



# Association of Salmon Fishery Boards

## Comments on the Consultation Draft of the National Marine Plan November 2013

### Introduction

The Association of Salmon Fishery Boards is the representative body for Scotland's 41 District Salmon Fishery Boards (DSFBs) including the River Tweed Commission (RTC), which have a statutory responsibility to protect and improve salmon and sea trout fisheries. The Association and Boards work to create the environment in which sustainable fisheries for salmon and sea trout can be enjoyed. Conservation of fish stocks, and the habitats on which they depend, is essential and many DSFB's operate riparian habitat enhancement schemes and have voluntarily adopted 'catch and release' practices, which in some cases are made mandatory by the introduction of Salmon Conservation Regulations. ASFB creates policies that seek where possible to protect wider biodiversity and our environment as well as enhancing the economic benefits for our rural economy that result from angling. An analysis completed in 2004 demonstrated that freshwater angling in Scotland results in the Scottish economy producing over £100 million worth of annual output, which supports around 2,800 jobs and generates nearly £50million in wages and self-employment into Scottish households, most of which are in rural areas.

### General comments

We welcome the opportunity to comment on this consultation. There is a clear and identified need to plan our activities in the marine environment in a strategic and consistent manner. Whilst the draft National Marine Plan moves us further in this direction, we are not convinced that the approach taken to develop the document has made such strategic decisions any more likely. This would appear to be largely a function of each sectoral chapter apparently reflecting the wish list of that sector rather than attempting to assess where and when activities should take place. The document does not adequately address the difficult questions of cumulative effects, or interactions between sectors. On that basis, the draft plan has failed to adopt an ecosystem approach to managing Scotland's Seas as required by Article 1 of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive.

As we have consistently stated in recent consultation responses, we do not believe that the numerous references to sustainable economic growth should not be included. This term has not been defined in law and we believe that sustainable development should be used throughout.

### Specific Comments

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

No. It is not clear how this document will be used by planners, regulators or marine planning partnerships, or indeed how useful the information contained within the document would be to them. Whilst the NMP sets out policies and objectives for various sectors there is no assessment as to whether and where such developments are sustainable, no attempt to address potential conflicts and no direction or guidance for planners/regulators as to how to deal with such conflicts.

The wording employed in the document is confusing and often potentially contradictory. The terms 'sustainable development' and 'sustainable economic growth' are used almost interchangeably throughout the document. We believe that the former should be used as

this is the terminology in the general duties under the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010. In addition, the word 'sustainable' is overused to the point of becoming meaningless. As an example on page 24: *The National Marine Plan embodies a **sustainable** approach to planning, development and use of the marine area. A presumption in favour of **sustainable** development and use is presented along with the other policies which are considered important in achieving a **sustainable** approach to **sustainable** economic growth.*

The purpose of the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 was highlighted by Richard Lochhead in his comments to the Scottish Parliament's Rural Affairs, Climate Change and Environment Committee (RACCE) hearing on 8 May 2013. Mr Lochhead stated: *the purpose of the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 is to protect our marine environment, so the outcome has to be that we find a way in which we can allow economic activity at sea while protecting the marine environment, which has to be the number one priority.*

We do not believe that the focus on sectoral growth is consistent with the comments above, particularly as many of these sectoral targets have not been subject to SEA or EIA. Until such time as the sustainability of such growth targets has been assessed (and in some instances the document makes clear that such assessments would not be possible until the completion of current and on-going work) it is entirely inappropriate to include such targets within the plan.

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

No. We do not believe that the draft plan provides a sufficient steer on how planners should integrate the two systems in practice. Policies GEN6 and GEN7 do not provide a framework in which such integration should take place, nor do they provide any guidance on which system should take priority or how differences or conflicting statements within the terrestrial and marine plans, or between different planning systems should be considered.

Going forward, it is important that there is a strong working relationship between the Marine Strategy Forum and the National Advisory Group for River Basin Management Planning. This has been raised at the MSF on a number of occasions, but has not yet been put in place.

