

## ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

---

COMMITTEE	Enterprise, Strategic Planning & Infrastructure
DATE	12 November 2013
DIRECTOR	Gordon McIntosh
TITLE OF REPORT	Marine Scotland Consultations
REPORT NUMBER:	EPI/13/197

---

### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to present the draft response on behalf of the Council for five Marine Scotland consultations under the heading 'Planning Scotland's Seas'.

### 2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the committee: -

- a) Approves the draft consultation response for submission to the Scottish Government.

### 3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications identified as a result of this consultation. The Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 states that marine planning functions will be delegated to a regional level via Marine Planning Partnerships (MPP). The MPP should consist of appropriate stakeholders including local authorities. At this level, the National Marine Plan will be implemented locally through a regional marine plan. By this time, there will be a better understanding of potential financial implications to the Council associated with this function. The exact timeframe for implementation is still not known.

### 4. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

The development of a National Marine Plan is a statutory requirement of the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010. Part 3 of the Act places a duty on Scottish Ministers to prepare and adopt a National Marine Plan, followed by regional marine plans. These consultations are some of the steps being taken to meet this requirement.

## 5. BACKGROUND/MAIN ISSUES

The Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 allows for the management of the competing demands on marine resources to be more effective. This ensures that the marine environment is protected and enhanced so that it continues to provide economic and social benefits for future generations. A comprehensive system of marine planning is required to ensure that environmental impacts are taken into account when new activity is being proposed. Marine Scotland has consulted on a number of proposals to take forward integrated marine planning for Scotland's seas and the Council has drafted responses to the following consultations: -

- a) Planning Scotland's Seas – Scotland's National Marine Plan Consultation Draft;
- b) Planning Scotland's Seas – Draft Sectoral Marine Plans for Offshore Renewable Energy in Scottish Waters: Consultation Paper;
- c) Planning Scotland's Seas: 2013 – Possible Nature Conservation Marine Protected Areas Consultation;
- d) Planning Scotland's Seas: Consultation Priority Marine Features; and
- e) Planning Circular: The Relationship between the Statutory Land Use Planning System and Marine Planning and Licensing.

Officers from within the Council (including Economic & Environmental Sustainability, Planning & Sustainable Development, and Environmental Services) have been consulted and contributed to the draft responses. This work has also been undertaken in partnership with the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Planning Authority.

- 5.1 **Planning Scotland's Seas – Scotland's National Marine Plan Consultation Draft.** Building on existing regimes, this paper sets out one framework for all activities taking place in Scottish Waters. The National Marine Plan (NMP) includes inshore waters out to 12 nautical miles which is governed by the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010, and offshore waters out to 200 nautical miles which is governed by the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.

The policies ensure sustainable development of Scottish waters and include the protection and enhancement where possible of the health of the sea. Policies include a presumption in favour for sustainable development of the marine environment; engaging with the public; using sound evidence in decision making; taking account of the achievement or maintenance of Good Environmental Status in Scottish waters; nature conservation, biodiversity and geodiversity; and encouraging marine activities that provide economic benefits.

In general, the Council agrees that the draft NMP clearly sets out the need to integrate marine planning and land use planning systems. It is evident what is expected of the Council in terms of the need for the NMP, however, it is not entirely clear how implementation will be

achieved. The Council's view is that more guidance is required plus the setting up of and being involved with Marine Planning Partnerships will also assist in its implementation.

The Council also supports the designation of national significant ports and harbours. This will ensure that there are links between the NMP and major developments included in future National Planning Frameworks. However, it has been noted that the proposed Aberdeen Harbour development has not been included in the NMP and the Council has requested that it be included. The Council has also suggested more emphasis on improving links to harbours and ports. For example, better links between the bus and train stations, along with the ferry terminals in Aberdeen could turn the area into a transport hub. The Council is also looking for more detail on potential oil spills, the impacts to the environment and subsequent claims for compensation should significant damage to the environment occur.

