



Combining Sea and Coastal
Planning in Europe
Marine Plan
Sustainability Appraisal
Report

Annex B Assessment Tables

Prepared for:

Dorset Coast Forum

Prepared by:

ENVIRON

Exeter, UK

Marine Planning Consultants

Bath, UK

Date:

November 2011

Project or Issue Number:

UK18-16802

ENVIRON

mpc
Marine Planning Consultants

Introduction

This annex contains the assessment tables which were completed during the stakeholder workshop on 12th October 2011. The assessment text within the tables has only been corrected for grammatical and formatting errors following the workshop and therefore is presented in note form.

The columns on the far right of each table have been completed by the Dorset Marine Forum in response to the appraisal mitigation and recommendations proposed in the tables.

SA Questions SOCIAL WILL THE MARINE SPATIAL PLAN?	Assessment Questions				DCF response
	Is this supported / conflicted in the plan?	If not, should it be, and if so, where?	What is the importance / nature of the impact?	Do you have any suggestions of how it can be made better, including alternatives?	
<p>a) Improve the health of coastal communities;</p> <p>b) Improve accessibility to employment, and decrease deprivation/social exclusion;</p> <p>c) Create conditions to improve health and reduce health inequalities, i.e. by promoting marine recreation;</p>	<p>a) TCC6, VEU1 and 2 HME11 REA9,10 and 11</p> <p>B) TCC1, 2, 3, SME1. SME10 because of the economic development around ports. SD1 – links to terrestrial plan as these plans have more control over employment. SME11. REA9 is supportive related to access.</p> <p>c) new policy needs to make reference to health and health inequalities.</p>	<p>c) New policy needs to make reference to health and health inequalities.</p>	<p>The aim of TCC6 is to promote community involvement and cohesion – hence a local positive effect on these criteria.</p> <p>There is a need to consider the possible future effects of climate change during the plan’s life span (20 years) e.g. flash floods, heat waves etc.</p> <p>Permissive policies towards development which enhance local economy would decrease deprivation leading to a local positive effect.</p> <p>TCC 3 should reduce the seasonal nature of the economy and providing year round employment would create an overall local positive effect on these criteria.</p>	<p>TCC6 needs to be strengthened to promote activities that are positive for health rather than just raising awareness of health issues.</p> <p>Suggest that an additional policy is included specifically with relation to human health – this is inferred in a lot of policies but not explicit. This could be done by splitting TCC6 to tease out human health needs to refer to activities, not just recreational activities.</p> <p>HME11 – there is a need to define / justify the use of one nautical mile.</p> <p>Suggestion to include a policy to promote local businesses and conditions to employ local staff/ up skill local community and to enhance local effects. The location of large businesses will be determined by other policies</p>	<p>Have split TCC 6 into two policies as suggested, new policy TCC 7 focuses on health and well-being.</p> <p>Have removed HME 11 as suggested in environment <i>proforma</i>.</p> <p>Feel this is covered by a positive attitude towards sustainable development, covered in TCC 2 and TCC 3. Also feel this is straying into community</p>

			Offshore renewables could make the local economy more buoyant with correlating local positive effects on health and other social factors.	and plans. TCC1, 23, and 4 all start with 'development' – there needs to be a glossary to define these terms.	strategies... Agree and done.
--	--	--	---	--	----------------------------------