**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?**

No. As stated above, it is not clear how this document will be used by planners, regulators or marine planning partnerships, or indeed how useful the information contained within the document would be to them. Whilst the NMP sets out policies and objectives for various sectors there is no assessment as to whether and where such developments are sustainable, no attempt to address potential conflicts and no direction or guidance for planners/regulators as to how to deal with such conflicts. There is no prescriptive or explicit guidance provided within the Plan to inform the preparation of regional marine plans. Further guidance for planners, regulators, marine planning partnerships and marine

users, is required, particularly in relation to nature conservation legislation and policy.

**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?**

If the National Marine Plan is developed in such a way that it adequately guides developments in a strategic manner, in accordance with the ecosystem approach, such specific policies would not be necessary.

**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?**

Chapter 3 sets out the National Marine Plan strategic objectives, which include the UK-wide High Level Marine Objectives and MSFD Good Environmental Status Descriptors. The former are set out under the five guiding principles of sustainable development, but each of these five principles is given an equal priority. This however, was not the way that these principles were set out by the UK Sustainable Development Strategy (as agreed by the Scottish Government). This document clearly states that: *We want to achieve our goals of living within environmental limits and a just society, and we will do it by means of a sustainable economy, good governance, and sound science.* This is vital as it clearly establishes that living within environmental limits and ensuring a strong, healthy and just society are the fundamental outcomes of sustainable development and the other three guiding principles are the means to deliver these outcomes, rather than a means unto themselves. Where a development is determined to be sustainable and appropriate it should go ahead, but there are equally strong reasons to identify areas in which no development should be permitted. In some cases these might even be areas where development has taken place in the past or present.

As far as the objectives themselves are concerned, ASFB has no difficulty with these – they are largely agreed at a UK or EU level and it would be inappropriate to suggest changes at this point. However, the relationship between these objectives and the following general and sectoral policies is not clear. All subsequent policies should be cross-referenced to ensure that they are in accordance with the HLMOs and GES Indicators. If they are not, they **should not** be included in subsequent chapters.

**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?**

Whilst we believe that the approach of setting out strategic objectives and sector specific objectives is reasonable, we do not believe that in practice this approach has adequately considered cumulative effects of activities, incompatibilities and conflicts between sectors

and between their associated sector specific and strategic objectives. As stated above, there must be a clear linkage between the NMP objectives and the subsequent sector specific objectives. If the latter cannot be demonstrated to be consistent with the former, they should not be included in the plan.

We have commented above on the focus of the UK Sustainability Strategy on the goals of living within environmental limits and a just society. We believe that the overarching aim of the National Marine Plan must be the protection and enhancement of the Scottish Marine Area, and any development should be consistent with that aim in order to be considered sustainable.

No reference is made to the scoping study on marine ecosystem objectives (SNH Commissioned Report 341). This report recommends a two tier approach: National Marine Objectives aimed at improving the management of Scotland's seas, and achieving the agreed Vision for Scotland's Seas; 'Bottom-line' targets (termed marine ecosystem standards) to ensure that human activities are not damaging marine ecosystems and the environmental goods and services they provide. We support this process and believe that such bottom line targets, which should take into account cumulative impacts, are vital to ensure that marine activities occur within environmental limits.

**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?**

We would suggest that the document states explicitly the relationship between the text included as policies within the box and the supporting text. What status does the supporting text have? Is it in fact part of the policy?

GEN 1, 2 & 3: Please see our earlier comments relating to the way in which the 5 principles of sustainable development are set out in the UK sustainable development strategy. For a development or activity to be sustainable it must respect all five principles of sustainable development. It is therefore unclear how GEN 2 and 3 should be interpreted. It could be argued that these policies are an attempt to put greater emphasis on economic benefits and social benefits respectively, to the detriment of the other 3 principles. We believe that a general policy relating to sustainable development (as defined above) should replace the first 3 general policies, as by definition, **any** development which was sustainable (as defined in the UK SDS) would meet all three of these policies.

GEN 4: We do not understand this – it does not appear to be a policy and should not be

retained within the plan.

GEN 6: Please see our comments on Q2 above. This policy should detail how differences or conflicting statements within the terrestrial and marine plans, or between different planning systems should be dealt with. There should also be a clear statement as to how prioritisation between different planning systems should take place. We would be concerned if consent through one planning system was used as a relevant consideration in determining consent through another planning system, rather than assessing the development on its own merits.

