

2020 SOUTH MARINE PLAN – Monitoring Survey – RESPONSE BY HISTORIC ENGLAND (SW and London & SE offices)

(Note: Q2 = job title – see end of table)

QUESTION	South West	London & South East
Q1 I am responding to this survey as:	An advisory body (e.g. statutory or non-statutory consultee)	
Q3 How would you rate your level of awareness of the South Marine Plan? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High - involved in its development and use it regularly • Medium - use it regularly • Low - know about it but don't use it • No awareness of it 	Medium	
Q4 This section is concerned with how marine plans have influenced day-to-day activities. Over the last 12 months, has your organisation used the South Marine Plan when making any decisions? Note: 'Decisions' includes authorisation and enforcement decisions, which normally refer to something that can be applied for, such as a marine licence, and also other kinds of decisions, for example, commenting on a marine licence application or developing a local plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No 	Yes	
Q5 In the last 12 months, how often has your organisation referred to policies in the South Marine Plan when making the following kinds of decisions. Note: ' <u>Authorisation and enforcement decisions</u> ' typically refer to something that can be applied for, such as a marine licence (as referenced in Section 58(1) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009). ' <u>Other decisions</u> ' includes all non-authorisation and non-enforcement decisions; for example, decisions taken when developing a local minerals and aggregates plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In all cases • In the majority of cases • In some cases • Very rarely • Never • Not applicable - don't make those decisions • Don't know 	Other decision – 'in some cases only'	
Q6 [is only shown if respondents indicate that they use marine plan policies in Q5; i.e. responses are 'In all cases' to 'Very rarely'] Which policy topics in the South Marine Plan did you consider when making the decisions referenced in the previous questions? Please select all that apply. Based on your selection, you will be asked about specific policies in the next question. <i>All policies listed</i>	Heritage assets; public access; and seascape [no cumulative effects]	

<p>Q7 For the topics you selected, did you consider the following policies? Please provide a response for each policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No • Don't know <p><i>All policies listed</i></p>	<p>Yes: Heritage assets and seascape</p>
<p>Q8 If possible, please provide examples of how and/or why you considered specific marine plan policies when making decisions:</p> <p><i>Free text</i></p>	<p>We don't have specific examples of using policies, but responses are informed by topics in the South Marine Plan</p>
<p>Q9 This question is about how different factors are considered in decision-making. Over the last 12 months, how much do you agree that you have seen an improved consideration of the following factors in decision-making as a result of the South Marine Plan? Note: 'Decision-making' includes authorisation and enforcement decisions, which normally refer to something that can be applied for, such as a marine licence, and also other kinds of decisions, for example, commenting on a marine licence application or developing a local plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly agree (Sa) • Moderately agree (Ma) • Moderately disagree (Md) • Strongly disagree (Sd) • Don't know (Dk) <p>a) Potential to develop skills related to marine activities</p> <p>b) Local strategies that emphasise development of skills related to marine activities</p> <p>c) Opportunities for a net increase in marine-related employment (particularly in line with skills available in the north east marine plan areas, and adjacent areas)</p> <p>d) Climate change adaptation measures (developments or activities that reduce or protect against impacts of climate change)</p> <p>e) Air quality and emissions of greenhouse gases and air pollutants</p> <p>f) Proposals incorporating features that enhance biodiversity or geological interest</p> <p>g) Demonstration of enhanced public access to and within the marine area</p> <p>h) Support for the development of supply chains within the marine renewable energy sector</p> <p>i) Alignment of marine plans and the terrestrial planning system</p>	<p>(d) – 'Don't know' We've seen an improved consideration of this in plan-making, but we do not think they are a result of the South Marine Plan. It seems that such matters are taken into consideration more as a result of the declaration of a climate emergency by the Government and in particular by local authorities that have led to various local responses, e.g. strategies with action plans, reviews of development plans/preparation of new development plan documents. It was noticed that there was no option regarding alignment with terrestrial planning</p>

Q10 If you are able to expand on your responses to the question above, please provide examples of how consideration of these factors has improved:

Free text

Devon County Council – Local Flood Risk Management Strategy – in our corporate response we mention the need to consider ‘seascape’ in the Strategy and the need to consider the South Marine Plan and emerging SW Marine Plan as baseline information, and seascape and public access as part of the SEA Framework in the SEA Scoping Report

Teignbridge Draft Local Plan (Part 1) – We advised that reference should be made to seascape assessment work in the context of policy EN2 for undeveloped coast and policy NE 4 landscape protection and consideration of impacts on seascape, as part of the settings of some heritage assets for these policies, and for policy EN3 coastal change management areas. We encouraged consideration of MCAA, Marine Plan and seascape character assessments in policy context for SA. We were critical of baseline information in relation to the coast and the role played in marine planning management down to Mean Low Water and lack of recognition of the need for integration of marine and land-use planning systems.