- 5.2 **Planning Scotland's Seas – Draft Sectoral Marine Plans for Offshore Renewable Energy in Scottish Waters: Consultation Paper.** Scotland's marine environment has great renewable energy potential including 25% of Europe's tidal resource, 25% of its offshore wind resource and 10% of wave potential. After taking into consideration the resource available, socio-economic and environmental impacts, this draft plan identifies future options for wind, wave and tidal energy developments. There are 10 proposed options for offshore wind energy, 10 for tidal energy and 8 for wave energy.

The Council supports the draft plan and particular the inclusion of option OWNE1 off the east coast of Aberdeenshire. The Council would, however, like to see included in the plan a mention of the European Offshore Wind Deployment Centre (EOWDC) which was consented by the Scottish Government in March 2013. The EOWDC will be sited in Aberdeen Bay and reinforce Aberdeen's place as the energy capital of Europe. There is also support for the identification of further offshore strategic development option zones in the longer term.

- 5.3 **Planning Scotland's Seas: 2013 – Possible Nature Conservation Marine Protected Areas Consultation.** A network of Marine Protected Areas (MPA's) has been drafted in this paper. This network will help to protect habitats and species (biodiversity) plus the landforms and natural processes that underpin the marine landscape (geodiversity). MPA's will offer more protection on top of other existing protection systems such as Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

Although there are no MPA's directly off the Aberdeen coast, the Council supports in principle the need for the network, plus, welcomes the future consultations on other areas identified for further study.

- 5.4 **Planning Scotland's Seas: Consultation Priority Marine Features.** Developed by a number of scientists, a list of Priority Marine Features (PMF) has been produced. These are key habitats and species (such as bottlenose dolphin to sea grass beds), which would benefit from site-based protection and / or other specific management measures.

The Council does not have the expertise to comment on the details associated with the individual PMFs, but do fully support the need for the list of PMFs.

- 5.5 **Planning Circular: The Relationship between the Statutory Land Use Planning System and Marine Planning and Licensing.** All activities in the marine environment will have impacts onshore. These impacts can include infrastructure requirements to impacts on communities in economic growth or decline. The planning circular highlights the links between marine and terrestrial planning systems plus provides guidance on joint working.

The Council agrees that the detail on the relationship between terrestrial and marine planning is helpful and appropriate. In particular, the circular discusses marine legislation, planning and licensing, plus, covers specific topics including renewable energy, ports and harbours, coastal defences, aquaculture and marine conservation.

The Council does highlight the need for more clarity over the roles for both marine and terrestrial planning when new harbours are being considered, as is currently under consideration in Aberdeen. The circular needs to be clearer that the impacts in both the marine and terrestrial environments need to be addressed together when considering consent. More clarity in the circular is required to tackle this.

## 6. IMPACT

The role of local authorities and Marine Planning will assist the Council in delivering a number of Single Outcome Agreement Outcomes including: -

1 - 'We live in a Scotland that is the most attractive place for doing business in Europe'.

2 - 'We realise our full economic potential with more and better employment opportunities for our people'.

11 - 'We have strong, resilient and supportive communities where people take responsibility for their own actions and how they affect others'.

12 - 'We value and enjoy our built and natural environment and enhance it for future generations'.

14 - 'We reduce the local and global environmental impact of our consumption and production'.

This report does not have an effect on people's equality and human rights, therefore, an Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment has not be conducted.

## 7. MANAGEMENT OF RISK

Taking part in the consultation process allows the Council the opportunity to shape marine planning for Scotland's seas. This will mean that the risk of the National Marine Plan for example, not being developed in a way that compliments and links with terrestrial planning in Aberdeen City is reduced.