GEN 7: Whilst we support this policy, we are concerned that the only mention of an '*other statutory plan*' is River Basin Management Plans. There should be an attempt to highlight all such considerations, at least in an annex.

GEN 9: We strongly support this policy, but we are not clear how this would work in practice. If, for example, it was established that a developer had failed to undertake such engagement (and we can cite numerous examples where this has not been the case), would this be taken into account in any subsequent planning decision? If so, what weight would such a consideration be given? More information on how this policy will work in practice is required.

GEN 10: We believe there should be a stronger emphasis on the precautionary principle.

GEN 11: Whilst we support this policy, we believe that reference should also be made to the Water Framework Directive, as is the case with GEN 18.

GEN 16: We believe that this policy should make specific reference to cumulative impacts of noise.

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

No comment

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

No comment

**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 comment

## Sea Fisheries

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

Scotland's Marine Atlas identifies '*fishing, which impacts the seabed and species*' as one of the two significant, widespread pressures on the Scottish marine area. It is therefore unacceptable that reduction of this pressure is not addressed as a specific objective for commercial fisheries. Qualitative Descriptor 6 of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive requires that: *Sea-floor integrity is at a level that ensures that the structure and function of the ecosystems are safeguarded and benthic ecosystems, in particular, are not adversely affected*. Like all other species, wild salmonids rely on a healthy, well-functioning marine environment during the marine phase of their life-cycle and some commercial fishing gear has the clear potential to adversely affect large areas of seabed.

We recognise that the polices in this chapter have the potential to address some of these issues, but the way in which these policies are drafted, means that potentially contradictory policies are included under the same heading. We believe that strategic protection of seabed integrity is an essential step in recovering our marine environment, whilst being cognisant of the potential for displacement of activities. In many inshore areas there could be a win-win for wider environmental concerns (such as sensitive benthic habitats included on the draft list of priority marine features) and wild salmonid stocks, particularly sea trout. On that basis we believe that that the second bullet point of FISHERIES 3 (*improved protection of the seabed through effective identification of high risk areas and management measures to mitigate the impacts of fishing where appropriate*) should be included as a specific, standalone policy.

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

See above

## 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. Indeed, it is not clear where Chapter 7 even attempts to do so. There is no reference to the Town and Country Planning Act or the Controlled Activities Regulations. We are content that this relationship is adequately set out in the Draft Planning Circular, but we could find no reference to this document in the draft plan. We were intrigued to see that the Draft Planning Circular includes the following statement (Para 77): '*The Scottish Government expects that, in time, regional marine plans, and any supplementary plans or guidance associated with them, will provide the principal spatial framework for decisions about the location of new aquaculture development*'. We understand that this was discussed, and rejected, during the Parliamentary stages of the Marine (Scotland) Bill and so we are not clear where this statement has come from. It would appear slightly at odds with the earlier statement (Para 69) that: '*The Act empowers the Scottish Ministers to order that marine fish farming is not development under the terrestrial planning system*'.

*The effect of such an order, which can only be made with the consent of the planning authority affected...'* We would be interested to hear what discussions have taken place between the planning authorities and Scottish Government in relation to the statement in paragraph 77.

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

**Objectives**

We have a number of specific concerns related to the objectives set out in Chapter 7. The first objective is not governed by the marine plan and therefore should be omitted. Whilst we recognise that the industry has a target of increasing production, and indeed that this target is supported by Government, it is inappropriate to include such sector-specific targets within the plan. The plan should set the over-riding objectives, **within which** such targets must be delivered. Sectoral wish-lists (whether supported by Government or not) should then be examined in the light of those over-riding objectives. There is no mention of any assessment of the environmental carrying capacity for such growth in production. On that basis it is impossible to place a figure on a level of growth which is sustainable. The growth targets included in the draft plan have not been subject to a *specific* SEA or HRA and indeed, Part 4 makes clear that Marine Scotland Science has yet to undertake a project to identify areas of opportunity and constraint for both finfish and shellfish sectors. On that basis we do not support the growth targets expressed in this chapter and strongly advocate that such targets are removed from the specific objectives and policies in the plan.

