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Executive Summary
A workshop under the theme 'How can marine spatial planning lead to a thriving natural marine environment in Scotland?' was held on 12th February 2015, organised by Scottish Environment LINK's Marine Taskforce. The event was attended by approximately 60 participants representing a range of interests in marine and terrestrial planning, including local authorities, national Government, academic researchers, environmental law experts, non-Government organisations (environmental charities), and independent consultants. The workshop had the following objectives:

- To raise awareness of national and regional marine planning and their scope for marine ecosystem enhancement across a wider national forum
- To explore current understanding of the importance and relevance of marine planning
- To facilitate productive discussion on the challenges of marine planning still to be resolved and how to address them on a local, national and international scale
- To help inform the on-going agenda for marine planning in Scotland and the wider UK

This report summarises two presentations delivered by keynote speakers considered experts in the fields of marine planning and environmental law, and key points of discussion from the workshop session, which focused on 3 questions:

1. What aspect of the planning system on land works well/best?
2. Bearing in mind lessons from Q1, how can marine planning lead to a flourishing natural marine environment?
3. What are the requirements to be able to deliver environmental enhancement through marine spatial planning?

This report also presents the results of a short questionnaire answered by participants designed to assess their perceptions of marine spatial planning.

The main recommendations based on the discussion during the workshop, and feedback during the plenary discussion, were:

- Government must take action to address the widely recognised lack of resources for marine planning, and prioritise spending on marine planning, which should start with a review of resource requirements to support national and regional marine planning going forwards. This should include staffing and training needs, funding and equipment or tools.
- Marine planning should work across all three pillars of the Marine Nature Conservation Strategy for Scotland to help ensure the integrity of natural ecosystems are maintain and strengthened for the long-term and that benefits to society are secured. Government and planning bodies should ensure that:
  - Environmental protection and enhancement should be a key focus of marine plans
  - Developments should seek to maximise environmental benefits, including enhancement of the marine environment where possible
- Early stakeholder and public engagement, including land-locked communities and terrestrial sectors, and exploring ways to make marine planning relevant to wider Scottish society at a scale that is meaningful to them. There is a clear and definite need for significant awareness-raising efforts about the marine environment and marine issues at a national level.
- Improve mechanisms for cross-boundary collaboration, which should prioritise both join-up between terrestrial and marine planning and between Scottish Marine Regions whilst also ensuring international dialogue and collaboration. This links closely with resource requirements, as provision of further funds will be necessary to support collaborative working efforts.

1 http://www.scotlink.org/workareas/marine/
Introduction

The National Marine Plan sets out strategic policies for the sustainable use of Scotland's marine resources out to 200 nautical miles. The publication of a National Marine Plan (NMP)\(^2\) for Scotland is a requirement of the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 and, following consultation of a draft in July-October 2013 which garnered over 90 responses\(^3\), a revised draft was laid before Scottish Parliament in December 2014. The Rural Affairs, Climate Change and the Environment committee completed a scrutiny period of the finalised Plan by the end of January 2015 and was formally adopted in March 2015.\(^5\)

There exists an opportunity - and need - to build the policy profile for marine planning by highlighting the relevance of how our seas are managed to everyone in Scotland, from coastal communities to our central belt and landlocked urban areas. Scottish Environment LINK members agree that there are still many challenges to be addressed and overcome in the delivery of national and regional marine planning and that a forum in which these challenges, and other perspectives on them, can be discussed with a wider audience of planning professionals would be of benefit.

LINK members coordinated an event that acted as a national-level forum for facilitated discussion on marine spatial planning with interested parties representing the wider planning profession, marine industries and specialist practitioners. With marine spatial planning coming to the fore at national level, this event was designed to facilitate timely thinking on how it can, and must, deliver sustainable development and ecosystem enhancement for Scotland’s seas, as well as reducing conflict within the marine environment and providing a framework by which development can take place. LINK members hoped the event would highlight the challenges facing marine planning in Scotland, as regional marine planning partnerships are set up and consequent opportunities for greater public participation in marine decision-making arise, leveraging heightened political and civic interest in Scotland’s governance post-referendum.

Perceptions of the marine environment and marine planning

Prior to the workshop, LINK prepared and distributed a short survey on marine planning across the stakeholders represented. The survey's purpose was to enable a better understanding of perspectives on marine planning and its applications by different groups or representations. The survey was subsequently distributed to a wider audience, internally to the wider LINK membership, externally via e-mail to members of the wider professional sector, and via social media to interested members of society. The survey design is presented in Annex 1. Here we provide a high level summary of the survey results.

The participants were asked to categorise themselves into a group or sector, to provide an indication of the representation of the participants, but still allowing for anonymity. Table 1 shows a summary of the groups represented in the survey. It should be noted that this categorisation was general and some of the participants can be considered to fall under more than one category (e.g. government planning professionals or academic environmental lawyers). A total of 48 surveys were received, but some participants did not complete all of the questions. Furthermore it should be noted that the majority of the participants (63%) were represented by only 3 groups: government, academia and non-government organisations.