SA Questions ENVIRONMENT WILL THE MARINE SPATIAL PLAN?	Assessment Questions				DCF response
	Is this supported / conflicted in the plan?	If not, should it be, and if so, where?	What is the importance of the relationship?	Do you have any suggestions of how it can be made better, including alternatives?	
<p>a) Have a positive impact upon any areas of environmental importance such as European sites. Nationally designated (Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), National Nature Reserve (NNR) and the species which these habitats support</p> <p>b) Aim to decrease the fragmentation and promote the interconnectivity of marine and coastal waters where appropriate.</p> <p>c) Provide opportunities for</p>	<p>a) HME1, HME2 and HME3, HME4 – seems to be adequately covered and supportive</p> <p>b) The plan also supports the marine protected area network, through HME1, HME2 and HME3, HME4, HME5</p> <p>c) REA7, 8, 9, TCC6 support the access to wildlife.</p> <p>Policies REA10 and REA11 might be in conflict, also REA5.</p>		<p>The policies, as would be expected from a range of conservation policies perform positively in regard to these criteria.</p> <p>The effect should be felt at a local, regional, national and international level due to the high level of designations present.</p> <p>However, there is potential that the plan is too conservative, to the detriment of development opportunities and enhancements that could arise through developer negotiations.</p>	<p>REA9 should say “...including under-represented groups.”</p> <p>There is a need to illustrate better how the plan goes beyond the statutory duties set out in legislation.</p> <p>The plan should be clearer in regard to developer contributions.</p>	<p>Agree, amended in the heading and policy</p> <p>Feel that HME 3 goes beyond European statutory duties, and at the same time there is a comment in economic <i>proforma</i> that HME 3 is too restrictive. Therefore no action taken.</p> <p>Agree; Addressed in justification for SME 3 – compensatory habitat and developer contributions</p>

<p>people to come into contact with, and appreciate wildlife and natural areas</p>					
<p>d) Have a positive effect on the landscape quality and integrity of the Dorset Coast? e) Conserve and enhance the AONB and avoid conflicts with the AONB management plan or Heritage Coast or World Heritage Site Management Plan Objectives? f) Policies protect and enhance the landscape/seascape resources? g) Ensure the resilience of landscapes and seascapes capacity?</p>	<p>d) - f) are largely covered through VEU1 and 1 and REA10 and 11. Although e) is not explicitly covered.</p>		<p>The policies are promoting the right type of development in the right places - a largely positive effect locally.</p>	<p>Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) need to be mentioned in the supporting text for HME1, 2, VEU1 and VEU2 – AONB and the Jurassic Coast’s world heritage status.</p> <p>The plan should define the scales of development – what is large scale in a Marine Plan?</p> <p>There is a need to address the cumulative impacts of development on the seascape character – or at least recognise this in policy.</p>	<p>Agree and done.</p> <p>Very hard to define what large scale is in the marine environment given 3D nature – could be submerged... therefore have altered to development.</p> <p>This is addressed in SME 2 with reference back to criteria laid out in box A. Will also address in justification of VEU 1.</p>
<p>h) Protect the seabed from inappropriate coastal use /</p>	<p>This is addressed in CAM1, SD1</p>		<p>A largely positive impact of the plan on these criteria. Although it is important to ensure that development is not prevented because all</p>	<p>CAM 2 should refer also to Beach Management Plans.</p> <p>There is a need to protect</p>	<p>Agree and done.</p> <p>Feel covered by</p>

<p>development and erosion</p> <p>i) Affect any designated sites for geology</p>			<p>development will affect coastal processes to some extent.</p>	<p>geological features such as the Shambles in addition to river beds.</p> <p>Suggest a policy to include deep water processes as well as the inter tidal zone.</p> <p>REA 3 – sensitive habitats could include wrecks – change to say 'sensitive features'.</p>	<p>criteria in Box A, SME 2 - have changed geology to geological features. Defined geological features in glossary.</p> <p>Agree and done.</p>
<p>j) Take into account the requirements of the Water Framework Directive and Marine Strategy Framework Directive and the chemical, ecological and hydrological pressures on the water environment</p> <p>k) Ensure sustainable use of natural resources and minimise the impact of waste disposal</p> <p>l) Limit water pollution to levels that do not</p>	<p>i) CAM2 and HME2 address all designated sites for geology. Geology also mentioned in Box A</p> <p>j) HME14 addresses MSFD</p> <p>k) refer to m and r</p> <p>l) Supported in HME7,8,9,10</p> <p>m) Supported in REA3 and REA4, SME8, HME8, HME10-11. Figure 19 refers to env sensitive moorings in relation to eel grass.</p> <p>n) Supported through</p>		<p>The plan is broadly supported by policies on water quality, natural resources and pollution. However there are a number of clarifications that could make a more positive effect.</p>	<p>Change the title of HME 15/16 section to 'reduction of litter to sustainable waste management and marine litter.'</p> <p>CAM1 needs to have "wherever possible" removed.</p> <p>HME14 – could be re-worded to state development should be consistent with Water Framework Directive and Marine Strategy Framework Directive. This policy could direct people to a planning checklist that DCC are looking to put on their website.</p>	<p>Agree and done.</p> <p>Agree and done.</p> <p>We have discussed this with terrestrial planners. If there was a policy framework which covered these issues, then we could omit and refer to that. But these are not in place (equivalent would be RSS or the relevant PPSs). Feel it is both necessary and justified to</p>