We remain unclear on the ability of marine planning system to achieve several of these objectives. For example: *'secure quality employment and sustainable economic activity in remote and rural communities'* or *'maximise benefits to Scotland from the Scottish aquaculture value chain'*.

**Living Within Environmental Limits**

As mentioned above, there has been no assessment of the environmental carrying capacity of the environment for aquaculture. We support the presumption against further finfish farm development on the north and east coasts of Scotland to help safeguard migratory fish species. However, there are also important salmon and sea trout fisheries (from both a socio-economic and conservation perspective) within the aquaculture zone which could and should benefit from area-based protection. This was the basis for the development of a locational guidance planning tool by Rivers and Fisheries Trusts of Scotland. This work was funded by Marine Scotland, and it is clear that the resulting model has a significant role to play in the aquaculture planning process (and indeed it is already being used). District Salmon Fishery Boards are statutory consultees in the aquaculture planning process and on that basis, we believe that reference to this planning tool, suitably qualified, should be included within the National Marine Plan.

This chapter is the only sectoral chapter not to have a section on interactions with other sectors and instead includes some information relating to this in the 'living within environmental limits section'. Chapter 5 makes clear that all subsequent chapters should have a section on interactions. Given the high profile of potential impacts between aquaculture and wild fisheries in particular, we believe that this is a serious oversight.

On page 61, impacts on wild salmonids are discussed – *'Sea lice are natural parasites and*

*can pass between wild and farmed fish and vice versa*'. This statement fails to recognise the vast discrepancy between the number of potential hosts for such parasites in populations of wild and farmed fish. As a very rough estimate more than 95% of salmonid fish in Scottish coastal waters are farmed fish and therefore the **only** interaction which the plan and the regulatory framework can seek to address is the movement of sea lice from farmed to wild fish. Movement of natural parasites from wild to farmed fish is not under any form of human control and can only be addressed by an industry move to closed containment.

### **Climate Change**

One aspect of the climate change section which is not covered is that warming waters may result in an additional generation of sea lice per year, as has recently been experienced in southern Ireland. This has implications for the control of parasites and interactions with wild fish.

It is not clear why Map 10 receives such high prominence in the plan, or indeed is included in the policies (see below). This map only relates to benthic impacts of finfish aquaculture and does not consider any of the other potential impacts.

### **Part 3: Planning Policies**

AQUACULTURE 1: We believe that the wording of this policy is more appropriate than the objective to grow the industry.

AQUACULTURE 2: Specific reference to the location guidance arising from RAFTS' Managing Interaction Aquaculture Project should be made here.

AQUACULTURE 3: See comments above

AQUACULTURE 4: This policy is extremely limited in scope and should be removed. It is clear that nutrient enhancement and benthic impact are only two of several potentially significant impacts of aquaculture. Presumably the MSS project included under 'The Future' will supersede this policy. If this policy is to be retained, it should include specific reference to the MSS project.

AQUACULTURE 7: We support this policy, but it should be expanded to encompass the continual review of Farm Management Areas for reasons of disease and parasite control, particularly in the light of MSS work on sea lice dispersal.

AQUACULTURE 10: Whilst we support the need for pre-application consultation (see our comments relating to GEN 9 in Q8 above) we do not believe that the purpose of consultation is to seek support for an application. Rather it is to inform and help identify and address/mitigate the concerns of stakeholders. This policy should be reworded to that effect and avoid reference to aquaculture developers actively seeking community support for their projects. Due to the high profile of potential impacts between aquaculture and wild fisheries in particular, we believe that specific reference should be made to wild fish interests in this policy.

AQUACULTURE 12: Whilst we are comfortable with the references to wrasse as a biological control for sea lice on Page 59, we do not believe that this should form a specific policy in the National Marine Plan. The use of wrasse is still in its infancy in



Scotland and whilst there may be great potential for biological control we are concerned at the high profile that this aspect is given within the marine plan. We are unclear about, and therefore uncomfortable with, the precise meaning of the word *encouraged* in this policy. Does this mean, for instance, that planning applications which include wrasse will be looked on more favourably through the planning and licensing systems? We believe it is unlikely that the use of wrasse would form a binding condition of consent and therefore there would be nothing to stop an operator stating that they intend to use wrasse, simply in order to increase the likelihood of consent. On that basis, we believe that this wording needs careful consideration.

