Nature have already had discussions concerning this and that PDC are looking at erecting signs informing of the importance of the strandline which is an important bird feeding habitat and which also helps to stabilize the beach.

Representation 4/7 – Poole Harbour Association

1. Welcome the action to improve communication with user groups but it is not stated how this will be achieved. The Steering Group does not have any user group representation and perhaps this could be considered.

Noted. It was recognised that this is an issue that needs further consideration and it is necessary to look at existing means of communication and investigate how these can be improved.

Representation 8/1 – Cefas

1. We suggest that you consider the inclusion of a separate section on potential cumulative environmental impacts of the different sectors operating in the area. We understand that cumulative impacts are mentioned in the document with regard to particular habitats. However we have found focused attention to potential cumulative impacts of all sectors within an area to be useful in environmental assessment.

Noted, but it was felt that this was not of relevance for the plan and that the information was contained within the individual chapters.

Representation 11/4 – Friends of Hamworthy Park

1. State of the beaches at Hamworthy. The beach was cleaned up until three years ago but now with receding neap tides the strand line debris dries and rots in the heat of the summer sun. Debris, insects and dog faeces (the beach is designated dog-friendly) are a health risk to all beach user including holidaymakers, many with children. This concerning situation has been brought to the attention of the Council on many occasions – without a positive response.

Noted. It is understood that English Nature have already had discussions concerning this and that PDC are looking at erecting signs informing of the importance of the strandline which is an important bird feeding habitat and which also helps to stabilize the beach.

Representation 14/7 – Dorset AONB

1. Would welcome the opportunity to be a partner on the Poole Harbour Steering Group if required.

Noted and it was felt that this could be considered further once the exact role of Natural England has become established.

Representation 19/13 – Society of Poole Men

1. The Harbour is used by shipping, the Fisheries and by recreational boat owners. They are the ones to be managed. The environment has to be managed, too, but in a different way. The time scales are so very different. While port management is a

day to day activity, environmental management is more a year on year monitoring/ review/react sequence. We therefore believe that the priorities are wrong in the layout of the document and that Port, Fishing and Recreation activities should be found at the front of the document, with environmental and other chapters following.

The order of the chapters should not be taken as having any priority. Other requests have been made to change the order of the chapters but as all are different it is not possible to accommodate all requests. Some reordering has taken place so that the document flows from addressing natural issues through to more human based activities, although again it is stressed that earlier chapters should not be considered as having more importance than later ones.

Representation 29/8 – RSPB

1. Whilst there are many laudable objectives and actions in the AqMP, there is little emphasis on their implementation. Without greater information on how actions will be taken forward as a result of the AqMP, the RSPB is concerned that the objectives may not be achieved nor the actions delivered.

Give stronger emphasis on implementation, particularly in relation to the objectives and actions that are necessary to achieve the EMS management scheme. One option is to include an 'implementation' chapter, which sets out who is responsible for delivering each action, how it will be done, a timetable for its delivery and how it will be monitored.

Additional wording has been included within the plan, primarily in Section 3.3 to explain how actions will be progressed and the plan reviewed. The importance of implementation is understood and to some extent the Matrix addresses this by identifying Lead Authorities and Timescales. Regular reviews will seek to ensure the relevant authorities are progressing their actions and updates will be disseminated via newsletters and websites.

2. Monitoring is a critical element of an EMS management scheme. As well as being able to report to Europe, monitoring is also required as a means of feedback on the effectiveness of the management measures against the objectives.

'Compliance' monitoring of an activity or measure is also needed, and will generally be undertaken by the respective relevant authority.

Careful integration of the compliance and condition monitoring is clearly important in order to assist in interpreting any changes that may be observed in the features and the possible causes.

Incorporate within the AqMP a programme of condition and compliance monitoring in order that the effectiveness of implementation of the management scheme can be measured and reported against.

It is felt that regular reviews by the Steering Group as to how actions are being progressed is sufficient to ensure that ongoing condition monitoring is taking place. It is a requirement that a six yearly review of the state of the European Marine Site is carried out and the Aquatic Plan does not need to list a programme of condition and compliance monitoring that is already required to be undertaken.

Representation 30/5 – Purbeck Heritage Committee

1. We are not convinced that interactions between different activities, the potential impacts from the current recreational zones and the introduction of winter refuge areas are well enough understood for adequate answer to be given. There is a need for substantial investigations over several seasons of the impacts to provide more rigorous information on which to base assessment of these proposals and any revision of zones.

Agreed. The plan identifies many actions which involve ongoing research and investigation of the impacts of various activities. It is anticipated that as future concerns arise that new actions will be agreed and more research initiated. In this way it is hoped that gaps in knowledge will be filled and our understanding of the impacts of different activities improved.

Representation 31/5 – Poole Harbour Study Group

1. You pose several questions about interactions and impacts which we do feel can be well answered at present. One of the most important conclusions of the *Ecology of Poole Harbour* was that we do not understand the interactions between the different habitats well and we understand the human interactions even less well. That lack of understanding needs to be addressed. The Study Group will, as in the past, help in studying the research needs for management of the harbour.

Noted