Minutes of the CMPP Members Meeting
10th March 2026
Online Meeting

Chair: Anthony Gallagher (AGa)

Present: Voting Members
Jan Brooke (JBr), Peel Ports
Zoe Clelland (ZC), RSPB
Calum Duncan (CD), Scottish Environment LINK
Allan Finlayson (AF), North Ayrshire Council
Kieron Green (KG), Argyll and Bute Council
Alistair Hamilton (AH), SWCRIFG
Lorraine Holdstock (LH), Argyll and Bute Council
Lucy Kay (LK), COAST
Willie Kennedy (WK), SSACN
Catherine Lambert (CL), Clydeplan
Thom Ledingham (TL), North Ayrshire Council
David Nairn (DN), Clyde Coastal Community Councils
Ruth Rice (RR), CMAL
Graham Russell (GR), RYA Scotland
Elaine Whyte (EW), Individual

Present: Non-Voting Members
Jill Bunyan (JBu), CMPP Staff
Chris Cutts (CC), CMPP Staff
Alex Watson-Crook (AWC), Board

Apologies:
Ruairidh Anderson (RA), Marine Directorate
Paul Bancks (PB), Crown Estate Scotland
Kevin Braidwood (KB), South Ayrshire Council
Claire Jones (CJ), Marine Directorate
Elke Scheibler (ES), Field Studies Council
Kerry Wallace (KW), NatureScot

1. Welcome and Apologies

The Chair welcomed all attendees and read out the apologies as listed above.

2. Chair's Report

CMPP submitted the draft Plan to MD in mid-December with amendments based on feedback received from MD in September. CMPP received the draft Plan with further comments from MD on 6th March. The CMPP Chair and staff met with MD on 5th March to discuss the Plan but also a few other items. In large part, the policies and the rest of the content in the draft Plan is ok. There are still a few outstanding issues including the wording of a few policies, references, statistics and some unclear wording in the context. Working on the draft Plan will be the priority in March with an aim to get it returned to MD by the Easter break. The assessments, namely the HRA and the SEA, were raised as needing checked to ensure they are up to date in terms of data and evidence. The CMPP staff reviewed these 2 documents and in large part they are up to date, but some edits are necessary.

MD gave clear direction that the CMPP consultation on the draft Plan cannot overlap with the NMP2 consultation. There are no confirmed dates for the NMP2 consultation yet, however we will have to have ours completed before it launches. This implements a level of urgency to carry out our consultation. Whilst MD are confident we can make that timeline of starting our consultation in late summer, we need to be aware of the risk.

A small working group to review the fisheries chapter and update it accordingly was established. They met on the 14th January. The group were able to discuss the fisheries policies that are contained in the SIRMP (published) and the OIRMP (draft at the time of the meeting) and use them as a starting point for creating new policy text in our fisheries chapter. The updated draft sea fisheries chapter was circulated to all members and MD on 13th February.

MD held a meeting with the 4 Local Authorities that are represented on the CMPP on the 3rd March to discuss the future of regional marine planning and future housing of CMPP. Discussions are ongoing.

In the previous meeting it was noted that CMPP will receive a funding increase in the next financial year. This has not been received in writing, but we have been assured this will take place. The CMPP staff received their confirmation of contract extension letters from NatureScot in February, confirming their contract extension through to end of March 2027.

The Chair asked if the members approved the minutes from the last meeting. Request for there to be an amendment regarding fisheries licensing.

3. Review of Action Points from the last meeting

Reference	Summary	Status
01/02/12/2025	Amend plan and circulate to members.	Ongoing; see item 4
02/02/12/2025	Hold fisheries workshop with interested parties and MD to resolve fishery policy text.	Ongoing; see item 4
03/02/12/2025	CMPP staff to circulate any updates on Housing.	Ongoing' see item 8

4. Update on the Regional Marine Plan

CMPP Chair and staff met with RA and CJ on Thursday 5th March. MD returned the Plan with comments on Friday 6th March. There are comments from RA, CJ and other policy colleagues. Other comments mostly focussed on updating statistics, adding in more recent bits of legislation and policy and including reference to terrestrial elements where appropriate to enable the Plan to be more closely integrated with NPF4 where there is an overlap between terrestrial and marine. There were a few remaining comments on some policies including the Climate Change policies and the Aquaculture policies, but they are relatively minor. There were some concerns from policy colleagues that our Clyde Regional Marine Assessment is looking increasingly aged. MD would like us to look at incorporating references to more recent assessments e.g. SMA2020 but still retain reference to the CRMA where appropriate.

