

Marine Ecological Surveys Ltd.

## Fishing & the Historic Environment

Prepared for English Heritage

### Consultation – August 2013

Responses are invited via email or post, with a preference for email, to be sent to:

tania@seasurvey.co.uk

T Woodcock  
Marine Ecological Surveys Limited  
3 Palace Yard Mews  
Bath  
BA1 2NH

Please take the time to fill out your contact details below.

#### Name / Organisation

Organisation name (if applicable)

Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee

#### Surname

Yorke

#### Forename

Robert

#### Contact Details

Silver Birches  
Bashurst Hill  
Itchingfield  
Horsham  
West Sussex  
RH13 0NY

Telephone: 01403 790500

email: robert.yorke@btinternet.com

Any data provided will be bound by the respondent's requested terms of confidentiality. We will process any personal data in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

All responses will be collated anonymously. We will share your response internally with English Heritage and the Steering Group. Please let us know if you would prefer your response to remain anonymous.

I am happy for my personal information to be shared internally  Yes  No

We would like to thank you for taking the time to complete this consultation, the project team are grateful for all comments received. Any feedback provided will be incorporated into the final report and recommendations where appropriate.

1. Please give your thoughts on the fishing-heritage interactions recognised within this report. If you have identified any other potential interactions please indicate them below, providing examples where possible.

I am grateful for the opportunity to reply to this consultation on behalf of the Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee (JNAPC). I attach information on the JNAPC and its members.

You should also be aware that I am an MMO Appointee on the Sussex IFCA and that I fully endorse the response to the consultation made by Mr. Tim Dapling on behalf of the Sussex IFCA.

The JNAPC welcomes this report because it addresses the interactions between fishing and the historic environment, something that we have been seeking for some time, and it raises the profile of maritime heritage within the fishing industry which is helpful. The report provides a good discussion of the scope for damage to the historic environment that might have been caused by fishing in the past and we are pleased to accept your conclusions on this matter.

From the report it is clear that the emphasis must now be on the future and that the aim should be to mitigate negative fishing-heritage interactions and enhance positive interactions in the years to come.

The report is very comprehensive but quite long. The important conclusions relating to future management options are included in Appendix 5 at the very end of the report, although they are flagged in the Executive Summary. There is a possibility that some busy readers might not access this appendix and therefore miss these important proposed options for future management and research.

We suggest a summary of the management options should be included in the Executive Summary which itself could afford to be 4 or 5 pages long given the extensive nature of the report. The Executive Summary should perhaps also include the basic conclusions from each section of the report, rather than concentrating on methodology, and the note on 'report structure' on page 2 might be included elsewhere.

Another interaction that the report might consider is anchoring by vessels engaged in recreational and commercial rod and line fishing since wrecks are often regarded by recreational fishermen as good locations for angling. In regard to other fishing interactions the report might also include anchoring and putting down shot-lines for scuba diving to collect shellfish such as scallops.

2. Do you believe that there is any useful evidence missing from this report? If so, please indicate below.

JNAPC would like to endorse the response by the Sussex IFCA on this subject which is repeated below

"We note the use of some fishing effort information/graphics from MMO sources. Whilst this effort is informative there is an absence of available IFCA inshore fishing effort data (inside 6 miles) for the study area located off Sussex. We believe similar information exists for the study area off Yorkshire.

Detailed fishing Sussex IFCA effort information can be obtained from the IFCAs fisheries baseline information available at the following link:

[http://www.sussex-ifca.gov.uk/repository/Baseline\\_Fisheries\\_Information\\_v2.pdf](http://www.sussex-ifca.gov.uk/repository/Baseline_Fisheries_Information_v2.pdf)

More widely national SFC/IFCA inshore effort data layers are described in:

[http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=MB0106\\_9391\\_FRP.pdf](http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=MB0106_9391_FRP.pdf)

It should be noted that MMO VMS data is limited to vessels over 15 metres in length (to be extended to 12 metre and over shortly).

The reports might also wish to make reference to available habitat type maps notably those associated with the Regional Environmental Characterisations

<http://www.cefas.defra.gov.uk/alsf/projects/rec-projects.aspx>

There are also discrete acoustic multibeam and side scan surveys undertaken in coastal waters to support Marine Conservation Zone identification that may offer useful evidence to support the identification of wreck location

Again we emphasis the value of evidence that can be derived from FIPAD and similar protocols in marine aggregate industry."

3. Do you have any feedback on the proposed management and research options?

The report should be commended on the comprehensive nature of the proposed management and research options, which the JNAPC fully supports.

There are four strands that we particularly note and encourage:

- 1) Use of both new and legacy information received from fishermen about finds in order to add to our knowledge of maritime heritage assets and their locations. This is the first time there has been the opportunity to groundtruth/enhance the recording of fasteners in the NRHE and we believe it is important to follow up this initiative.
- 2) Work with fishermen in relation to navigation/location and the use/choice of fishing gear to avoid future damage to both known and unknown heritage assets.
- 3) Improve early reporting of new sites, or damage to existing sites, by enhancing FIPAD and extending it throughout England to introduce a national recording process. We recognise the excellent work already undertaken by English Heritage, Wessex Archaeology and the Sussex IFCA in setting up the current FIPAD pilot study.
- 4) Develop archaeological initiatives with the FLAGs involving the fishing community. Exploration of potential fasteners/sites with remote sensing and verification with drop down video has the potential to integrate habitat and archaeological surveys.

The Sussex IFCA is already working with the fishing community in two locations on the use of drop down cameras. The IFCA has the Hastings FLAG within its District and is willing to explore how the IFCA might work with the local FLAG on archaeological conservation issues.

4. Do you have any further suggestions as to how English Heritage can work with fishers and other stakeholders to further increase understanding and evidence of interactions with the historic environment?

The JNAPC believes that it is very important to raise awareness of underwater cultural heritage within the fishing community. This can be undertaken through the media but local awareness raising, for instance at fishermen's meetings, will also be important. We believe this is an important priority in order to facilitate the successful implementation of other proposed management and research initiatives.

We would be pleased to assist in any future work on this project.