



C-SCOPE Marine Plan

Sustainability Appraisal Statement, May 2012

SA Statement

1. Introduction

This statement is prepared in accordance with Article 9 of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive¹.

The SA identified that overall there would be minor positive effects from the implementation of the C-SCOPE Marine Plan. One minor negative effect was identified.

Recommendations were made which could further enhance the social, economic and environmental performance of the C-SCOPE Marine Plan. This Statement has provided information as to how these measures have been taken into account in developing the Final C-SCOPE Marine Plan.

2. Main issues raised in the Sustainability Appraisal Report

Social

In terms of significant effects, a number were identified: TCC6 will have the local impact of promoting community involvement and achievement will have a **minor positive** effect. The plan contains 'permissive' policies towards development. The impact of these is to allow 'sustainable' development to proceed and should therefore enhance the local economy and decrease deprivation, resulting in a **minor positive** effect

Reducing the seasonal nature of the economy and providing year round employment will have the impact of creating a more stable and resistant job market. The effect of which would be to create an overall **minor positive** effect on the local economy and reduced unemployment.

Offshore renewables could make the local economy more buoyant, if it attracts larger developers / companies the extent of the impact could be regional. It is likely this would have a **minor positive** effect in terms of employment and health.

Economic

The policies of the Marine Plan taken together will be positive in relation to promoting aquaculture and fisheries. This impact has the potential to have an effect at the regional scale and occur over the long-term – providing an economic benefit for the South West region. However, as a proportion of total 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 impact. Overall this is considered to be a **minor positive** effect on the overall economy and a potential **moderate positive** effect on the local economy, given its regional scale but small proportion of overall economic activity.

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. This will have a potential negative impact through the prevention of development. This is considered to be a potential **minor negative** effect at this stage, however it is uncertain whether this will materialize.

¹ Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment.

Tranquil places are an attraction to local residents and to those from outside the area. The tranquil areas are generally those that don't have car parks generating income as the car parks can detract from the very tranquillity people value. The retention of tranquillity means in some cases the exclusion of other users in order to maintain tranquillity – that is the value of the area can be negatively affected by its popularity. There are therefore positive and negative implications of the Marine Plan in this context. Specifically the trade-off between the economic benefits of maximising the tourism / recreation draw of the area and the potential indirect effect that these areas become less tranquil and therefore cease to attract visitors.

This plan performs positively in regard to retaining tranquillity and protecting tranquil spaces, thereby emphasising the importance of maintaining the attributes of these areas but perhaps not achieving the maximum economic benefits, this is therefore a **minor positive effect** on the local economy, where as it could be a moderate effect if economic benefits were prioritised.

There are questions over the long term sustainability with regard to potential breaching of the Portland Harbour causeway and breakwaters due to the impacts of rising sea levels and extreme weather events caused by climate change. It is uncertain whether the financial resources will be available to ensure that the breakwaters will be maintained. Over 20 year timescale of the Marine Plan, the Olympic Legacy will provide a **moderate positive** effect in economic terms but beyond that period it will be too difficult to predict.

Environmental

The Marine Plan's performance with regard to the environmental criteria, as would be expected from a range of conservation policies, performs positively overall. The impacts of the HME policies on biodiversity should be felt at a local, regional, national and international level in regard to the enhancement of these sites and supporting biodiversity resulting in a **major positive** effect.

The potential impact of the Marine Plan is to promote the right type of development in the right places including the co-location where possible of uses this is predominately a **minor positive** effect.

The plan should result in largely positive impacts on water quality, natural resources and pollution locally through the relevant policies resulting in **minor positive** effects. However there are a number of clarifications that could improve the outcomes of these policies – these are discussed in the following section with relation to mitigation. Waterborne transport studies state that the network would achieve a net reduction in air pollution by transferring traffic (non-freight) to marine routes therefore a **minor positive** effect on the plan in terms of NOx and PM10 potentially, but also this also has the potential to have a limited contribution to a global target of GHG reduction.

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 areas. This does however assume that the terrestrial planning policies are in fact sustainable. Therefore there is a **potential positive** effect but the potential magnitude is unknown.

There will be a largely 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. This should result in **minor positive** effect due to the local impact of these policies.

3. How Sustainability Appraisal considerations have been integrated into the C-SCOPE Marine Plan

The SA assessment set out a number of opportunities to enhance the social, economic and environmental performance of policies within the C-SCOPE Marine Plan.