Draft Torbay Heritage Strategy – we encourage reference to seascape in the Strategy ‘Vision’ with appropriate consideration of South Marine Plan and seascape assessment in policy context and recognition of their marine/maritime heritage assets.

Q11 In the last 12 months, have you observed changes to public access to, and within, the south marine plan areas marine plan areas? Note: 'Public access' refers to the provision of features such as footpaths and slipways that enable people to reach the coast and/or sea.

- Public access has improved
- Public access has deteriorated
- No change observed
- Don't know

Don't know

<p>Q12 This question is about the South Marine Plan public access policies S-ACC-1 and S-ACC-2. In the last 12 months, how frequently did you consider public access policies S-ACC-1 and S-ACC-2 when making decisions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In all cases • In the majority of cases • In some cases • In very few cases • Never • Not applicable • Don't know 	N/A
<p>Q13 If you are able to expand on your responses to the two previous questions, please provide examples of how public access has changed, and/or how the Draft North East Marine Plan policy was considered:</p> <p><i>Free text</i></p>	No comment
<p>Q14, 15 & 16 are only shown if respondents select 'Decision-maker' or 'Applicant' in Q1.</p>	N/A
<p>Q17 In your opinion, how has the South Marine Plan affected your activities, infrastructure or organisation's ability to deal with future challenges, such as potential impacts of climate change or increasing competition for marine resources? Note: this question includes professional and recreational activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better placed • Worse placed • No difference • Don't know 	Don't know
<p>Q18 Where possible, please give examples to support your response to the previous question:</p> <p><i>Free text</i></p>	No comment
<p>Q19 Has your organisation been involved in developing and/or submitting a proposal to a formal decision-making process within the South marine plan areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes - Please state in what capacity (i.e. applicant, consultant, advisory body) • No 	No
<p>Q20 & 23 is only shown if respondents select 'Yes' in Q19. Q21 is only shown if respondents select either of the 'Yes' options in Q20. Q22 is only shown if respondents select either of the 'Yes' options in Q20. Q24, 25 & 26 is only shown if respondents select 'Yes' in Q23.</p>	N/A

<p>Q27 This question is about South Marine Plan policy S-MPA-4: In the last 12 months, when assessing proposals in relation to policy S-MPA-4, which of the following factors were considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Features of Conservation Importance (FOCI) • Impacts on Annex 1 habitats identified in the Habitats Directive • Impacts on species and habitats included in the S41 lists identified in the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 • Policy applied, but none of the factors listed were considered • Policy not applied (Please give reasons) 	<p>Policy not applied (Please give reasons) <i>Text:</i> Not applicable as we have no authority to advise on matters relevant to this policy</p>
<p>Q28 In the past 12 months, have you seen any changes in water quality in the south marine plan areas? Examples of observed changes in water quality could be increased or decreased levels of silt or chemicals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality has improved • Water quality has deteriorated • No change observed • Water quality is not something my organisation is aware of 	<p>Water quality is not something my organisation is aware of</p>
<p>Q29 Have new activities (e.g. fishing or recreational activities) and/or infrastructure (for example, a fish farm or new marina) had an impact on water quality in the south marine plan areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No • Don't know 	<p>Don't know</p>
<p>Q30 In your opinion, has South Marine Plan policy S-WQ-2 influenced the change in water quality referred to above? Note: Policy S-WQ-2 is: Activities that can deliver an improvement to water environment, or enhance habitats and species which can be of benefit to water quality should be supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No • Don't know 	<p>Don't know</p>
<p>Q31 is only shown if respondents indicate they have seen a change in water quality in Q27</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Q32 In the last 12 months, have you seen an increase in the number of proposals that have provided opportunities for co-existence? Note: Co-existence is where multiple developments, activities or uses occur alongside or in close proximity to each other in the same area, or at the same time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No • Don't know 	<p>Don't know</p>

Q32 & 33 is only shown if respondents select 'Decision-maker' in Q1	N/A
Q34 Are you a port or harbour representative? Note: This includes responding on behalf of organisations that represent ports or harbours, and port or harbour users. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No 	No
Q35, 36 & 37 are only shown if respondents select 'Yes' in Q33.	N/A
Q38 & 39 is only shown if respondents select 'Applicant' in Q1.	N/A
Q40 How did you find out about this survey?	Direct email
Q41 Finally, as part of our marine plan monitoring work we may want to get in touch with you. Do you give your permission to be contacted in the following instances? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No 	Yes
Q42 will only be shown if respondents select 'No awareness of it' in Q3	N/A
Q43 Preferred contact details below:	Head of Marine Planning – Historic England

NOTES:

Table compiled by Christopher Pater (Head of Marine Planning, Regions Group – Historic England), dated 15th December 2020