



## **Planning Scotland's Seas Consultation**

### **2013 SCOTLAND'S NATIONAL MARINE PLAN**

This page covers the response of the Scottish White Fish Producers Association to the above Consultation which was issued by Marine Scotland on behalf of the Scottish Government on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2013.

Fishing is already subject to substantial controls which are enforced by Marine Scotland and emanate from the Common Fisheries Policy or National fisheries policy. It will be subject to further controls as a result of the implementation of MPA protection and the consequences of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and Stage II of the introduction of the Water Framework Directive. We can see no additional management advantages coming to fishing or the management of activities in Scotland's waters as a result of the introduction of a Marine Plan and in particular regional plans.

Sea fishing deserves protection in the planning process in the same way as protection in the terrestrial planning process is granted to agriculture. Unfortunately the opposite is the case when it comes to be assessed against 'sustainable' development. Moreover, fishermen will not receive any form of compensation for the loss of their livelihoods and the potential socio economic impacts that will bring to families and communities.

## RESPONSE OF THE SCOTTISH WHITE FISH PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. It must firstly be outlined that we are extremely disappointed that Marine Scotland did not consult on the intention, which is deduced from the Plan, to place fishing on a lower category of importance than that accorded to those activities which fall within the definition of “sustainable development”.

### 2. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT.

- 2.1. In the response to the pre-consultation draft, the SFF, of which SWFPA is a constituent Association, also noted as follows: – *“It has been a disappointment that the recommended engagement between stakeholder groups has not taken place. Marine Scotland has an important part to play in making that happen. Long before any idea of formalising marine planning occurred, marine users and developers understood the importance of early engagement. That led, in the vast majority of cases, to an accommodation being reached between and amongst interested parties.”*
- 2.2. Notwithstanding this expression of disappointment, Marine Scotland did not seek to bring together interested parties to discuss how marine planning might lead to coexistence rather than confrontation.

### 3. DEVELOPMENT.

- 3.1. To understand an essential of the NMP it is important to understand the meaning of the word “development” as used in the document.
- 3.2. In the Town & Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1947. - 10 (2) In this Act, except where the context otherwise requires, the expression "development " means the carrying out of building, engineering, mining or other operations in, on, over or under land, or the making of any material change in the use of any buildings or other land:
- 3.3. Provided that the following operations or uses of land shall not be deemed for the purposes of this Act to involve development of the land, that is to say—  
(e) the use of any land for the purposes of agriculture or forestry (including afforestation) and the use for any of those purposes of any building occupied together with land so used;
- 3.4. It is therefore our view that in the absence of any other definition, fishing, in the marine environment, is not development, as agriculture is not, in the terrestrial environment.
- 3.5. Bearing that in mind where does that leave fishing in the context of the NMP and competition for space in Scottish Waters?
- 3.6. If fishing is not development, what is it? Probably it is best regarded as an “economic activity”.

#### 4. PRESUMPTIONS

- 4.1. The NMP contains no presumption in favour of existing economic activity against development. Indeed quite the opposite
- 4.2. This is evidenced by the first policy (GEN 1) of the NMP. It will be seen that sustainable development has a presumption in its favour, presumably against anything including existing economic activity. It is only thereafter in the next two policies that marine activities which provide economic and social benefits are encouraged, presumably in those areas which are not being occupied by preferred sustainable developments.

Subject Policy	Number	Policy Text
General	GEN 1	There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and use of the marine environment when consistent with the policies and objectives of this Plan.
General	GEN 2	Sustainable developments and marine activities which provide economic benefit to Scottish communities are encouraged when consistent with the objectives and policies of the Plan.
General	GEN 3	Sustainable developments and marine activities which provide social benefits are encouraged when consistent with the objectives and policies of the Plan.