We believe that reference should be made to the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organisation International goals (as agreed by the International Salmon Farmers' Association):

- 100% of farms to have effective sea lice management such that there is no increase in sea lice loads or lice-induced mortality of wild salmonids attributable to aquaculture
- 100% of farmed fish to be retained in all production facilities

These should be the minimum standards for 'sustainable' growth of the industry.

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

An earlier draft of the document included the following objective: '*Reduce the environmental impact of aquaculture through good husbandry practice and bioremediation*'. We believe that this must remain a key objective, especially in the light of the industries target (supported by Scottish Government) to significantly increase production.

There are no specific policies relating to Farm Management Agreements/Statements. Whilst it could be argued that these are specific legal requirements of the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2013, the same argument could also be put forward for the Scottish Technical Standard, which does have a specific policy.

**Wild Salmon and Migratory Fish**

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

**Objectives**

We are unclear of the significance of the first objective to the National Marine Plan. On that basis we believe that it should be dropped, unless it is clarified how marine planning will be used for the management and regulation of migratory fish and fisheries. We would be content however, if this objective was redrafted to be consistent with the specific policy on Page 70.

**Background and Context**

We understand from discussions with officials that chapter 8 is intended to have a somewhat different emphasis than other chapters, as it is primarily about the effects of other sectors on such species. It would be useful if this aspect was more clearly explained in the background and context section (and past, current and potential future pressures

should be included). In the absence of such an explanation there is a clear expectation that a number of key issues should be covered by this chapter. These issues would include: exploitation rates within the fisheries; commitments under the North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organisation; and various issues relating to the management of mixed stock fisheries. On the latter point, it is not possible to make an assessment of the impact of coastal netting on individual stocks until the river of origin of the fish exploited by the fisheries can be characterised. Genetic analysis to determine the origins of salmonids caught in coastal netting in NE England established that coastal T&J nets are mixed stock fisheries (with approximately 80% of catches originated from Scottish rivers). This led to Defra's decision to include T&J nets in their existing phase out of coastal drift netting in North-East England. It would be a significant omission if this issue was not addressed by the marine plan (at the very least in the background and context section).

We are surprised that there is no mention of the conservation status of Atlantic salmon and sea trout, either at an International or National level. Map 11 should highlight the 17 SACs designated for Atlantic salmon in freshwater. In an SAC, member states must take measures to maintain or restore the listed species and such measures may need to be implemented outside the SAC (i.e. within the marine environment). The marine phases of both Atlantic salmon and sea trout are included on the draft list of Priority Marine Features - the habitats and species of *greatest conservation importance* in inshore waters. They are therefore candidates for protection, particularly under the 'wider seas' pillar of the Scottish Government's Marine Nature Conservation Strategy. This is particularly important, given the emphasis of the policy on Page 70. In our experience it is the Habitats Directive which has been the primary driver for such protection.

There is no reference to the role of District Salmon Fishery Boards, Fishery Trusts or indeed Marine Scotland, SNH or SEPA in the management of salmonid fisheries. If this chapter is to be useful to marine planning partnership and developers, it is important that the various roles of such bodies are set out in this chapter.

#### **Interactions with other sectors**

Commercial fishing should be included within this section. As noted above, there is significant potential for mobile gear to significantly impact upon marine feeding areas for sea trout. In addition, the SALSEA programme identified the potential for accidental by-catch of Atlantic salmon in pelagic trawl fisheries. It is now possible to identify corridors at sea that could be protected spatially and/or temporally from fishing pressure (in addition to other pressures such as marine renewables and aquaculture).

Reference should be made to the current scoping work being carried out by MSS in relation to marine renewables and migratory fish.

#### **Living Within Environmental Limits**

It is not clear what the relevance of including catch statistics for only one year (2012) is.