## 8. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Aberdeen City Council response papers: -

- i) APPENDIX 1 - Planning Scotland's Seas – Scotland's National Marine Plan Consultation Draft;
- ii) APPENDIX 2 - Planning Scotland's Seas – Draft Sectoral Marine Plans for Offshore Renewable Energy in Scottish Waters: Consultation Paper;
- iii) APPENDIX 3 - Planning Scotland's Seas: 2013 – Possible Nature Conservation Marine Protected Areas Consultation;
- iv) APPENDIX 4 - Planning Scotland's Seas: Consultation Priority Marine Features; and
- v) APPENDIX 5 - Planning Circular: The Relationship between the Statutory Land Use Planning System and Marine Planning and Licensing.

## 9. REPORT AUTHOR DETAILS

Anne-Marie Gauld  
Environmental Planner  
[amgauld@aberdeencity.gov.uk](mailto:amgauld@aberdeencity.gov.uk)  
01224 522768

APPENDIX 1 - Planning Scotland's Seas – Scotland's National Marine Plan Consultation Draft.

**Q1. Does the NMP appropriately guide management of Scotland's marine resources?**

Aberdeen City Council (the council) agrees that the NMP appropriately guides management of Scotland's marine resources.

**Q2. Does the NMP appropriately set out the requirement for integration between marine planning and land use planning systems?**

The council agrees that the NMP makes clear the need for integration between marine planning and land use planning.

**Q3. Does the NMP appropriately guide development of regional marine planning? What, if any, further guidance is required for regional marine planners in terms of implementation and how to interpret the NMP?**

At the moment, it is clear what will be expected of local authorities in terms of the NMP. However, what is actually required to achieve its implementation is not clear. It is hoped that future guidance plus representation in Marine Planning Partnerships will help with this.

**Q4. The Marine Regional Boundaries Consultation proposed that in addition to regional marine planning, further integrated management of key marine areas would be achieved by designating the Pentland Firth; the Minches and the mouth of the Clyde as Strategic Sea Areas.**

**Should the NMP set out specific marine planning policies for Strategic Sea Areas?**

The council is unable to comment on this since SSA's will not directly affect ACC.

**Q5. Are the objectives and policies in the NMP appropriate to ensure they further the achievement of sustainable development, including protection and, where appropriate, enhancement of the health of the sea?**

Yes.

**Q6. Chapter 3 sets out strategic objectives for the National Marine Plan and Chapters 6 – 16 sets out sector specific marine objectives.**

**Is this the best approach to setting economic, social and marine ecosystem objectives and objectives relating to the mitigation of and, adaptation to climate change?**

Yes.

**Q7. Do you have any other comments on Chapters 1 – 3?**

No further comments.

### **General Planning Policies**

**Q8. Are the general policies in Chapter 4 appropriate to ensure an approach of sustainable development and use of the marine area? Are there alternative policies that you think should be included? Are the policies on integration with other planning systems appropriate? A draft circular on the integration with terrestrial planning has also been published - would further guidance be useful?**

The general policies in Chapter 4 appear to be appropriate. There are no other suggested alternative policies.

**Q9. Is the marine planning policy for landscape and seascape an appropriate approach?**

Yes.

**Q10. Are there alternative general policies that you think should be included in Chapter 4?**

No.

### **Guide to Sector Chapters**

**Q11. Do you have any comments on Chapter 5?**

**Are there other sectors which you think should be covered by the National Marine Plan?**

No comments on Chapter 5.

## **Sea Fisheries**

**Q12. Do you have any comments on Sea Fisheries, Chapter 6?**

The council has no comments to make on sea fisheries.

**Q13. Are there alternative planning policies that you think should be included in this Chapter?**

No.

## **Aquaculture**

**Q14. Does Chapter 7 appropriately set out the relationship between terrestrial and marine planning for Aquaculture? Are there any planning changes which might be included to optimise the future sustainable development of aquaculture?**

No further suggested changes to be included.

**Q15. Do you have any comments on Aquaculture, Chapter 7?**

No further comments.

**Q16. Are there alternative planning policies that you think should be included in this Chapter?**

No further alternative planning policies suggested.