The concerns over the CRMA also related to the HRA and SEA and how much both assessments were reliant on evidence from the CRMA, considering it is quickly going out of date. CC reviewed the HRA and SEA after the meeting with MD. There is mention of the CRMA in both assessments but also references to SMA2020. The HRA and SEA haven't been updated since 2023 so there is scope now to make amendments and update it with more recent data and statistics. CC contacted MD after reviewing both documents to alleviate any fears that they aren't entirely reliant on the CRMA, and amendments can be made to bring it more up to date before submitting to MD for checking.

The comments that we received do not contain any comments on the Sea Fisheries chapter. The new draft of the chapter was submitted to MD and circulated with members in the middle of February. It is being dealt with separately by MD. We hope that this will be returned to us by the end of March.

Discussion

- Members were content for CC and JBu to make any necessary changes to the Plan and assessments and submit to MD, but additionally some members noted they were happy to look at the Plan even in the short timescale, and would like to see MD's latest round of comments. JBu noted that some of the policy text still needs tweaked and plans to discuss amendments with MD at the next catch up in 2 weeks. If further discussion is needed, JBu may contact members for feedback.
- Suggestion to refer to the Marine and Coastal Restoration Plan in the assessments. Offer to contact Marine Laboratory in Aberdeen for their latest Finfish and Scallops surveys. Requested that we would like to make it clear to MD that we hope this is the last round of comments. Otherwise we can't adhere to the timeline for public consultation. Noted that we need to be mindful of the time required by Local Authorities to consider the Plan and assessments to approve to go to consultation.
- Noted that the Sea Fisheries chapter will need to be discussed and circulated with members when MD return the chapter to CMPP. Noted that a member had some issues with the draft chapter that was submitted to MD in February. Noted that it's important that the chapter reflects factual information.

ACTION: CMPP staff to amend the Plan and circulate to members
ACTION: CMPP staff to circulate the Fisheries chapter with comments to members when received from MD

5. Update on Consultation Documents

Drafts of the SPP, the consultation response form and the FAQ document were circulated and discussed at the September meeting. Edits have been made to these documents and were circulated in advance of this meeting. 2 more documents were also created and circulated – a summary document and a referral document. JBu will work on another draft of these documents in April after the Plan and assessments have been submitted to MD, so members can submit comments during the rest of March. A 3rd draft will be circulated at the end of April for comment, with the aim that a 4th draft will be circulated in the June Meeting Papers for discussion and potential approval at the June Members Meeting. JBu focussed on the changes made to the consultation response form, and the 2 new documents.

Consultation Response Form

JBu took the members through the document. At the September Members Meeting, comments were made that the consultation response form questions should be broken down further. It was suggested that each question for chapters 1-16 should include a sliding scale of agreement with each chapter's policies and recommendations, and an optional space for further comment. JBu made these edits.