- 4.3. This outcome of the NMP is unacceptable to the Scottish fishing industry. While the NMP nods in the direction of fishing and its contribution to Scotland's society, as we understand it, it proposes nothing concrete to protect it against new development. The fishing industry would be more cooperative in relation to the introduction of new sustainable development, if the NMP were to provide a fair balance. Regrettably, short term gain is allowed, once again, to conquer cu
- 4.4. It is argued that the presumption awarded in the NMP in favour of sustainable development breaches, in whole or in part or runs against the spirit of a number of the U.K.'s High Level Marine Objectives as follows: –
  - 4.4.1. HLMO 3 *“Marine businesses are taking long-term strategic decisions and managing risks effectively. They are competitive and operating efficiency.”* Quite apart from the ever-changing control regulations, it is impossible to take long-term decisions in respect of fishing activity if one's fishing grounds are at threat from sustainable development initiatives.
  - 4.4.2. HLMO 6 *“The use of the marine environment is benefiting society as a whole, contributing to resilient and cohesive communities...”* This may or may not be the result for coastal communities depending on fishing but there is nothing to protect

those communities against the risk of negative effects arising from sustainable development.

- 4.4.3. HLMO 9. *“There is equitable access for those who want to use and enjoy the... Seas and their wide range of resources and assets and recognition that for some island and peripheral communities the sea plays a significant role in their community.”* NMP carries no such recognition and indeed proposes possibility of exclusion of those operating from island and peripheral communities in traditional fishing areas.
- 4.4.4. HLMO 14. *“All those who have a stake in the Marine environment have an input into associated decision-making.”* It does not appear from the NMP or the sectoral plan on renewable energy that any views, which are contrary to the imposed presumptions, will be taken into account let alone the objections of those holding contrary views being given any weight in associated decision-making.
- 4.4.5. HLMO 17. *“Marine businesses are subject to clear, timely, proportionate and, where appropriate, plan-led regulation.”* It is enough to say he that the elimination of a marine business has the result of the giving of consent to a development is not proportionate. It is however difficult to understand this HLMO unless there were intended to be a comma between ‘led’ and ‘regulation’. Even then its meaning is far from clear!
- 4.4.6. HLMO 18. *“The use of the marine environment is spatially planned where appropriate... and recognises the protection and management needs of marine cultural heritage according to its significance.”* Fishing is part of Scotland’s rich marine cultural heritage. The NMP affords no protection for fishing against development. It only requires that planners take the fact that fishing occurs into account.
- 4.5. The Marine Policy Statement (MPS) deals with the matter of presumptions by avoiding it.
- 4.6. The MPS states: – *“It (MPS) identifies those activities to which a degree of priority is expected to be given in marine planning, but does not state, and is not intended to imply, which activities should be prioritised over any others. Relative priorities will be most appropriately determined through the marine planning process...”*
- 4.7. The NMP of course does give a priority, or preference, to development, as long as it is sustainable against existing economic activity, but it fails, convincingly, to make an argument to justify its position.

## **5. AGRICULTURE**

- 5.1. The SFF response has already established that the closest terrestrial activity to marine fishing is agriculture. The response goes on to detail the rationale for that assertion and I will not reiterate that here.
- 5.2. No recognition for fishing grounds is given in the NMP, far less a protective role as set in the SFF response. It should be specifically noted that there is certainly no preference given to sustainable development, which renewable energy generation development is assumed to be, even if full restoration is possible. No discussion of restoration, nor ensuring that funds exist for the purpose of restoration, is undertaken in either the NMP or the relevant draft sectoral marine Plan.