3.1. Introduction

The Sustainability Appraisal Report that was published alongside the Draft C-SCOPE Marine Plan Consultation and identified potential social, economic and environmental effects arising from the policies in the Marine Plan. These effects were documented in the Non-Technical Summary to the Sustainability Appraisal and the Sustainability Appraisal Report.

3.2. Integrating the Sustainability Appraisal Report recommendations

The SA process was used as an opportunity to identify the potential for further improving the social, economic and environmental performance of the plan. With this in mind the Sustainability Appraisal Report made recommendations which included suggestions for changes to policy wording, and identified where actions needed to be considered carefully during their development.

The C-SCOPE Marine Plan contained 65 policies in total. The Sustainability Appraisal considered that the cumulative effects identified for the Marine Plan were largely positive, essentially focusing on the links between positive economic impacts and positive impacts relating to deprivation. A notable potential negative impact relating to the possible negative impact of restriction of growth caused by overly restrictive and conservative policies was identified. Many of the recommendations were subtle in their wording changes, but collectively they improve the robustness and overall performance and sustainability of the C-SCOPE Marine Plan.

All of the recommendations in the Sustainability Appraisal Report have been considered and a response made as to whether they should be accepted or rejected. This is all recorded in the annex to this document: Annex 1: Schedule of responses to recommendations made in the Sustainability Appraisal report. The changes to be made are clearly identified, as is the rationale when the recommendation has been rejected.

2.3.1. Incorporation of suggested policy wordings

Forty seven recommendations from the Sustainability Appraisal Report were accepted, and rejected in only eight cases. All of the details of this can be found in Annex 1: Schedule of responses to recommendations made in the Sustainability Appraisal report. This schedule contains not just the alterations to be made, but also reasons for rejecting recommendations.

4. How the opinions of consultees on the SA have been taken into account

Copies of the Sustainability Appraisal Report and its Non-Technical Summary were freely available to consultees on the C-SCOPE website during the Marine Plan consultation period which ran from 16th December until 9th March 2012. Two responses were received specifically on the Sustainability Appraisal Report, although 21 responses were received on the draft Marine Plan.

Table 1: Consultee comments on the SA and responses

Comment	Response
Chapter 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) report identifies ‘targets’ for the protection of underwater cultural heritage and we must ask for clarification regarding what these targets comprise and who set them	In this case it is referring more to ‘principles’ than targets, so we are referring to those contained within the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and the 1992 Valetta European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage.
Section 4.2 doesn’t seem to provide any information about ‘seascape’	Agreed and now included.
Section 4.3 (geology) includes summary detail about waste water discharge which should be in section 4.6.	Agreed and moved.
Section 4.11 mentions four protected wreck sites, presumably this captures sites in the wider marine environment adjacent to Dorset rather than specifically within the marine plan area	This is correct; there are no protected wreck sites within the C-SCOPE Marine Plan area, but it was felt that they were worth mentioning in the wider context.
Section 6.1.2 mentions mitigation, but in terms of landscape and seascape which describes character, how is the principle of mitigation applicable?	There is no mitigation proposed for seascape other than addressing /recognising the cumulative effect on seascape. Agree that mitigation for landscape and seascape is a difficult concept; ensuring development doesn’t conflict with the character as set out in policies VEU 1 and 2 are probably the best mitigation.
Section 6.1.3 describes commercial marine minerals resources which should be described separately from a general description of geological and geomorphological features	Agreed and now within section 6.1.9, Economy and Material Assets
Perhaps 6.1.11 could examine if other proposed projects in the area (e.g. ‘wreck to reef’) might actually relieve visitor pressure on other seabed wreck sites.	This would be a different assessment, in this section we are trying to indicate what the situation will be without the plan in general terms.
Table 9.1 (cumulative impact assessment matrix) requires re-examination (re ‘protection of the historic environment’) with regard to positive factors which should be achievable, subject to delivery of policies TCC 4 and VEU 4	Agreed, sympathetic development and restoration of historic environment could create potential positive effects on employment and social deprivation in the long term. Amended accordingly.

(see also the C-SCOPE SA Framework table).	
Table 11.2 also requires attention in that 'protection of the historic environment' should also include under 'effect' wider community support and visitor access to, enjoyment of and understanding about the historic environment with the monitoring indicator list to include the Heritage at Risk programme.	Agreed, and now included.