<p>damage natural systems</p> <p>m) Reduce contamination, and safeguard seabed / sediment quality and quantity</p> <p>n) Minimise waste, then re-use or recover it through recycling; and</p> <p>o) Maintain and restore key ecological processes (e.g. hydrology, water quality, coastal processes)</p>	<p>HME15 and 16. HME8 addresses liquid waste</p> <p>o) Supported through HME4, 7, 8, CAM1, SME8, HME10. Probably covers maintaining rather than restoring.</p> <p>REA8 possibly working against the criteria.</p>			<p>HME8 – just say “new developments”</p> <p>SME8 – beach replenishment – see economy objectives Water quality policies should apply to shell fish waters as well.</p> <p>HME 11 is largely obsolete – suggest deleted as it is covered in HME 10 – providing HME 10 is amended to remove ‘point source’ and refers to pollution across the board.</p> <p>There is a need to mention mooring of tankers and hazardous cargos anchoring in bays.</p>	<p>include at present, until MSFD more established in UK policy framework.</p> <p>Agree and done</p> <p>Agree and done with modified text to make clearer.</p> <p>Agree. HME 11 deleted., pointsource removed.</p> <p>Have had discussions with MCA about this issue; it is not illegal – rights of innocent passage in UNCLOS include anchoring. It is monitored by the MCA. There is also a bad-weather</p>
--	---	--	--	---	---

				<p>The use of the word 'industrial' is superfluous in policies. Include a policy that requires the re-use of dredged material.</p>	<p>anchorage in Weymouth Bay – could argue safer there than out at sea. Could have an economic impact on Port if ships were discouraged from waiting in Bay.</p> <p>Agreed and addressed.</p> <p>This is well covered by the MMO licensing requirements for Dredging and disposal under the waste framework directive waste hierarchy. – MMO work with applicants pre-licensing to identify suitable re-use of materials.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

<p>p) Provide a sustainable strategy for mixed used development on potential renewable sites?</p> <p>q) Contribute towards the national targets for greenhouse gas reduction?</p> <p>r) Ensure adequate resources for future generations?</p>	<p>p) SME 6 supports the co-location of uses</p> <p>q) see t) duplication of objective</p> <p>r) Supportive policies are HME6 – sustain fishing resources, HME7, 15 and 16, SME1, SS4.</p>		<p>Largely a positive impact to encourage co-location.</p>	<p>Need to indicate in the supporting text that a renewables capacity study has been undertaken.</p> <p>Need to state that offshore development is not just renewable energy but could also include artificial reefs, cabling etc.</p> <p>There should be provision for smaller off-shore renewable energy, including pilot schemes.</p> <p>The co-location policy (SME 6) should be more general and inclusive.</p>	<p>Agree and done.</p> <p>Agree and removed second sentence. Examples covered in justification in SME 6. Included wreck to reef example of fisheries enhancement, angling and diving.</p> <p>Agreed and integrated into CAM 6.</p> <p>Covered above.</p>
<p>s) Limit air pollution to levels that do not damage natural eco-systems or affect community health</p> <p>t) Have a neutral impact on or result in reduced greenhouse gas emissions</p>	<p>s) HME14, HME3, HME9, HME10 – are all supportive although they don't really address air pollution – wording is a bit vague.</p> <p>t) CAM5, CAM 6, REA7 – waterborne transport studies have focused on integrating</p>		<p>Waterborne transport study states that the network would achieve a net reduction in air pollution by transferring traffic (non-freight) to marine routes therefore a local positive impact on the plan.</p> <p>The plan's impact will be largely dependent on the interface with terrestrial planning and the effect that coastal erosion and sea-level rise might have on development and specifically access to the marine</p>	<p>HME9 should pick up exhaust materials from shipping</p> <p>HME14 – add air quality. There is a need to make sure that the impacts of cumulative developments are covered.</p>	<p>This is not practical can't avoid exhaust materials from shipping, could argue better than increased road traffic.</p> <p>Cumulative effects are covered under SME 3 Box A</p>