## 6. PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

- 6.1. With fishing, while agencies, such as MCA control aspects of fishing activity, it is the Scottish Government, through Marine Scotland which exercises by far and away the biggest control on activity. Much of the legislation involved flows from the Common Fisheries Policy. However national control can be exercised under such statutes as the Inshore Fishing (Scotland) Act 1984.
- 6.2. As with agriculture management of, and planning for, the enterprise falls, strategically to the owners and tactically to the skipper, of the vessel. The owner and the skipper may, of course, be one and the same person.
- 6.3. In an agricultural enterprise the management and the planning can only be executed upon the land which is included in that enterprise. The position at sea is entirely different. The planning can extend to any area in which the method permitted to the relevant vessel can be exercised. That area is defined by controls imposed by authority whether national or supra national.
- 6.4. It is understood that Marine Scotland does not intend to surrender its duty to control the Scottish fishing industry to marine planners, whether based in Edinburgh or regionally.
- 6.5. The fishing industry intends to retain its right to plan its activities in the best interests of each of its enterprises.
- 6.6. Although it seems inevitable that the spatial extent in which fishing can be conducted in Scottish waters will be restricted by decisions of planners, given that fishing activity is dynamic and is conducted on a national scale, it is only correct that those decisions are taken centrally by those who are responsible to the Scottish Ministers and through them to the Scottish Parliament.
- 6.7. We are content along with SFF that Regional Marine Planners and the bodies which employ them will not be responsible to any third party, for any planning decisions which they take.
- 6.8. The Sustainability Appraisal for the NMP gives an interpretation of part of Policy 3, relating to fishing, of the NMP. Policy 3 at its second bullet point says “... *effective marine planning should help to ensure: improve protection of the seabed through effective identification of high-risk areas and management measures to mitigate the impacts of fishing where appropriate.*”
- 6.9. That interpretation is: – “*Policy 3 identifies the need for protection of the seabed and the mitigation of impacts of fishing. We have therefore assumed that the term “sustainable” encompasses sustainable fishing gear issues and anticipate that the regional marine plans (with input from Inshore Fisheries Groups) will identify suitable regional/local policy regarding gear, using the national policies as a starting point.*”
- 6.10. In the relevant part of Policy 3 the word “sustainable” does not appear. Notwithstanding this local planners are enjoined to develop local policies with regard to gear and management measures to mitigate the impacts of fishing where appropriate.
- 6.11. It is worth taking a little time to examine the consequences of this.

- 6.12. The assumption made, given that the word “sustainable” does not appear, is without foundation. In any event the question of seafloor integrity is a matter for MSFD implementation and thus implementable at the UK level.
- 6.12.1. There is no suggestion in the NMP, itself, that the requirements of Policy 3 should be devolved to regional planners. It is not acceptable for that this policy does not surface in the draft Plan, but surfaces, without warning, in the Sustainability Appraisal.
- 6.12.2. It is not revealed how planners will obtain the knowledge, of fishing and fishing gear, to enable them to take the decisions required of them. The members of an IFG have no locus in contributing to such decisions.
- 6.13. It may be appropriate, at this stage, to nail the canard of seafloor damage. It is not denied that bottom fishing or dredging does have the capacity, in varying degrees, to alter the seabed. It may also be that damage is caused to the benthos. However it is ignored by those who campaign against bottom fishing that that is exactly what ploughing does to an arable field. There are controls, in certain cases to prevent fishing activity affecting margins but there is absolutely no policy, let alone legislation, which prevents the turning over of a field, the consequence of which is that the surface is altered and the benthos equivalent is destroyed.
- 6.14. It is incomprehensible that it be proposed that the task of marine environment protection which, in terms of the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010, and earlier legislation, is firmly imposed on Ministers should be devolved to regional planners.
- 6.15. Any suggestion, therefore, that Regional Marine Planners should have any duty or ability to amend fishing activity must be eradicated from the Plan, and thus the Sustainability Assessment.

## **7. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**

- 7.1. The following paragraphs are extracted from the SA.