Discussion

- Noted that by addressing policies and recommendations in the same questions, it may not be clear what respondents are responding to. They may have different opinions about the policies and the recommendations, so that should be broken down into 2 questions. There's a risk that by having policies and recommendations addressed in the same question, a respondent could answer part (a) of the question using the sliding scale of agreement to disagree because they disagree that the recommendations aren't policies. Other members agreed that it was necessary to differentiate between the 2 as the responses would be harder to analyse.
- Noted that the form may just need to be very long. Can write a short introduction at the start to make it clear that respondents do not have to answer every question.
- Noted that there was positive feedback for 'to what extent do you agree or disagree' as this is not leading or suggestive questioning. Request to update the sliding scale of agreement to 'strongly disagree' for 1 and 'strongly agree' for 5. Request to amend the text in the question from 'to what extent do you agree or disagree' to 'to what extent do you disagree or agree' as that is the order the sliding scale of agreement uses.
- Suggestion to amend the text used in the part (a) of each question to clarify that we are not asking 'will support the achievement of the Chapter's objectives', but instead we are asking respondents to what extent do you think that what is presented will achieve the objectives and does the Plan have enough in it to achieve what it is setting out to do.
- Noted that some Government consultations format their response forms in such a way that they are broken down into sections and respondents can click on the sections they wish to respond to. This will depend on what platform we use to host the form.
- Noted that we need to have a Word version of the form that respondents can download and share with others e.g. colleagues.

Summary Document

JBu took the members through the document. At the September Members Meeting it was requested that a document like this was produced to cover 2 key points – an explanation as to why Plan development has taken many years and outline why there has been significant changes to the policy text since the pre-consultation draft in 2019. The document is relatively high level. Everything that is covered in the document is publicly available information either through the draft plan or in minutes from previous members' meetings. MD are aware of the

drafting of the document but have not seen it. MD understand why a document like this is wanted by CMPP and don't have an issue with it. MD suggested that this document should be published separately from the consultation papers, and we can refer to it in the consultation response form. We could publish the summary document on the website.

Discussion

- The document needs subheadings throughout. In the final paragraph, suggested to add in that the policies are also there to guide developers, not just decision makers (note that the sentence in the last paragraph is copied from the Orkney Plan so that language has been approved by MD).
- Noted that the sentence re policies and recommendations is confusing, reads as if where policies have been weakened, we have created recommendations instead and that isn't the case. Requested to distinguish why we have policies and why we have recommendations and have separate clear sentences to explain. Suggested to not use the word 'weak'.
- Noted that we need to keep the language factual and that MD instruction has led to changes in the policy language.
- Requested to have stronger wording in relation to the Action Plan as well.
- In the 2nd paragraph, suggested to add a sentence that makes clear as a result of the process, members have had to accept a high level of compromise. Noted that a sentence like that will help when members are signing off for consultation. This kind of sentence may need to be repeated in other consultation paper.
- Question if the FAQs are part of the consultation documents and do they get signed off by MD? No, only the draft Plan and the SPP need sign off from MD. The summary could go as part of the FAQ document.
- Noted that the members are meant to represent their organisation/stakeholders but are there to reach a compromise, it should be a positive and not a negative. How it is phrased will be important.
- Noted that it needs to be made clear that the members had agreed to a set of policies, then many of them had to be amended in line with legal advice from MD.
- Noted that we need to consider who this document is aimed at (not necessarily the same thing as who is reading the document) as possibility for it to be misinterpreted.
- Noted that CMPP should be aware of the use of AI, and that AI isn't known for picking up subtleties or differences very well.

Referral Document

JBu didn't go through this document. However, made a note that this is early stages with just a few organisations for each sector listed, and welcome any suggestions from members on names to add to the list.

Discussion

- Noted that there was some confusion about what this document's purpose is. Some members thought it was going to be a list of organisations that have been involved in the development of the draft Plan, broken down by sector. However, the draft document contains organisations that haven't been involved in the development but are relevant to the different sectors in the CMR. Suggested that the document could list the CMPP members and the wider players under each sector in the CMR.
- Suggested that this isn't part of the consultation documents. Can be on the website separately as part of wider regional marine planning, with a list of CMPP members and a list of other organisations who are active in marine planning in the CMR.
- Question of GDPR about having named contacts on the website outside the membership, perhaps just needs to be organisations.

- Suggested to have a statement referencing the list on the website of partners.

SPP
JBu didn't go through this document but noted that there remain some issues with past and present tense, and clarification needed.

ACTION: Members to submit any comments on the consultation documents to JBu by the 17th of April.