<p>u) Decrease the reliance upon fossil fuel resources and promote renewable energy technologies/strategies</p> <p>v) Reduce the number of individuals vulnerable to rising sea levels</p>	<p>waterborne passenger transport with public on land transport. HME15 waste disposal also supportive.</p> <p>u) SS4, CAM5 and 6 and ports policy (SME10). There a potential conflict with the tranquillity policy - REA10 in relation to wind farms, SME1, 5,(landside components) SME6, 7, 10 could be positive.</p> <p>HME14 could work against as could REA11. The link to terrestrial planning I important, SD 1 is supportive of this.</p> <p>v) Supported by CAM3, 4. SME4.</p>		<p>areas. SD 2 promotes the cooperation with terrestrial planning. This does assume that the terrestrial planning policies are in fact sustainable. Therefore there is a positive impact but the potential magnitude is unknown.</p>	<p>Is ocean acidification adequately covered? There is a pH reference in HME7 though. Need to check whether this is within the scope of the plan to address.</p> <p>General point – is it worth having a transport section? If not, suggest expanding SME10 that focuses on shipping.</p> <p>REA7 – does the policy need to refer to both commercial and passenger shipping. Add a reference to short sea shipping. Is a new policy on short sea shipping needed in SME policies?</p> <p>Need to cross refer to the discussion about tranquillity in economy b)</p> <p>HME14 – this policy is needed and wouldn't recommend removal or significant change.</p> <p>TCC 1 refers to deprivation, although this could be altered to reflect dissatisfaction although it is unclear how this could be</p>	<p>criteria. Air quality added to criteria and to HME 14.</p> <p>This is a global climate change issue, only way can address is through CAM policies...</p> <p>Policies support PHAL management plans which include ship handling etc.</p> <p>REA 7 is purely about passenger, so have addressed via new policy, SME 12</p> <p>Will address in economy section</p> <p>Agree, changes made by adding effects on people as well as environment.</p> <p>Not really sure</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>influenced by the MSP.</p> <p>Recommend to include a requirement for developer contributions to ensure community resilience to sea level rise in future.</p> <p>Need to support adaptation and diversification of coastal communities to sea level rise</p>	<p>what this means? We're happy that this policy addresses how marine development can help address deprivation.</p> <p>Don't feel we can be this specific, developer contributions are covered in SME 3 justifications – decision makers would identify most appropriate measures at time of application; this may or may not be linked to sea level rise.</p> <p>We have previously thought about this in depth; it is really the realms of terrestrial planning. Feel CAM 3 & 4 cover this as much as a marine plan can.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>w) Protect or enhance the cultural and archaeological historic environment, its features and/or setting</p> <p>x) Avoid loss of scheduled and other nationally and internationally important heritage assets and features</p>	<p>w) Supported by VEU5 and VEU4, VEU3 and TCC4</p> <p>x) Supported by CAM2 and Box 1</p>	<p>Recognise that there is a potential conflict between the objective and CAM1 and CAM 2</p>	<p>Largely a positive impact of the plan on the historic environment – although there is a concern that the plan might be too protective which ,might result in the failure to take advantage of planning gains to maximise the best elements of the heritage environment.</p>	<p>TCC6 needs to say cultural as well as natural environment</p> <p>VEU4 – look at wording to change to a positive slant. Early engagement is required for any development that is likely to disturb cultural heritage assets (define what is meant as an asset in supporting text).</p> <p>VEU3 to include reference to effects on settings as well – and seek opportunities to enhance them.</p> <p>VEU6 should say heritage of cultural assets not buildings</p> <p>Cross check against PPS5 to check for wording consistency</p> <p>Need to equalise VE3 with HME1.</p> <p>Plan should set out a positive and pro-active strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment in the plan area.</p> <p>SD 2 – land sea interface used – clarification need – does this refer to coastal of just development that extends from land to sea e.g. a pier?</p>	<p>Agreed and done.</p> <p>Agreed and done.</p> <p>Agreed and done.</p> <p>Agreed and done.</p> <p>Have done.</p> <p>Agreed. Addressed through new policy VEU 3.</p> <p>Have changed wording to coastal zone. Will define in Glossary.</p>
--	---	--	--	---	--