5. The reasons for choosing the plan as adopted, in the light of other reasonable alternatives

The Sustainability Appraisal Report considered high level alternatives from an early stage. Initially the approach was to assess the strategic approach of the Marine Plan i.e. to assess how the Marine Plan should be written and how it should be structured. The view was taken that this level of alternatives would result in no significant effects on the environment. With regard to the spatial strategy and the strategic objectives of the plan, the potential to develop strategic spatial alternatives at early stages of the preparation of the plan was considered. At this point, it was determined that there were no key drivers and policies (e.g. off-shore wind development, oil and gas licensing or aggregates) that would drive the spatial distribution of the MP. Spatial alternatives were therefore not considered in the development of the Marine Plan and not covered in the SA Report. Consultation on the Draft Marine Plan did not identify any other reasonable alternatives, given the geographic scope and objectives of the plan.

The Sustainability Appraisal Report recommended ways to mitigate and/or enhance policies to improve their performance, and most of these recommendations have been taken on board in the final C-SCOPE Marine Plan.

6. Details of monitoring arrangements

The C-SCOPE Marine Plan is non-statutory and at present (May 2012) it is unclear if it will be implemented. However, detailed monitoring measures were proposed in Section 11 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report, which will enable the early identification of unforeseen adverse effects and enable the responsible authorities to undertake appropriate remedial action should the Plan be implemented.

Appendix 14 of the C-SCOPE Marine Plan sets out a recommended set of indicators and how and when these are monitored. These have been adapted from those proposed in Section 11.

7. Additional amends

Following the consultation process, further amends were made to the Marine Plan. One additional policy was added, to address access to essential services such as water supply. The policy is a protective one and it was considered not to affect the outcome of the Sustainability Assessment or the Sustainability Assessment tables. All consultation comments and responses are available on the C-SCOPE website: <http://www.cscope.eu/en/results/marine-mgmt-plan/dorset>

8. Appendices

Annex 1: Schedule of responses to recommendations made in the Sustainability Appraisal report.



Annex 1: Schedule of responses to recommendations made in the Sustainability Appraisal report

This document incorporates into a schedule the recommendations made about the draft C-SCOPE Marine Plan in the Sustainability Appraisal Report.

Each of the recommendations made has been considered according to the following criteria in order to ensure clarity and consistency in the process of editing the Draft C-SCOPE Marine Plan:

A	Accepted	Formal recommendation accepted as written
P	Partially accepted	Formal recommendation partially accepted
C	Issue accepted but treated differently to suggestion	Issue addressed in Formal recommendation covered through other means
R	Rejected	Formal recommendation rejected
N	Noted	Comment noted, and not acted on because it is felt that the plan already adequately reflects the issue raised, or it would introduce too high a level of detail
T	Minor issues	Minor issues

The Sustainability Appraisal Report and other supporting documents are all available at <http://www.cscope.eu/en/results/marine-mgmt-plan/dorset>

For any further information, please contact k.buchan@dorsetcc.gov.uk

Table 1: Schedule of responses to SA recommendations on Social criteria

Recommendations for enhancement of the C-SCOPE Marine Plan in regard to Social criteria:	Response	Additional comments
Creation of new policy that explicitly addresses health and health inequality / deprivation	A	Have split TCC 6 into two policies as suggested, new policy TCC 7 focuses on health and well being
TCC 6 should be strengthened to promote activities that are positive for health rather than just raising awareness of health issues	A	Have split TCC 6 into two policies as suggested, new policy TCC 7 focuses on health and well being
HME11 needs to clarify the significance / justification of one nautical mile	A	Have removed HME 11 as suggested in Environment recommendations
There is the potential to include a policy that promotes local businesses which could have local impacts	N	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 strategies...
TCC1, 2, 3 and 4 all start with 'development' – this needs to be defined in a glossary as development means different things to different people	A	Included in glossary
There should be conditions in the plan regarding employing local residents and up-skilling the community where employment is not possible.	N	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 strategies...

