

**Minutes of the Recreational Angling Sector Working Group held at the Southern IFCA Office, 64 Ashley Road, Parkstone, Poole, Dorset, BH14 9BN, at 1500 on Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> April.**

**Present**

*Angling Representatives*

Mr C Holloway (Acting Chairman) (CH)

Mr R Stubbs (RS)

Mr A Deeming (AD)

*SIFCA representatives*

Robert Clark (RC)

Patrick Cooper (PC)

**Introductions**

The attendees group introduced themselves, providing information on their backgrounds and relevant positions in the recreational angling sector. RC requested initially that CH be considered acting chair for the meeting until more members were appointed and a chair could be elected. It was also agreed that PC would take minutes for the meeting.

RC gave an introduction on the background to the creation of the group and how the IFCA felt it could help develop relationships with the angling community further and how the group could help develop the IFCA's angling strategy. It was noted by the chairman that responsibilities relevant to the angling community were fairly new to the IFCA's and attendees agreed that it made sense for anglers to feed into the strategy.

**Group Admin**

*Timings*

CH felt that the structure of the group would be a key issue and recognised that different people would have different work situations and different travel requirements and that would need to be considered when determining frequency and timings of meetings. It was also agreed that the group was required to be as best a cross-representation of the angling sector as possible considering location, interests and age etc.

CH suggested 5pm as a meeting time as it would make it feasible for those who work and would not be too late for those who have to travel further. AD asked whether this would be too early for those who work and needed to travel. This was discussed and the group decided that on balance it was appropriate. The group decided that Wednesdays at 5pm would be best as this did not clash with any other meetings. The group also decided that the meetings would be held quarterly as this fell in with other cycles. When considering exact dates attendees felt that Angling Trust meetings had to take priority and these would need to be considered when determining dates.

### *Membership*

It was agreed that those angling members present would go back to the umbrella organisation of the regional Angling Trust groups to seek nominations for additional membership. The attendees agreed that this was appropriate to ensure that broad representation for the group would be achieved, however where appropriate members of other groups could be invited for single meetings/specific topics.

DS raised the topic of charter representation on the group as the sector has the potential to reach larger numbers, including non-club anglers. It was considered that in some cases recreational interests may not align directly with some commercial aspects of certain charter businesses, however as some issues may require the experience of charter vessels and that they had the potential to reach a wider audience the group would consider appropriate suggestions.

Beach anglers were also discussed, a sector that typically was difficult to reach. AD stated that he felt tackle shops are the best way to reach this sector and that this could be coordinated through members of the group. This was agreed by those present.

Following the discussions the group came to the decision that it would be appropriate for relevant Angling Trust groups to mandate individuals based on relevant criteria. This was accepted by the group. On the topic of numbers it was decided that roughly 3 from each region would be an appropriate number.

### *Outputs*

RC asked as to whether the group would agree with circulation of draft minutes to the IFCA committee. As this would be prior to getting full approval from the group often due to tight deadlines it was suggested that minutes be drafted and circulated, but submitted to the IFCA committee in draft to meet deadlines.

### *Name of Group*

AD raised the topic of the name of the group asking whether the initially proposed name of the Recreational Sector Working Group could be adapted to become more appropriate that better reflects angling. The suggestion of Recreational Angling Sector Group was proposed and accepted.

## **Bass**

RC discussed the issues regarding bass management and Southern IFCA's position paper and recommendations. The discussion considered how the IFCA management could best have a positive impact on the stock recovery. RC stated that the authority felt it could have the most impact with management through development of current Bass Nursery Areas and further consideration of the near shore netting regulations. It was discussed that where legislation was to be developed it needed to be considered to be effective, not brought in in haste.

When discussing the proposal in more detail AD raised that some wording could be more effective and make the position clearer, specifically referring to removal of bass wanting to make clear that fishing was to be allowed, just not landing etc. AD also raised a point regarding the reference to a mullet fishery in the document, wanting to clarify this as commercial. RC agreed to consider these wordings in future.

It was also noted by members that more juvenile bass had been seen recently than in previous years and that this was reflected in the Solent Bass Survey. Members agreed that it

was important to protect this where possible. When discussing further consideration of the BNAs and Fixed net byelaws CH felt that there could be difficulties relating to angling and extension into new areas, he felt that it was more important to make the current ones enforceable. RC agreed that the review of management measures should capture this.

AD raised concerns regarding nearshore netting legislation and that adapted legislation could lead to displacement. RC stated that the IFCA would aim to develop legislation in a manner that they would have pre-emptive measures in place to mitigate this.

ACTION – RC to expand at next meeting

### **Slipper limpet as bait**

RC discussed the legislative background of the use and movement of slipper limpet considering its requirement not to be moved under the wildlife and countryside act 1981, and recent MMO advice. The group discussed difficulties with this especially in the South of England where slipper limpets were established. The group discussed that a letter to the Non-native species secretariat to request advice may be the best action to take.

### **Bait Agreement**

CH discussed the work on the bait working group in developing the bait agreement and how the process had allowed anglers, along with members of other sectors, to feed in to an agreement which aimed to meet the needs of those who dug bait as well as complying with environmental requirements of the harbour. RC discussed the initial feedback the IFCA had received regarding the agreement.

AD asked on what would happen regarding the east of the district, raising concerns regarding the Isle of Wight and that there was nowhere to be displaced to. RC discussed the steps for the agreement, raising the point that the revised approach referred to commercial fisheries, so recreational digging would not have to follow in the same 2016 timeframe. RC suggested that it would be good to develop the model in Poole, learning lessons there, and when it proved to be successful, consider work to the east.

### **Black Bream**

PC informed the group of the work Southern IFCA planned to do in Sandown Bay regarding the Sidescan sonar mapping project and the bream tagging program with the local anglers. AD asked whether the recent review had been updated since comments, PC stated that it had been updated but not recently re-circulated and that it would be as part of the black bream information and reports. DS stated it would be good to inform local anglers at the next ECA meeting, PC said he would attend with DCFO Jones.

### **Any other business**

#### *Small fish surveys*

RC mentioned the upcoming Small fish surveys in Poole that the IFCA were looking to undertake and asked whether there would be interest for local anglers/AT representatives to be involved and assist. The group discussed the benefits of these surveys and how they can highlight ecosystem value. CH indicated there would likely be someone from the local angling community who would be interested.

#### *Communication*

AD asked whether the IFCA would be able to circulate information to anglers on the loW as previously discussed. PC stated that leaflets had been drafted, similar to those in Poole and that they would be available shortly.

*IFCA review*

AD asked whether the IFCA had received feedback from the IFCA review. RC stated that they had received summaries of the responses and that these summaries highlighted that potentially the IFCA needed to work more with the angling community to improve perception.