SA Questions ECONOMY WILL THE MARINE SPATIAL PLAN?	Assessment Questions				DCC Response
	Is this supported / conflicted in the plan?	If not, should it be, and if so, where?	What is the importance / nature of the impact?	Do you have any suggestions of how it can be made better, including alternatives?	
<p>a) Promote aquaculture and fisheries activities that increase job opportunities and food security using environmentally sound practices;</p>	<p>Job opportunities are addressed. SME5 is important – links to necessary infrastructure. Important to support the industry in terms of processing etc. The following policies support this objective: TCC3 TCC6 SME1 HME12</p> <p>TCC 5, SME11 and SME 5 are all drivers of economic development, HME 1, 3, 5, 6 and TCC1 and 2 go some way to containing this growth SD3 is also important to increase the evidence available to make decisions.</p> <p>The following policies work against / conflict with this objective:</p>	<p>Food security is not explicitly covered in the policies. However, it may be appropriate to include this explanation in policy HME5, HME3, TCC5 or SME11.</p>	<p>The policies taken together will be positive in relation to promoting aquaculture and fisheries. This effect has the potential to have a regional scale and occur over the long-term – providing an economic benefit for the South West. However, as a proportion of other economic activity, fishing employment is not considered significant. HME7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 also seek to improve water quality which will help fisheries and will have a positive effect.</p> <p>Some of the policies seem restrictive in relation to safeguarding the environment – HME3 in particular might be too restrictive and might reign in the extent of the economic benefits.</p>	<p>Amend SME5 so that it is less specific, i.e. remove the direct reference to fisheries? (delete the ‘such as’...).</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of a specific infrastructure policy to ensure economic effects are realised.</p> <p>By encouraging the diversification of the fishing fleet, the economic could be resilient to shocks in the future. This would complement TCC 3.</p> <p>SME8 needs to be reworded so that it leads to the provision of “an appropriate resource in terms of what already exists in the natural environment”.</p> <p>Does HME12 and 13 need to clarify the “areas defined”</p>	<p>Agree and done.</p> <p>Feel with the removal of specifics in SME 5 that this is covered.</p> <p>Don’t feel this can be covered in policy, but will include in justification for TCC 3.</p> <p>Agree and done – see environment <i>proforma</i></p> <p>Have combined HME 12 and 13, and</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SME8 – beach replenishment can introduce pollution / other problems and this can have an impact on fisheries if inappropriate material is used. HME 12 and 3 can be potentially restrictive to the fishing industry. HME3 is restrictive with relation to fishing. 			<p>Re-word HME3 to make this less restrictive.</p> <p>It would be helpful if food security is mentioned more explicitly in the policies.</p>	<p>point people to sensitivity maps which will be appended and available via GIS tool.</p> <p>Agree and have changed wording to 'have regard to' as opposed to 'no significant'.</p> <p>Included in justification for HME 5, 6 and SME 11.</p>
<p>b) Protect or enhance the tranquility of the coast;</p> <p>c) Improve accessibility to good quality marine areas and increase opportunities for outdoor recreation and exercise;</p> <p>d) Promote prosperity and quality of life benefits for the people and communities of</p>	<p>REA10, REA11 and TCC4 address tranquillity.</p> <p>TCC6, VEU5 address recreation.</p> <p>REA1, REA2, REA5, REA12 and figures 18a and b constrain activity.</p> <p>REA9 is supportive in relation to underrepresented groups.</p> <p>SME1 and REA8 – increases access to the coast.</p> <p>Communities SD1 and 2, TCC1, 2 and 3 – deal more with prosperity rather than quality of life.</p>		<p>Tranquil places are generally those that don't have car parks generating income. The retention of tranquility means in some cases the exclusion of other users in order to maintain tranquility – that is the value of the area can be negatively affected by its popularity. So there is ultimately going to be a trade-off between tranquil places and accessibility. However, this plan performs positively in regard to retaining tranquility and protecting tranquil spaces.</p> <p>There are therefore positive and negative implications of the plan in this context.</p>	<p>There is a test of significance within policy REA10 (significantly threaten) this needs to be defined.</p> <p>HME14 should clarify whether it refers to effects in reference to the effects on wildlife or the effects on people? Needs to be both?</p> <p>Delete the phrase on the natural environment.</p> <p>There is a need to reference guidance within the supporting text.</p>	<p>Agree, have removed significant as this is very difficult to define.</p> <p>Agree and have included people and wildlife.</p> <p>Agree and done.</p> <p>Agree, is in a footnote, but will also include in justification.</p> <p>Don't feel this is necessary, as</p>