*The NMP recognises its role in setting policy for the sea fisheries sector, within the context of the Common Fisheries Policy and the powers of the Scottish Government to put domestic management measures in place. Both objectives and policies recognise the pressures on biodiversity resulting from fishing and fishing practices:*

- *The objectives aspire to sustainable harvesting using maximum sustainable yield. They are also directed to changing specific fishing practices, including maximising annual quota opportunities, monitoring total removals from the sea (rather than landings) and tackling the issue of discards. They recognise the need to manage fisheries in line with international and national environmental priorities.*
- *The policies focus on managing fishing to ensure sustainability of fish stocks. They also identify the desired outcomes for sea fisheries of marine planning, e.g. protection of vulnerable stocks, improved protection of the seabed, and the need for other sectors (when planning their activities) to take into account the need to protect fish and shellfish stocks and sustain healthy fisheries. There is also an overall requirement for other sectors to consider the environmental impact on fishing generally.*

*Most of the policies are focused on the sustainability of the sea fisheries sector but, in doing so; they have positive implications for the sustainability of fish stocks as well.*

*The aspiration to maximise annual quota opportunities (Objective 2) should be viewed in the light of the aspiration to fish at maximum sustainable yield: the two should work together in the long-term to achieve sustainable fish stocks. In addition the cross-cutting general policies will assist both Scottish Government and regional marine plans in reducing the effect of fisheries on biodiversity in the long term.*

*It is anticipated that, in the long term, these policies and objectives (taken together with the cross-cutting general policies) will have positive implications for biodiversity.*

- 7.2. These proposals come as no surprise, They are well known as a result of involvement with MSFD, CFP and Government Policies. Why they should appear in the Scottish Marine Plan is not explained.
- 7.3. We understand that for the instruction of third parties it is important for the SMP to relate the legislative restrictions applicable to fishing activity, including effort, to be set out, demonstrating that control has exercised outside the boundaries of the NMP. However, to insinuate that somehow these legislative requirements should also be part of the SMP is improper.
- 7.4. The SMP may, and probably should, carry a description of the legislative framework but policies to implement the legislation must be left outside the Plan.
- 7.5. The Sustainability Appraisal contains a Table (3) which sets out the objectives of the NMP. The first four are of considerable interest.
- 7.6. *Will the draft Plan: –*

*1 Support the development of a sustainable marine economy?*

The draft Plan supports the development of the marine economy. However it is not clear that the development will be sustainable. Marine Scotland has adopted, where it requires, for each activity, a different definition of 'sustainable'. To the cynical it would appear that justification for development can be obtained if the definition of 'sustainable' is amended to suit the intended outcome. This is, to say the least, disappointing when the future of our marine environment depends on intelligent and consistent drafting.

*2 Contribute to the growth of any marine industry without detriment to another?*

The answer to that question would have been in the affirmative if the NMP had striven to achieve that. However it is clear from the NMP and much clearer from the Renewable Energy sectoral marine plan that such contribution is not intended.

*3 Safeguard and/or create jobs that support new or existing communities?*

Again looking to the Renewable Energy sectoral Marine plan it is clear that safeguarding existing jobs is not considered of any consequence when the adverse effect of the introduction of a new, yet untried, activity, upon existing jobs is

regarded as minimal. It is unclear what the attitude to those jobs would have been had the effect not been contrived to appear minimal but had been higher.

#### *4 Remove or avoid barriers to new marine enterprise opportunities?*

New marine enterprise opportunities, if they can be classed within the definition of sustainable development have barriers to their approval removed by the presumption given. It is incidental the effect that that may have on existing activity which is important to fragile and remote coastal communities.

### **8. POLICY COMPETITION**

- 8.1. There is no doubt that the Scottish Government regards the activity of commercial sea fishing as important at both local and national levels. It is a fact that fishing is a great deal more important, in economic and social terms, to Scotland than it is to the rest of the United Kingdom. It is not clear, however, where fishing lies in comparison to other marine uses. It is of concern to us that if we examine the SMP and in particular policy Renewables 1, we find: – *“There is a presumption in favour of adopted Plan Options identified through the Sectoral Marine Plan process. The inclusion of these adopted Plan Options in the National Marine Plan does not imply that licences or consents will be granted, but preference will be given to proposals within these areas.”*
- 8.2. Policy Renewables 3 contains another preference. *“There is a presumption in favour of renewable energy developments in areas identified to support the Saltire Prize.”*