7. Transformative Actions for Resilient Coastal Communities

The first TRACC meeting with Community Councils was held in November '25. A second meeting was arranged for January, which due to poor response was rescheduled for February. Unfortunately, the meeting was cancelled due to the same problem. The decision was made by the TRACC team to take a new approach that is slightly different from the 3 other case studies. After cancelling the 2nd meeting, several CCs got in touch to say that they are interested in the project, but they are facing a number of challenges which make engagement difficult.

The team are going to identify the CCs that are interested in having a discussion and set up some informal chats with them individually. The team also want to open this opportunity up to CMPP members. The Clyde team will have support from the wider TRACC team in conducting these discussions. The aim will still be to put together a core group of relevant individuals and organisations that are interested.

The first meeting in November did produce some good conversations with the CCs that attended and identified some of the problems that level of governance faces. There are potential benefits for having conversations between the TRACC team and CCs, and how to address the best ways CCs can feed into the wider governance systems and respond to issues such as coastal adaptation and sea level rise.

Discussion

- Noted that CCs can be apprehensive about working with outside organisations when many have had experience with multiple projects over the years that dimmish resource and capacity.
- Noted belief that the TRACC project has been framed incorrectly: spoken to various CCs and they have been interested in participating in the project, but they aren't aware of what is happening.
- The CCs don't have any ownership over the project, that sits with the TRACC team from the outset.
- The project has funding to review coastal resilience and use different forms of data and engagement to provide insight into how the governance system works for CCs and coastal resilience.
- Noted it's a multi-million-pound project but only £15,000 is made available for the case study area. There would be more buy-in if more money was available.
- Invites will be sent out to CCs that have expressed interest in the project so far but also to organisations.
- EW noted that she or a colleague would be interested in taking part in a discussion and would like to know more about the project.
- Noted that CCs are very different, and there will be different levels of interest and capacity to engage across the region. However, perhaps the CCs that are dealing with other pressing issues e.g. housing shortages, should be engaged in the project and not left behind. The previous point about ownership was echoed.

- Noted that there are several instances where academic led projects take an academic approach to engagement, and little to no recognition that it's a different speciality that doesn't always work with communities. It might not be suitable for this project as its in its 2nd year already, but this type of learning about what works and what doesn't when engaging communities should be fed back to the team, and if additional funding can be allocated to better support community engagement e.g. hiring an individual who is already embedded in the community. Unfortunately, it is UKRI funding so its distribution is structured and little to no flexibility for changes.

ACTION: CMPP Members to email the staff if they are interested in taking part in a discussion with the TRACC team over the next few months.

8. Update on Housing Options

There was not much more of an update than was already given in the Chair's Report. JBu thanked the local authority members for attending the meeting and MD for hosting. The Chair and the CMPP staff did not attend this meeting to allow for the attendees to speak freely to MD. Discussions will continue with relevant parties. Whilst finding another host is the preferred option, other avenues can still be explored. There will need to be further movement on this issue in the coming months as the NatureScot hosting arrangement has a hard stop at the end of March 2027.

9. Members Updates

RYA Scotland
RYA Scotland and other organisations were involved in a NMP2 meeting to discuss the recreational and marine tourism sector. It was a very useful meeting with a good turnout of stakeholders from across the sector.

RYA Scotland responded to the consultation on Scotland's River Basin Management Plan. Issues that were raised in the response included INNS and a move away from the terminology 'bathing waters' to 'recreational waters' as there are lots of groups of people using the water at all times of year. That change in terminology would require an update to legislation, but it was important to raise.

4Cs
In January, 4Cs organised a meeting with Lochgoilhead CC to discuss the planning decisions for the Loch Long fish farm. Despite there being significant objection in the communities, the Scottish Ministers gave the go ahead for the development. The meeting had a good turn out in person and online including fish farm representative, NGOs and an MSP. Many people expressed their dissatisfaction with the marine planning process and the problems with industry being able to lobby Scottish Ministers to influence decision making processes. Another meeting will take place soon.