<p>the Dorset Coast through appropriate levels of development surrounding the plan area;</p> <p>e) Improve and integrate marine planning throughout the Dorset coast and to take the importance of tourism and the economy into account.</p>	<p>HME policies support quality of life as they address the environment. HME14 – supportive on communities</p> <p>e) SD1, SD2, SD3 and SD4 relate directly to Improving and integrating marine planning throughout the Dorset coast. VUE5 and REA12 are generally supportive</p>		<p>Specifically the economic benefits of maximizing the tourism / recreation draw of the area and the potential indirect effect that these areas become less tranquil and therefore cease to attract visitors.</p> <p>SS2 may have an indirect negative effect.</p> <p>There is a difference between general access and accessibility for non-abled. The later should be focused on.</p>	<p>HME14 needs to reference REA10 (a catch all policy which lists several factors that affect tranquillity).</p> <p>The perception of tranquility is relative and therefore the measure/definition of tranquility needs to be included within the supporting text.</p> <p>REA2 - detail needs to be provided on how this is monitored and by whom.</p> <p>REA5 is working against but is a trade-off that needs to be made to protect the environment. Making the policy more positive should be considered, e.g. activities which are positive which are compatible with these uses will be supported.</p> <p>REA1 – needs to link to current plan processes rather than existing and remove “pre-date the plan”.</p> <p>Need to reference “existing recreational management plans” rather than zoning</p>	<p>covered adequately in SME 2, Box A criteria, also REA 10, REA 11.</p> <p>Agree and will include in justification of REA 10/11 and in glossary.</p> <p>Covered in justification – PHAL, Weymouth Harbour Master and beach managers.</p> <p>Don't feel this is unduly negative and difficult to have a positive policy. Leaving as is.</p> <p>Agree and done.</p> <p>Agree and done</p> <p>Feel that the figures</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				<p>plans.</p> <p>Maybe remove figure 18 as these will change over time – just show the harbour jurisdictions instead. Fleet should also be included.</p> <p>REA6 – why does all activity need to be restricted in this area? Almost don't need REA6 as this is covered in REA5. Consider deletion of REA6.</p> <p>SME10 needs to be reviewed to ensure it is compatible with existing and planned activities.</p> <p>The section should be re-named from “supporting sustainable development in Portland Harbour” to “Ports and Shipping” and needs to include both Portland and Weymouth Ports.</p> <p>Potentially need to be less restrictive with relation to HME3 and HME9 - need to define what is acceptable within policy or supporting</p>	<p>need to be here, there will be a link to the GIS planning tool; updates will be made here so the latest version will be available. A caveat on the marine plan figures will point people to the GIS for very latest data. Will include Fleet.</p> <p>Agree and deleted REA 6.</p> <p>Agree, have met with PHAL since SA workshop and discussed policies surrounding Port.</p> <p>HME 3 amended as <i>per</i> environment <i>proforma</i>. Agreed on HME 9, amended policy. Justification</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>text.</p> <p>Need to clarify where the reference to 6 nautical miles comes from.</p> <p>Focus policy REA 11 on honeypot sites to preserves tranquillity elsewhere. There is a need to make specific mention to the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site (JCWHS) and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) policies which promote honeypot sites.</p> <p>The MSP will need to closely integrate with the relevant LDFs in particular on car parking standards as this will have a direct link to the outcomes of the plan.</p> <p>TCC3 should be expanded to include Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>REA 9 should provide an example.</p> <p>REA 8 shouldn't just mention slipways. Should say 'access' not slipways.</p> <p>The plan should present its own definition of sustainable</p>	<p>will refer to new legislation on ship-to-ship transfer and licensing of ports.</p> <p>Agree and amended in line with recommendation</p> <p>Yes, agree with this statement and this is reflected in policies SD 1 and 2</p> <p>This is remit of terrestrial planning</p> <p>Covered in justification.</p> <p>Agree and done.</p> <p>Have used Bruntland and government</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