Table 2: Schedule of responses to SA recommendations on Economic criteria

Recommendations for enhancement of the C-SCOPE Marine Plan in regard to Economic criteria:	Response	Additional comments
Amend SME5 so that it is less specific, i.e. remove the direct references (delete the “such as” ...)	A	
Consider the inclusion of a specific infrastructure policy to ensure economic effects are realised	C	Feel with the removal of specifics in SME 5 that this is covered.
Include a policy that encourages the diversification of the fishing fleet, this would work towards making the fleet more resilient to future economic shocks	P	Don't feel this can be covered in policy, but will include in justification for TCC 3
SME8 should be re-worded so that it leads to the provision of “an appropriate resource in terms of what already exists in the natural environment”	A	
Does HME12 and 13 need to define the “areas defined” in the policy	C	Have combined HME 12 and 13, and point people to Sensitivity maps which will be appended and available via GIS tool.
HME 3 used Habitats Directive language in regard to non-European designated sites. This should be reworded to avoid confusion (this applies to the plan as a whole);	A	Have changed wording to ‘have regard to’ as opposed to ‘no significant’

It would be helpful if food security is mentioned more explicitly in the policies;	A	Included in justification for HME 5, 6 and SME 11
There is a test of significance within policy REA10 “...significantly threaten...” this needs to be defined in the supporting text or removed;	A	Have removed significant as this is very difficult to define.
HME14 should clarify the “natural environment” – is this to include human receptors also?;	A	Have included people and wildlife
The perception of tranquility is relative and therefore the measure/definition of tranquility needs to be included within the supporting text of REA10;	A	Included in justification of REA 10/11 and in glossary
REA2 - detail needs to be provided on how this is monitored and by whom, probably in the supporting text;	C	Covered in justification – PHAL, Weymouth Harbour Master and beach managers
REA5 could be made more positive, for example encouraging activities that do not cause disturbance rather than discouraging those activities that do;	R	Don’t feel this is unduly negative and difficult to have a positive policy.
REA1 – needs to link to current plan processes, re-phrase to “...should conform to relevant recreational management / zoning plans...”	A	
Remove figure 18 as these will change over time – just show the harbour jurisdictions instead. Fleet should also be included	R/A	Feel that the Figure 18 is necessary. There will be a link to the GIS planning tool; updates will be made here so the latest version will be available. Will include Fleet.

Consider deletion of REA 6 as this issue is covered in REA 5;	A	Deleted REA 6.
SME10 needs to be reviewed to ensure it is compatible with existing and planned activities;	A	Have met with PHAL since SA workshop and discussed policies surrounding Port.
The section including SME 10 should be re-named from “supporting sustainable development in Portland Harbour” to “Ports and Shipping” and needs to include both Portland and Weymouth Ports;	A	
Potentially need to be less restrictive with relation to HME3 and HME9 - need to define what is acceptable within policy or supporting text.	A	HME 3 and HME 9, amended policy.
Need to clarify where the reference to six nautical miles in HME 9 comes from;	C	This was removed
Focus policy REA 11 on honeypot sites to preserve tranquility elsewhere. There is a need to make specific mention in the background text to the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site (JCWHS) and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) policies which promote honeypot sites;	A	
There should be an additional policy which links car parking to the provisions set out in the adjacent Local Development Frameworks;	N	Reflected in policies SD 1 and 2

TCC 3 should be expanded to include Green Infrastructure;	R	This is remit of terrestrial planning
REA 9 should provide an example in the supporting text;	A	Covered in justification
REA 8 shouldn't just mention slipways, this should be rephrased as "...existing access facilities...";	A	
The plan should present its own definition of sustainable development, or 'resilient' development;	N	Have used Bruntland and government definition within introduction to marine plan. Also definition within SME 1
SD4 should say "...quality data gathering";	A	
SME2 is potentially restrictive and needs to define "major development";	A	Defined in footnote
Title of TCC 2 what is the definition of higher skills? This should be defined in the supporting text	A	Have deleted higher
CAM 1 should be extended to address coastal flooding and erosion risk;	A	
SME4 and SME9 - more general policies needed recognising both Portland and Weymouth ports –possibly in supporting text;	N	SME 4 – don't feel mention ports over other sectors is appropriate here; and strategic importance of ports is addressed in SS 3.
There is a need to emphasise the agreement between the port and the sailing academy to ensure future use for sailing is not	A	

compromised;		
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;	R	This will be the remit of IFCA's via byelaws, Not sure we can create policy for this.
Invasive species policy need to make specific mention of aquaculture.	C	Already mentions mariculture. Will expand more on specific issues surrounding invasive spp and mariculture in justification