Glasgow City Region
GCR are now working on the scoping exercise for the new Regional Spatial Strategy. There will be several workshops held with the Heads of Service of each of the 8 local authorities within the Glasgow City Region and a workshop with the members of the new Regional Spatial Planning Sub-Committee (in place of the former Joint-Committee). Will be looking to engage with other stakeholders in the near future.

The Clyde Mission Masterplan is progressing quickly. There were a number of engagement sessions held over the past 2 months.

The deadline for the first round of funding for the Heat Decarbonisation Fund was at the end of February. There were a number of EOIs but only a few projects were suitable for the fund, but they are well developed projects and look to be able to contribute significantly to the aim of heat decarbonisation.

Renfrewshire Council's evidence report got through gate check before Christmas. Glasgow City Council are looking to progress to a draft proposed plan later this summer. Inverclyde Council and West Dumbartonshire are still working on the development of their Plans.

10. AOB

The CMPP team will be attending the next Regional Marine Planning Forum (RMPF) tomorrow (Wed 11th March). This will be the 4th RMPF and will be held online. The Short Life Working Groups were established at the 2nd RMPF last year, but progress has been slow due to other priorities. JBu is the NMP2 workstream representative and attended a workshop with the consultants working on NMP2 in January. CC is the Research and Engagement workstream representative. Unfortunately, the first meeting has been cancelled twice and is yet to have a rescheduled date. AG is the lessons learned and guidance workstream representative and attended the first meeting in February. An update on any relevant discussions will be given at the next Members Meeting.

Which version of the draft Plan will be the final version, when will that be available and how long will each member have to sign it off? CMPP need to reach agreement with RA and CJ that the Plan and its assessments can be submitted to Scottish Ministers for sign off. Hopefully the draft that CC and JBu will work on over the next few weeks will be the final draft and we will receive no further comments from MD. The version that CMPP staff submit to MD will also be circulated to members. We will then need to wait to hear if MD are content with that draft. However, that might not be the final draft. The CMPP staff will email all members with the Plan, assessments and an accompanying email to state this is the version we would like the representatives to take to their organisations for approval to go to consultation and when we need a response by. We hope to be able to circulate this email with the draft documents by the end of April/start of May, but that will depend on a few factors. As stated earlier, the Fisheries chapter is being dealt with separately, and we hope to receive feedback on that by the end of March. The CMPP staff will come back to members on that chapter for comments.

Will the Scottish Election have any impact on CMPP's progress to consultation, or any impact on other organisations that could impact of us? CMPP can continue working with MD during the pre-election period (26th March-6th May). For local authorities, it varies. TL noted for North Ayrshire that there are Planning Committees scheduled during the pre-election period but unsure if they will go ahead. That might depend on who is on the Planning Committee and if they are standing for election, as the meeting would need to be quorate to go ahead, and if there are enough items on the agenda to warrant the meeting going ahead. Additionally, most local authorities do not hold a Planning Committee meeting in July due to summer recess. JBu is in contact with all the local authorities about timelines and requirements and will continue to speak to them on a regular basis to ensure we can work to the proposed timeline and if any adjustments need to be made.

Request for the accompanying email that will be sent to all members with the draft plan and assessments for sign off to go to consultation, to make it clear that there has been compromise amongst the members and this sign off is to approve the current draft to go out

to consultation, not this is the final draft. There is a risk that if it's not made clear to members it could lead to confusion and delays. Members will have an opportunity to respond to the Plan during the consultation period.

11. DONM

Tuesday 1st June
Tuesday 1st September

Reference	Summary	Status
03/02/12/2025	CMPP staff to circulate any updates on Housing.	Ongoing
01/03/032026	CMPP staff to amend the Plan and circulate to members	April
02/03/03/2026	CMPP staff to circulate the Fisheries chapter with comments to members when received from MD	By end of March
03/03/03/2026	Members to submit any comments on the consultation documents to JBu by end of April	By 17th April
04/03/03/2026	CMPP Members to email the staff if they are interested in taking part in a discussion with the TRACC team over the next few months.	Ongoing