				development, or ‘resilient’ development. There is a need for a positive policy to promote integration with terrestrial planning and infrastructure.	definition within introduction to marine plan. Also definition within SME 1. This is covered in SD 1 and SD 2.
f) Protect or enhance the efficient use the planned areas existing ports, harbours, piers, marinas or slipways. g) Promote economic development h) Enhance and promote commercial and industrial assets. i) Support adaptation to the risk of coastal erosion.	<p>Ports Need to look at the access and egress to these areas as well. SS3, SS4, SME1, SME5 SD1, TCC2, TCC3 and SD2 would support this objective.</p> <p>Policies which may cause issues – HME9 unsupportive at the moment – define unacceptable</p> <p>SME10 only covers Portland not Weymouth. Is very focused on infrastructure works – needs to cover port development generally (include operational activities and access and egress to ports). SME3, HME3 and HME12 are restrictive</p> <p>g) refer to discussion under f</p>		<p>Positive impact overall although there are questions over whether the harbour is sustainable in the long term with regard to potential breaching of the causeway. It is uncertain whether the breakwaters will be maintained. Over 20 year timescale of the MSP, the Olympic Legacy will be positive in economic terms but beyond that period it will be too difficult to predict.</p> <p>There is potential for the cultivation of different species as seas warm and warmer water species occur further north <u>but</u> species could also be lost and there could be a lag between the point that current species move on and new species move in which may create economic fluctuations.</p>	<p>SD4 should say “quality data”.</p> <p>SME3 is potentially restrictive and needs to define ‘major development’</p> <p>Does the plan overly apply the language of the habitat regs to all major development and is this too heavy handed?</p> <p>Title of TCC2 what is the definition of higher skills? Should be defined and should reconsider the word ‘higher’.</p> <p>CAM1 – should be extended to address coastal flooding</p>	<p>Agree and done.</p> <p>Agree – see environment <i>proforma</i>.</p> <p>Have softened HME 3 and HME 12, plus discarded HME 11. Have discussed with terrestrial planners, and as there is currently not a policy framework in place which covers many of the MSFD criteria we feel it is justified and necessary to be more explicit.</p> <p>Agree, have deleted higher</p> <p>Agree and done.</p>

	<p>h) SME1, SME5 HME8 – relevant but not limiting. Reference back to ports activities</p> <p>i) CAM policies are supportive, SME4 is supportive</p>			<p>and erosion risk</p> <p>SME4 and SME9 - more general policies needed recognising both Portland and Weymouth ports.</p> <p>There is a need to emphasise the agreement between the port and the sailing academy to ensure future use for sailing is not compromised.</p> <p>For new species exploitability, the plan needs to provide for protection against ‘gold rush’ behaviour i.e. the rush to exploit a species that was otherwise absent needs to be managed / avoided.</p> <p>Invasive species policy needs to make specific mention of aquaculture.</p>	<p>SME 4 – don’t feel mention ports over other sectors is appropriate here; and strategic importance of ports is addressed in SS 3.</p> <p>Included in justification for revised SME port policy</p> <p>This will be the remit of IFCA via byelaws, Not sure we can create policy for this.</p> <p>Already mentions mariculture. Will expand more on specific issues surrounding invasive spp and mariculture in justification</p>
--	---	--	--	---	--