---


Table 1: Showing the self-assigned demographic of respondents to the survey on perceptions of marine planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector/group</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning professional</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Government Organisation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local coastal partnership</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory body</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the views of the participants to the question: ‘How healthy do you think Scottish seas are?’ A significant proportion (41%) of participants felt that Scottish seas are in ‘fairly healthy’ condition, whereas nearly a quarter (27%) considered that Scottish seas are ‘quite unhealthy’. These results are expressed as a percentage of those who answered the question.

Table 2: Showing an assessment of perceptions of the health of Scottish seas by survey participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agreement (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very healthy</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly healthy</td>
<td>40.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither healthy nor unhealthy</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite unhealthy</td>
<td>22.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unhealthy</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionally variable</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further investigation of the perceptions of the health of Scottish seas indicates a difference of perception or opinion between sectors. Figure 1 illustrates the variation in these perceptions between the different sectors. Of the three sectors that are best represented amongst the participants (government, academia and Non-Government organisations), those that felt Scottish seas are fairly healthy were primarily government (22%) and academia (33%). Non-government organisation representatives (generally environmental charities) had a less positive outlook, representing 45% of participants of the opinion that Scottish Seas are quite unhealthy. Only one participant, representing a marine industry, perceived Scottish seas to be very healthy.
The survey also assessed perceptions around the importance of the marine environment to various environmental, social and economic functions and ecosystem services. Overall, the results indicated a general perception that the marine environment is closely linked, and important in some way, to all the functions specified on the survey. Furthermore, other important roles of the marine environment suggested by participants included energy (or energy distribution), communication, research, contribution to physical and mental health (through being in the coastal/marine environment), biotechnology, and biodiversity value. An overview of these results is displayed in Figure 2.

The results in Figure 2 indicate that the functions for which the marine environment is most important, or has the most important contribution, are climate change (74%) and the well-being of coastal communities (80%). Half of the respondents considered the marine environment to be ‘quite important’ for land-locked communities, and further research to determine whether this perception reflects public awareness in different geographical locations around Scotland would be helpful to identify areas where more public awareness about marine planning needs to be raised. A small proportion of the participants (2.27%) felt that the marine environment was ‘not too important’ for employment, transport, well-being of land-locked communities and water quality/cycling, and none of the participants felt that the marine environment was ‘not at all important’ for any of the stated functions.

These perceptions illustrate to some extent that, in the context of marine planning, there is a need to consider both the wider ecosystem considerations and contributions of a healthy marine environment as well as the localised community level needs and impacts.
Figure 2: Perceptions of the importance of the marine environment to different functions or services as a percentage of the survey participants who answered the question

Presentations

National Marine Plan update

An update on the National Marine Plan and an overview of the Planning Circular\(^{6}\) was provided by Anna Donald, Head of Planning Policy for Marine Scotland, which set the policy context for this workshop. The National Marine Plan (NMP) was informed by Scotland’s Marine Atlas and sets out a framework for sustainable development in the marine environment in Scotland, and will guide the development of Regional Marine Plans. Following recent Parliamentary scrutiny of the NMP, it was formally adopted in March 2015. The Planning Circular provides a description of the relationship between marine and terrestrial planning, expanding upon the guidance outlined in the NMP for the overlap and distinction in planning between these two regimes.

Keynote presentations

Two keynote speeches were then delivered prior to the workshop session, the first by Rachel Shucksmith, Marine Spatial Planning Manager at the NAFC marine centre in Shetland. This presentation focused on the process by which the Shetland Marine Spatial Plan\(^{7}\) was developed, the challenges faced and the lessons learned. The Shetland Marine Spatial Plan is one of two regional plans which will serve as pilots for Scotland. It seeks to establish a policy framework to guide the placement of activities in the marine environment which will inform decision-making, guide priorities and help to achieve a balance between national and local interests. The NAFC employed a number of different techniques to develop the plan, including constraint mapping to guide


developments such as renewables, which allows for flexibility (such as updating the model as new data become available) and is designed to improve planning success.

The second presentation, given by Anne-Michelle Slater (Head of the School of Law at the University of Aberdeen), gave an overview of a 'Marine Planning Exchange' project, which will deliver a platform designed to act as a vehicle for the exchange of data and information about marine planning for the North Sea. The exchange platform, which will take the form of a website, will enable access to data and information about marine planning for interested stakeholders, including regulators, NGOs, developers and community interests. This exchange will differ from existing sources as "...there are no mapping tools that provide integrated information on all the activities for which the authorities have developed overall frameworks under the management plans.\(^8\) The exchange purposes to increase transparency, as well as knowledge and understanding, of the ecological, economic and social processes underpinning marine planning, and facilitate the implementation of national and European law for the North Sea.

The slides of the keynote presentations can be found in Appendices 2 and 3.