## **Wild Salmon and Migratory Fish**

**Q17. Do you have any comments on Wild Salmon and Migratory Fish, Chapter 8?**

No comments on Wild Salmon and Migratory Fish.

**Q18. Are there alternative planning policies that you think should be included in this Chapter?**

No further alternative planning policies suggested.

## **Oil & Gas**

**Q19. Do you have any comments on Oil and Gas, Chapter 9?**

There is no specific consideration of potential oil spills, and depending on the scale, the resulting impact on the environment and potential claims for compensation. Should there be the inclusion of relevant environmental benchmarking around the UK coastline, and if so, how might this work in this context?

**Q20. Are there alternative planning policies that you think should be included in this Chapter?**

No further alternative planning policies suggested.

## **Carbon Capture & Storage (CCS)**

**Q21. Do you have any comments on Carbon Capture and Storage, Chapter 10?**

No comments.

**Q22. Are there alternative planning policies that you think should be included in this Chapter?**

No further alternative planning policies suggested.

## **Offshore Renewable Energy**

**Q23. Should the NMP incorporate spatial information for Sectoral Marine Plans?**

Yes. This will ensure that data for each relevant site is available allowing informed decisions and thus appropriate development in Scottish waters. However, who will be responsible for providing up-to-date spatial information?

**Q24. Do you have any comments on Offshore Renewable Energy, Chapter 11?**

No further comments.

**Q25. Are there alternative planning policies that you think should be included in this Chapter?**

No further alternative planning policies suggested.

## **Recreation and Tourism**

**Q26. Do you have any comments on Recreation and Tourism, Chapter 12?**

While it is mainly understood that a healthy natural environment is important for tourism, the council feels that there is a missing objective for the promotion of sustainable tourism which should include the keys for economic, social and marine ecosystem. Tourism, just as any other sector, should be encouraged in a sustainable way. While direct impacts to marine ecosystems may be less than other sectors, there are still cumulative effects with other sectors to consider.

**Q27. Are there alternative planning policies that you think should be included in this Chapter?**

No further alternative planning policies suggested.

## **Transport (Shipping, Ports, Harbours & Ferries)**

**Q28. Should the NMP specifically designate national significant ports/harbours as described in Chapter 13: Marine Planning Policy Transport 2?**

The NMP should designate national significant ports and harbours. This will ensure links with major developments included in the next National Planning Framework. There is no mention of the proposed Aberdeen Harbour development. This should be included in the NMP.

**Q29. Do you have any comments on Transport, Chapter 13?**

While there is an objective to encourage and support development of port and harbour infrastructure, the Council would like to see more emphasis on improving the infrastructure to allow better connections to ports through various types of transport and making better links with the surrounding areas. In the case of Aberdeen, the vision would be to turn the train and bus stations along with the ferry terminals into a transport hub through improved links. This would further help strengthen the links between marine and terrestrial planning.

**Q30. Are there alternative planning policies that you think should be included in this Chapter?**

No further alternative planning policies suggested.

### **Telecommunication Cables**

**Q31. Do you have any comments on telecommunications, Chapter 14?**

No comments.

**Q32. Are there alternative planning policies that you think should be included in this Chapter?**

No further alternative planning policies suggested.

### **Defence**

**Q33. Do you have any comments on Defence, Chapter 15?**

No comments.

**Q34. Are there alternative planning policies that you think should be include in this Chapter?**

No further alternative planning policies suggested.

### **Aggregates**

**Q35. Do you have any comments on Aggregates, Chapter 16?**

No further comments.

**Q36. Are there alternative planning policies that you think should be included in this Chapter?**

No further alternative planning policies suggested.

### **Business and Regulatory**

**Q37. Please tell us about any potential economic or regulatory impacts, either positive or negative, that you think any or all of the proposals in this consultation may have.**

The council has no further comments to add.

