

PEMBROKESHIRE COASTAL FORUM
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

2.30pm 28th May 2004 at Pembrokeshire College G1.2

NOTES OF MEETING

1. The following were present

Edward Holdaway (EH)	Chair
Nic Wheeler (NW)	Pembrokeshire Coast National Park
Stephen Hurr (SH)	Pembrokeshire County Council
Paul Varallo (PV)	Environment Agency Wales
Nic Ainger (NA)	MP - Chair, Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum
Jo Dilly (JD)	Pembrokeshire Coastal Forum
Steve Morris (SM)	Pembrokeshire College
Ted Sangster (TS)	Milford Haven Port Authority
Andrea McConnell (AM)	Countryside Council for Wales
Carolyn Heeps (CH)	Crown Estates
Robin Crump (RC)	Field Studies Council
Emyr Williams	Pembrokeshire County Council
Stephen Alderman	National Farmers Union
Andrew Brown (AB)	Milford Docks Company
Sue Mackie	PLANED

Apologies were received from David Reed, Ged Davies, Phil Coates, Mark Andrews, Jonathan Hughes, David Fletcher and Alison Smith

2. Minutes of the meeting of 27th February 2004

The minutes of this meeting were distributed and were accepted as a true record.

3. Matters arising

There were no matters arising that were not already on the agenda.

4.

a. Future of the Forum

EH introduced a paper on the future of the Forum: the Forum Team. He emphasised the importance of the conclusions of the UK Government report, ICZM in the UK: A Stocktake, which identified the valuable nature of coastal forum and gave some background on the importance of PCF in relation to ICZM in Pembrokeshire. He recommended that the Forum Team continue in their work. Achievements to date included: organising topic group meetings, running coastal surgeries, managing Marine Code Outdoor Charter Project, producing an Issues Report and initiating a recreational audit.

The Committee, in general, expressed their support for the Forum and the work of the team and its continuation. In particular, it recognised the value of its role in facilitating synergies between organisations and providing a much needed public interface for marine issues.

A number of members of the Committee emphasised that the Forum and the team were already helping them fulfil their remits. AM highlighted the fact that it was helping CCW in delivering its remit and expressed the hope that CCW would be able to continue its support for the Forum. The question of core funding was raised by NW. He stressed that if long-term core funding were to be forthcoming, it would have to be made clear by the Forum what it would be doing for the funding organisations by way of core activities.

It was emphasised, in discussion, that although the current aims and objectives of PCF were well defined, its future role needed to be decided and objectives set out. In order to allow the Forum to move forward, EH highlighted that fact that it would help if organisations specified what they actually required from it. RC identified the importance of consulting the general public and industry in order to obtain their opinions.

In terms of funding, AB recommended a marketing process for PCF, for which Objective 1 money may be available. NW suggested putting a package together to present to potential contributors. To assist possible future contributors in the allocation of funds, it would be helpful if the PCF financial year corresponded with the normal year beginning April and ending

March. It was noted that a proposal for funding should be in place by late September to fit into the funding round for 2005/6.

It was agreed that:

1. The future role of the Forum, its objectives and future programme should be developed in the light of the emerging strategy for ICZM and should be a topic for discussion at the next full meeting of the Forum.
2. Finally, it was agreed that the Chairman should write to the funding partners to initiate the process of putting a new funding package together and particularly to seek out what partners expect of the Forum in terms of helping their core activity.
3. A meeting of funding partners should be called as soon as practical to discuss the way forward.

b. Issues Report

During the discussion, concerns were expressed that some of the content may not be factually correct, that the report only reflected public perception and was not necessarily a true representation of the subject matter. Its relevance to future strategy was also questioned.

It was pointed out that the views contained therein came from a wide variety of sources, such as Coastal Surgeries and community action plans. Although not popular, public "perceptions" were genuine. It was noted that the Report had been valuable as an exercise and that the results should be used in the next steps of the Strategy process. It was also crucial that the PCF address public misconceptions.

AM suggested that this should not be called an Issues Report, rather a Consultation Report.

It was agreed that:

1. The document, as drafted, should not be published.
2. The document, with a new title, revised introduction and minus the conclusions should be put on to the website, with the caveat that the issues and potential actions are not formally endorsed by the Forum and its members individually.
3. A meeting of the Steering Committee would be called, probably in September, to identify the key issues to be addressed by the Strategy and the Strategy itself.
4. A Forum meeting will be held in the Autumn to discuss the Strategy.