#### **Climate Change**

The focus of the climate change section is on climate change impacts in fresh water. Whilst such impacts will be expected to occur, it is not clear why the draft *marine* plan does not focus on those impacts in the marine environment. Recent research has demonstrated that changes in sea surface temperature, and associated changes in the distribution of prey items, correlate strongly with recent declines in marine survival of

Atlantic salmon – there is no mention of this in the document. A key strategy for mitigating climate change is to reduce human induced pressures on those species which are susceptible to the effects of climate change. The National Marine Plan has a vital role to play in building the resilience of species and habitats at risk from climate change impacts. A key aspect of this is to minimise human induced pressures (e.g. fisheries, marine developments including aquaculture and exploitation of the species) in order to preserve stocks.

**Part 3**

We welcome the as yet unnamed policy which recognises that the impact of developments on migratory fish should be considered in marine planning and decision making processes.

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

A previous draft included an objective to *'limit impact of coastal mixed stock fisheries and encourage reduction in annual catches to help preserve stocks'*. We believe that this objective should be reinstated.

**Oil & Gas**

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

No specific comments, subject to the retention of the policy within Chapter 8, which we would hope encompasses any and all impacts of the oil and gas sector on migratory fish. This policy should be cross referenced within the chapter.

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

No comment

**Carbon Capture & Storage (CCS)**

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

See answer to Q19.

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

No comment

**Offshore Renewable Energy**

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

No comment

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

**Objectives**

We are not sure that 'promotion' is the most suitable language to be employed in the National Marine Plan. More appropriate wording might be: To ensure that development of offshore wind, wave and tidal renewable energy is sustainable and occurs in the most suitable locations.

We do not support objective 2. See our previous comments relating to sustainable economic growth.

**Interactions with other users**

Specific reference should be made to potential impacts on migratory fish and fisheries. Significant research effort is currently being focussed on this issue and the MSS research strategy should be specifically mentioned in this chapter.

**Policies**

RENEWABLES 1: This policy should be qualified to ensure that any such proposals are consistent with the National Marine Plan and meet the requirements of nature conservation legislation including MPA designations.

RENEWABLES 5: The policy within chapter 8 should be cross-referenced here.

RENEWABLES 7: We support this policy but it should be expanded to include the following text: *to an appropriate and consistent depth to mitigate for any potential effects on marine species.*

RENEWABLES 9: We support the need for pre-application consultation but we believe that the reference to *users*, should be expanded to *relevant stakeholders* – please also see our comments relating to GEN 9 in Q8 above.

**The future**

This section appears to make an assumption that all renewable developments within Round 3 and the Scottish Territorial Waters sites will be delivered. This is not appropriate as all applications must be determined according to due process.

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

No comment

**Recreation and Tourism**

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

No comment

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

No comment

**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?**

No comment

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

See answer to Q19.

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

No comment

**Telecommunication Cables**

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

See answer to Q19.

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

No comment

**Defence**

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

No comment

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

No comment

**Aggregates**

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

See answer to Q19.

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

No comment

### **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.**

No comment

### **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?**

No comment

### **Sustainability Appraisal**

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

Please see our comments in relation to SEA in our response to Q15.



## National Marine Plan Consultation Draft

### RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM

Please Note this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately

#### 1. Name/Organisation

Organisation Name

Association of Salmon Fishery Boards

Title Mr  Ms  Mrs  Miss  Dr  Please tick as appropriate

Surname

Wells

Forename

Alan

#### 2. Postal Address

Capital Business Centre

24 Canning Street

Edinburgh

Postcode EH3 8EG

Phone 0131 272 2797

Email alan@asfb.org.uk

#### 3. Permissions - I am responding as...

Individual

/

Group/Organisation

Please tick as appropriate

(a) Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site)?

Please tick as appropriate  Yes  No

(b) Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis

Please tick **ONE** of the following boxes

Yes, make my response, name and address all available

or

Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address

or

Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address

(c) The name and address of your organisation **will be** made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site).

Are you content for your **response** to be made available?

Please tick as appropriate  Yes  No

(d) We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

Please tick as appropriate  Yes  No

## CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

Please identify the main area of interest you identify with :

Nature Conservation

Fisheries

Industry/Transport

Energy

Aquaculture

Recreation/tourism

Academic/scientific

Local authority

Community group

Public sector/Regulatory body

Local Coastal Partnership

Other (Please state)

Salmon and sea trout fishery management