### **9. BALANCE**

- 9.1. If the NMP is to be believed, every effort has been made to achieve balance. The Sustainability Appraisal suggests: –
- Avoidance or reduction of adverse effects has been built into the draft NMP, through inclusion of the cross-cutting policies. These set an overarching framework that applies to all planning and decision-making activities in the marine environment. The wide-ranging nature of these cross-cutting policies (sustainable economic growth, sustainable development, factors for consideration in decision-making – social, community, economic, environmental – as well as requirements for early engagement) means that they will act as balancing measures across the whole policy framework. Thus policies focused on development will be balanced by policies about communities or environment. Development proposals, for example, will need to be progressed and assessed in the context of this balanced policy framework.*
- 9.2. That has to be compared with *“There is a presumption in favour of adopted Plan Options identified through the Sectoral Marine Plan process.”* In any common understanding of any process, let alone the planning process, balance occurs when activities of equal merit, weight or importance are compared against each other. How can balance occur when, in the context of planning, one activity is preferred against another?



- 9.3. It goes further. As if a presumption in favour were not enough, definitions are amended in order to favour activities which already have that preference. One short example relates to renewable energy and the definition of 'sustainable' in relation to it. This is the wording *"For the purposes of this assessment, we have assumed that "sustainable" therefore includes avoidance of unacceptable adverse effects on biodiversity (e.g. obstacles to migration; noise disturbance during construction and operation; collision risk for birds, fish and cetaceans; benthic effects of anchoring; etc.). Taken together with the general cross-cutting policies, we therefore anticipate that adverse effects of biodiversity will be avoided."*
- 9.4. In the SMP reference to scallop dredging and bottom trawling any effect on the seabed is "unacceptable". Not so with renewable energy. "
- 9.5. The Sustainability Appraisal goes on to suggest that *"The objectives and policies together are working towards sustainable fishing practices and management, to ensure the sustainability of fish stocks (e.g. Policy 1). The potential for conflict between fisheries and other marine sectors is recognised, particularly in terms of competition for space, and the policies require that fisheries interests are taken into account in planning and decision-making, including engagement with fishers at the local level. This is likely to involve trade-offs between the sectors, which will be negative for some and positive for others. The key here is that these trade-offs would result from considered discussion and review, rather than through imposition."*
- 9.6. Here we find another anomaly. A presumption in favour suggests an imposition. The requirement that planners resolve conflict with the planning system implies an imposition.
- 9.7. It has been consistently brought to the attention of Marine Scotland that marine planning has been effectively arranged between competing interests, yet no recognition of this appears in the NMP.
- 9.8. On a practical level, it appears that national or regional marine planners will have the authority to interfere with and re-arrange the national agreement between the UK Fishing Industry and the Ministry of Defence in relation to dived submarine activity. The Code of Practice is a marine plan entered into between the relevant protagonists. Sectoral plans agreed between amongst the relevant parties should be endorsed as part of the NMP.

## **10. ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO MARINE PLANNING**

- 10.1. The Marine Management Organisation, in England, has exposed to the public its first draft plan on Marine Planning.
- 10.2. That draft plan recognises the importance of sustainable maritime development. However it is prepared to balance that importance against existing economic activity. For fishing it suggests the following as a policy.
- 10.3. *Within areas of fishing activity, proposals should demonstrate in order of preference:*
- *that they will not prevent fishing activities on, or access to, fishing grounds*

- *how, if there are impacts on the ability to undertake fishing activities and access to fishing grounds, they will minimise or mitigate these*
- *the case for proceeding with their proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the impacts*

10.4. Subject to the requirement for a displacement/impact assessment,, leading to appropriate solutions, we would support the above as a policy in the SMP.

## **11. FISHING RIGHTS**

11.1. It is assumed to be beyond argument that Scottish fishing vessels operating in Scottish waters are exercising the public right of fishing.

11.2. That public right extends to the vessels of other nations. It will be remembered that the UK Government in negotiating a 12 mile band around the coasts of the UK at the time of Common Market entry did not confiscate the rights of other nations to continue to fish in the 6-12 mile band.