## **Equality**

**Q38. Do you believe that the creation of a Scottish National Marine Plan discriminates disproportionately between persons defined by age, disability, sexual orientation, gender, race and religion and belief?**

Yes  No

**Q39. If you answered yes to question 23 in what way do you believe that the creation of a Scottish National Marine Plan is discriminatory?**

N/A

## **Sustainability Appraisal**

**Q40. Do have any views/comments on the Sustainability Appraisal carried out for the NMP?**

No comments.

APPENDIX 2 - Planning Scotland's Seas – Draft Sectoral Marine Plans for Offshore Renewable Energy in Scottish Waters: Consultation Paper.

**Plan Development**

1. **Do you agree with the approach (outlined in Section 3 of the Sectoral Marine Plans) used to develop the Plans?**

Yes  No

**Please explain:**

The Plans should be reviewed in line with the National Marine Plan. The suggestion would be to use the same mechanism for gathering future data as has been used for gathering current data. Could the data be reviewed every 5 years in line with the plan? Setup a central records centre for new information, including information gathered as part of surveys for individual projects. The Plans Review Steering Group should include representatives from all key stakeholders of the marine environment.

2. **Do you have any views on the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal Report? Do you think that all the social, economic and environmental effects (positive and negative) have been identified? Are there other issues that should be taking into account in the preparation of the Final Draft Plans?**

There are no comments to make on this particular subject.

3. **The SEA has identified a range of potential effects from the Draft Plans. Measures for the mitigation of these effects have been identified in the SEA environmental report. Do you have any views on these findings? Do you think that the proposed mitigation measures will be effective? Do you have any additional suggestions?**

There are no comments to make on this particular subject.

4. **The Socio-economics Report has identified a range of potential impacts on existing sea users. Do you have any views on these findings? Do you think that the proposed mitigation measures will be effective? Do you have any additional suggestions?**

There are no comments to make on this particular subject.

**5. Taking into account the findings from the technical assessments, do you have views on the scale and pace of development that could be sustainably accommodated in Scottish Waters??**

There are no comments to make on this particular subject.

**6. Are there aspects of the Draft Plans that you believe should be improved? Are there any aspects you believe should be taken forward differently?**

**Please explain any reasons for your answer and provide details of any suggested improvements:**

There are no comments to make on this particular subject.

**7. Do you believe an appropriate balance, between tackling climate change, maximising opportunities for economic development and dealing with environmental and commercial impacts been achieved in the Draft Plans?**

Yes  No

**Please explain:**

No further comments to make on this particular subject.

#### **Draft Plan options**

**8. The Draft Plan for Offshore Wind Energy proposes 10 Draft Plan options. What are your views on the Offshore Wind Draft Plan options? Are they in the correct place? Are there reasonable alternatives that should be considered?**

**Please indicate which proposed Draft Plan option(s) you are commenting on using the relevant indicator (i.e. OWN1)**

The council supports OWNE1 which is the nearest and most relevant development zone to the council. This option appears to be in its correct place. The council is unable to comment on the other locations. No other reasonable alternatives have been considered.

**9. The Draft Plan for Wave Energy proposes 8 Draft Plan options. What are your views on the Wave Draft Plan options? Are they in the correct place? Are there reasonable alternatives that should be considered?**

**Please indicate which proposed Draft Plan option(s) you are commenting on using the relevant indicator (i.e. WN1)**

The Wave Energy proposals do not directly affect the council and is, therefore, not a position to comment.

**10. The Draft Plan for Tidal Energy proposes 10 Draft Plan options. What are your views on the Tidal Draft Plan options? Are they in the correct place? Are there reasonable alternatives that should be considered?**

**Please indicate which proposed Draft Plan option(s) you are commenting on using the relevant indicator (i.e. TN1)**

N/A

**11. Do you believe any draft plan options be removed from the Draft Plans for Wind, Wave and Tidal Energy?**

Yes  No

**If Yes, please indicate which proposed Draft Plan options you believe should be removed (using the relevant indicator), and explain why:**

N/A

### **Plan Implementation and Review**

**12. The Plans, once implemented, will be reviewed to take account of actual development and increasing knowledge of development factors. How often do you believe should this be done and why? Who do you believe should be involved in the Plans Review Steering Group, to oversee the review process?**

Please refer to answer for question 1.