Table 3: Schedule of responses to SA recommendations on Environmental criteria

Recommendations for enhancement of the C-SCOPE Marine Plan in regard to Environmental criteria:	Response	Additional comments
REA9 should say "...including under-represented groups."	A	
There is a need to better illustrate how the plan goes beyond the statutory duties set out in legislation	R	Feel that HME 3 goes beyond European statutory duties, and at the same time there is an Economic recommendation within SA that HME 3 is too restrictive.
The plan should be clearer in regard to developer contributions	A	Addressed in justification for SME 3 – compensatory habitat and developer contributions
Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) needs to be mentioned in the supporting text for HME1, 2, VEU1 and VEU2 – AONB and the Jurassic Coast's world heritage status	A	

The plan should define the scales of development – what is considered large scale in a Marine Plan?	C	Very hard to define what large scale is in the marine environment given 3D nature – could be submerged... therefore have altered to development.
There is a need to address the cumulative impacts of development on the seascape character – or at least recognise this in policy	N	This is addressed in SME 2 with reference back to criteria laid out in box A.
CAM 2 should refer also to Beach Management Plans	A	
There is a need to protect geological features such as the Shambles in addition to river beds	N	Feel covered by criteria in Box A, SME 2 - have changed geology to geological features. Defined geological features in glossary.
Suggest a policy to include deep water processes as well as the inter tidal zone	N	Feel covered by criteria in Box A, SME 2
REA 3 – sensitive habitats could include wrecks – change to say “sensitive features”	A	
Change the title of HME 15/16 section to “reduction of litter to sustainable waste management and marine litter”	A	
CAM1 needs to have “wherever possible” removed	A	
HME14 – could be re-worded to state development should be consistent with Water Framework Directive and Marine Strategy Framework Directive. This policy	C	

could direct people to a planning checklist that DCC are looking to put on their website;		
HME8 – rephrase to say “new developments”;	A	
Water quality policies should apply to shell fish waters as well;	A	
HME 11 is largely obsolete – suggest deleting as it is covered in HME 10 – providing HME 10 is amended to remove ‘point source’ and refers to pollution across the board;	A	
There is a need to mention mooring of tankers and hazardous cargos anchoring in bays;	R	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 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.
The use of the word “industrial” is superfluous in policies;	A	
Include a policy that requires the re-use of dredged material;	R	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.
Need to indicate in the supporting text that a renewables capacity study has been undertaken;	A	
Need to state that offshore development is not just renewable energy but could also	A	Examples covered in justification in SME 6. Included wreck to reef example of fisheries enhancement, angling and diving.

include artificial reefs, cabling etc.;		
There should be provision for smaller off-shore renewable energy, including pilot schemes;	A	Integrated into CAM 6.
The co-location policy (SME 6) should be more general and inclusive;	A	Examples covered in justification in SME 6. Included wreck to reef example of fisheries enhancement, angling and diving.
HME 9 should pick up exhaust materials from shipping;	R	This is not practical can't avoid exhaust materials from shipping, could argue better than increased road traffic.
HME 14 – add air quality. There is a need to make sure that the impacts of cumulative developments are covered;	C	Cumulative effects are covered under SME 3 Box A criteria. Air quality added to criteria and to HME 14. (Now HME 11)
Recommendation to expand to include a discrete transport section, or suggest expanding SME 10 that focuses on shipping;	P	Policies support PHAL management plans which include ship handling etc.
REA7 –the policy should refer to both commercial and passenger shipping or include a new policy on short sea shipping in SME policies;	C	REA 7 is purely about passenger, so have addressed via new SME policy
HME14 – this policy is needed and wouldn't recommend removal or significant change.	A	Changes made by adding effects on people as well as environment. (Now HME 11)
TCC 1 refers to deprivation, although this could be altered to reflect dissatisfaction (although it is unclear how this could be influenced by the Marine Plan);	N	It was felt that this policy adequately addresses how marine development can help deprivation.

There is a need to support adaptation and diversification of coastal communities to sea level rise;	N	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.
TCC 6 needs to include cultural as well as natural environment;	A	
VEU 4 – 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);	A	
VEU 3 to include reference to effects on settings as well – and seek opportunities to enhance them;	A	
VEU 6 should say heritage of cultural assets not buildings. Cross check against PPS5 to check for wording consistency;	A	
Need to ensure consistency between VEU 3 with HME1;	A	Addressed through new VEU policy.
SD 2 – land sea interface used – clarification need – does this refer to coastal or just development that extends from land to sea e.g. a pier?	A	Have changed wording to coastal zone. Define in Glossary.