11.3. Those rights were translated from custom into law. Scottish fishermen, however, have the benefit of Law to underpin their right. It is contained in the Fisheries Act 1705 passed by the Scottish Parliament.

11.4. Even if there is a valid national policy reason for riding roughshod over an industry which, even the Government itself recognises, is a crucial part of Scotland's cultural heritage and an important and, in some cases, vital part of Scotland's rural economy, no attempt is made in the NMP to suggest that, either the Developer or the State, or both of them, should compensate Scottish fishermen for the loss of their right.

11.5. The principle of compensation, whether by non-compulsory or compulsory purchase in respect of landholdings is an essential right and part of the Law of Scotland. Why then does the Government not propose such an equitable approach for those of the Scottish people who either are in the livelihood in the marine environment or depend on those who do?

## **12. CONCLUSIONS**

- 1. The public right to fish in the waters surrounding Scotland must be defended by the Scottish Government and places in which that right can be exercised should only be restricted if no other solution, in the public interest, can be found.**
- 2. The protection of fishing in the planning process be arranged on the same principles as proposed by the Marine Management Organisation for the English East region.**
- 3. The presumption in favour of sustainable development over and against existing economic activity be removed.**

- 4. If the public right to fish is to be expropriated as the result of a planning decision licensing consent, appropriate compensation must be paid.**
- 5. The legal controls applicable to fishing must be imposed and administered centrally by Marine Scotland.**
- 6. No part of fisheries control or management must be delegated to regional planners.**
- 7. The draft plan and associated documents must be reviewed to ensure that policy proposals appear only in the former and not the latter.**

NEXT PAGE: CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

## CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

Please identify the main area of interest with which you identify.

### FISHERIES

Comments

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

NO. It does not attempt to do so, and neither should it, as management is not a function of a plan

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

NO. Further work on this is required to ensure that "planning" applications are treated as a *unum quid*.

**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?**

Comments. What ever may be the position for sectors other than fishing, the management (aka. control) of fisheries must be carried out at a national level. Such management needs to be objective and not, as we have seen all too often, on a local basis, subjective. In any event fisheries in Scotland is a dynamic activity and thus can only be controlled at the broader scale.

**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?**

Comments. The difficulty in responding to this question is that the planning intentions for Strategic Sea areas are not set out in the draft NMP. This question therefore cannot be answered here.

**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?**

Comments. NO. Please see the text above.

**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?**

Comments.. The strategic objectives repeat various national and European requirements which cannot be avoided.

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

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?**

Comments

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

Comments. Although not of direct interest, there is a concern that the worthy proposals do not reflect what in fact will happen if certain proposed preferred areas for offshore renewable energy are developed.

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

Comments

**Guide to Sector Chapters**

**Q1 1. Do you have any comments on Chapter 5?**

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

Comments

**Sea Fisheries**

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

Comments. Please see the text above

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

Comments. Please see the text in section 11

**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?**

Comments

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

Comments

**Q1 6. Are there alternative planning policies that you think should be included in this chapter?**

Comments

### **Wild Salmon and Migratory Fish**

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

Comments

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

Comments

### **Oil & Gas**

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

Comments

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

Comments

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

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

Comments

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

Comments

### **Offshore Renewable Energy**

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

Comments

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

Comments

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

Comments

**Recreation and Tourism**

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

Comments

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

Comments

**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?**

Comments

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

Comments

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

Comments

**Telecommunication Cables**

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

Comments

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

Comments



## **Defence**

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

Comments

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

Comments

## **Aggregates**

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

Comments

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

Comments

## **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.**

Comments. The preference established in favour of 'sustainable development' over an hour against the existing economic activity which is fishing is indefensible and bass be deleted.

## **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?**

No

**Q39. If you answered yes to question 38 in what way do you believe that the creation of a Scottish National Marine Plan is discriminatory?**

Comments

**Sustainability Appraisal**

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

Comments. Please see the text above