## Strategic Environmental Assessment

**13. To what extent does the Environmental Report set out an accurate description of the current environmental baseline? Please also provide details of any additional relevant sources.**

There are no comments to make on this subject.

**14. Do you agree with the predicted environmental effects of the plans as set out in the Environmental Report?**

There are no comments to make on this subject.

**15. Do you agree with the recommendations and proposals for mitigation of the environmental effects set out in the Environmental Report?**

There are no comments to make on this subject.

**16. Are you aware of any additional on-going research or monitoring that may help to fill gaps in the evidence base, particularly relating to the marine environment and its interactions with renewable energy devices? Please give details of additional relevant sources.**

No.

**17. Are you aware of any further environmental information that will help to inform the environmental assessment findings?**

No.

### Additional comments

**18. Do you have any other comments you wish to make of the Plans and / or the related assessments?**

The Council would be keen to see an inclusion or mention of the European Offshore Wind Deployment Centre (EOWDC) which was consented by the Scottish Government in March 2013.

APPENDIX 3 - Planning Scotland's Seas: 2013 – Possible Nature Conservation Marine Protected Areas Consultation.

**1. Do you support the development of an MPA network in Scotland's Seas?**

Yes  No

The Council supports the need and development of an MPA network. Although there are no proposed designations off the Aberdeen coast, the Council fully supports the current proposals plus the future consultations on the area identified for further study.

**Individual possible Nature Conservation MPAs**

**2. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Clyde Sea Sill* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**3. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *East Caithness Cliffs* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation: Yes  No

N/A

Management Options: Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes  No

N/A

All of the above: Yes  No

N/A

**4. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *East of Gannet and Montrose Fields* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation: Yes  No

N/A

Management Options: Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes  No

N/A

All of the above: Yes  No

N/A

**5. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Faroe-Shetland sponge belt* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**6. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Fetlar to Haroldswick* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**7. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Hatton-Rockall Basin* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation: Yes  No

N/A

Management Options: Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes  No

N/A

All of the above: Yes  No

N/A

**8. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Loch Creran* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation: Yes  No

N/A

Management Options: Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes  No

N/A

All of the above: Yes  No

N/A

**9. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Loch Sunart* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**10. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Loch Sunart to the Sound of Jura* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**11. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Loch Sween* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**12. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Lochs Duich, Long and Alsh* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**13. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Monach Isles* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**14. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Mousa to Boddam* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**15. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *North-east Faroe Shetland Channel* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**16. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *North-west Orkney* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**17. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *North-west sea lochs and Summer Isles* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation: Yes  No

N/A

Management Options: Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes  No

N/A

All of the above: Yes  No

N/A

**18. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Noss Head* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation: Yes  No

N/A

Management Options: Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes  No

N/A

All of the above: Yes  No

N/A

**19. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Papa Westray* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**20. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Rosemary Bank Seamount* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**21. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Small Isles* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation: Yes  No

N/A

Management Options: Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes  No

N/A

All of the above: Yes  No

N/A

**22. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *South Arran* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation: Yes  No

N/A

Management Options: Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes  No

N/A

All of the above: Yes  No

N/A

**23. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for *The Barra Fan and Hebrides Terrace Seamount* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation: Yes  No

N/A

Management Options: Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes  No

N/A

All of the above: Yes  No

N/A

**24. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Turbot Bank* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation: Yes  No

N/A

Management Options: Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment: Yes  No

N/A

All of the above: Yes  No

N/A

**25. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Upper Loch Fyne and Loch Goil* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**26. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *West Shetland Shelf (formerly Windsock)* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

**27. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessment for the *Wyre and Rousay Sounds* possible Nature Conservation MPA?**

Designation:

Yes  No

N/A

Management Options:

Yes  No

N/A

Socioeconomic Assessment:

Yes  No

N/A

All of the above:

Yes  No

N/A

### **Choices to represent features in the MPA Network**

**28. Recognising the scientific advice from JNCC included alternatives for representing offshore subtidal sands and gravels, ocean quahog and shelf banks and mounds in the Southern North Sea, do you have a preference or comments on the following combinations to represent these features, bearing in mind Turbot Bank will need to be designated to represent sandeel in this region:**

Firth of Forth Banks Complex

Turbot bank and Norwegian Boundary Sedimentary Plain

Or Firth of Forth Banks Complex, Turbot bank and Norwegian Boundary Sedimentary Plain

No comment to make on this subject.

**29. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessments for the preference you have indicated in the question above, regarding alternatives for representing offshore subtidal sands and gravels, ocean quahog and shelf banks and mounds in the Southern North Sea?**

Yes  No

N/A

**30. Recognising the scientific advice from JNCC included alternatives for representing the burrowed mud feature in the Fladens, do you have a preference or comments on the following combinations to represent these features, bearing in mind the part of Central Fladen (known as Central Fladen (Core)) containing tall seapen (*Funiculina quadrangularis*) will need to be designated to represent tall seapen in this region:**

Central Fladen pMPA only

The tall sea-pen component of Central Fladen, plus Western Fladen

Or the tall sea-pen component of Central Fladen, plus South-East Fladen.

No comment.

**31. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessments for the preference you have indicated in the question above, regarding alternatives for representing the burrowed mud feature in the Fladens?**

Yes  No

N/A

**32. Recognising the scientific advice from JNCC included alternatives for representing offshore subtidal sands and gravels, offshore deep sea mud, and burrowed mud in OSPAR Regions III and V, do you have a preference or comments on the following combinations to represent these features:**

South-West Sula Sgeir and Hebridean slope

Or Geikie slide and Hebridean slope

No comment.

**33. Do you have any comments on the case for designation, management options and socioeconomic assessments for the preference you have indicated in the question above, regarding alternatives for representing offshore subtidal sands and gravels, offshore deep sea mud, and burrowed mud in OSPAR Regions III and V?**

Yes  No

N/A

APPENDIX 4 - Planning Scotland's Seas: Consultation Priority Marine Features.

**Q1. Do you agree with the recommended list of Priority Marine Features as the basis for targeting future marine conservation action in Scotland's seas?**

**If your response includes a suggestion to amend the list, please indicate the specific species and habitats that your comments apply to and, where possible, provide or reference any evidence or data sources which have influenced your comments.**

Yes  No

N/A

**General**

**Q2. Are there other issues that have not been highlighted in this consultation that you would like to mention?**

Yes  No

How often is 'periodic' in terms of the periodic review of the list?

APPENDIX 5 - Planning Circular: The Relationship between the Statutory Land Use Planning System and Marine Planning and Licensing.

**1. Is the Draft Circular on the relationship between the land use and marine planning systems helpful?**

Yes.

**Q2. Does the Draft National Marine Plan appropriately set out the requirement for integration between marine planning and land use planning systems?**

It appears to be reasonably set out. Although it is not entirely clear what the roles will be for both marine and terrestrial planning when new harbours are being considered, as is currently under consideration in Aberdeen. When determining an application for a new harbour it is important that consent is based on the total impact of the project on both the terrestrial and marine environments. Paragraph 58 onwards covering Ports and Harbours could make clearer the process for new harbours and how this will be taken into account.

**Q3. Do you agree with the suggestions for good practice in paragraphs 30-39, and do you have any other suggestions?**

It is agreed. No further suggestions made.