**Workshop Discussion**

The workshop session was designed to encourage consideration of marine spatial planning in a broader way, at a landscape (or seascape) level as well as in terms of different sectors and services. Spatial planning in the terrestrial environment is further ahead, in terms of its implementation, than marine spatial planning and it should be possible to learn lessons from the development of existing planning frameworks to help guide marine planning going forwards\(^9\) in a way that enables environmental enhancement to be mainstreamed where possible. Furthermore, the workshop aimed to draw out what practical resources and infrastructure will be needed to ensure that marine planning can be successfully implemented at a local or regional level.

The discussion groups addressed the same three questions:

1. **What aspect of the planning system on land works well/best?**
2. **Bearing in mind lessons from Q1, how can marine planning lead to a flourishing natural marine environment?**
3. **What are the requirements to be able to deliver environmental enhancement through marine spatial planning?**

**1. What aspect of the planning system on land works well/best?**

As land-use planning is considerably more advanced than marine spatial planning, it is important to reflect on the processes and practices that have been implemented, as positive or negative lessons may be learned which could help to ensure the development and implementation of more efficient and effective marine plans. A number of projects, plans and policies were identified as good examples of planning on land from an environmental and socio-economic perspective, some of which may be relevant to marine spatial planning as it is taken forwards. Equally, there are also bad examples from land-use planning that illustrate where practices or processes can be improved upon.

**Planning Legislation and Processes**

A fundamental point about the land planning system is that it has **statutory force**; without legislative backing, it is easier for developers to contest planning decisions. It is a planning-lead system; all decisions must be made in accordance with the appropriate plan, and there is universal acceptance of planning-based decision-making. It was commented that sometimes planners have difficulty getting people to understand this concept.

---


Permitted Development Rights (a presumption of development consent below defined parameters, e.g. small scale extensions or alterations to building or utilities) was discussed as being, in principle, a good idea, but application to the marine environment may not be as straightforward. While PDR can be overridden in Natura 2000 sites on land, there is still much work to be done to identify where marine features and natural heritage interest are, and a smarter system would probably be necessary for appropriate protection of wider seas interests.

National Parks were also discussed as a success of land planning in Scotland, highlighting the two examples of Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park and the Cairngorms National Park. Although these are not non-use areas – rather they are designed to promote opportunities for the public to access and enjoy the parks - there is a higher level of scrutiny on planning within the Parks, and high level aims under the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000 are designed to balance environmental and cultural considerations with social and economic needs for development. In 1974, the chair of the National Parks Policy Review Committee, Lord Sandford, recommended the principle that "Where irreconcilable conflicts exist between conservation and public enjoyment, then conservation interest should take priority" to help make decisions on environmental priorities. This is considered a welcome guideline in ensuring that the natural environment is safeguarded where economic growth might otherwise be prioritized and an inappropriate development might be approved.

Another area of terrestrial planning considered good practice, and well-implemented, is Monitoring of Plan outcomes. Planning authorities are required by law to produce an Annual Monitoring Report covering the monitoring of policies in the Plan that they are responsible for preparing. A monitoring scheme would be essential in all forms of planning (including marine), which would help to identify potential deficiencies in the regulatory regime and promptly highlight further legislative needs.

Design and Access Statements (DAS) (short reports which complement and support planning applications) were considered to be a useful tool for demonstrating how a development can be sufficiently accessed by potential users. The benefits of DAS to communities were highlighted and it was suggested that these should be written into all planning applications to raise the quality of applications.

Strategic Development Plans that cover Scotland’s four largest city regions were cited as good examples of the type of partnership between multiple local authorities that will be required for marine planning at the regional level.

Public engagement/consultation
There is recognition that there is public interest in how the environment is managed and that engagement with the public and stakeholders was good during certain processes. Examples where this has been done well include the creation of Local Development Plans, and the Main Issues reports that form part of this process, and the Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Plan. The inclusive nature of terrestrial planning processes was noted, with tools such as charrettes aiding the plan making process and making it a “two way conversation”.

Early engagement has proved beneficial, particularly for the general public and local communities, as it puts the plans into context and makes it relevant to them. An example where this has been done successfully is Local Development Plans, which include a Statement of Community Involvement, designed to explain to members of the public how they will be involved in the

---

10 The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Amendment Order 2014
development of the plans, providing the highest possible level of community engagement. Public engagement enables dialogue about places, many of which will have **meaning or value associated with it to people that live locally**, and promotes an **understanding of the bigger picture** (i.e. how people and places are interconnected, and how this fits into the planning system). Early engagement provides the background and context to a development from the start, which means that this process does not need to be done at a later stage and all involved can feel better, if not fully, informed. It was suggested that this should form part of the process guidance.

**Political awareness**

It was felt that political awareness around planning and planning issues in Scotland is generally higher (compared to the rest of the UK), but there is much still to be done to **change the political mindset of economic growth to one of sustainable development** and ecosystem services.

It was also discussed that the policies for planning are generally theoretically good, but their application less so. Awareness of **ecosystem services** and the **ecosystem approach** in the terrestrial and marine environment is still an emerging area of research and **understanding of these concepts and their application remains low**. The development of new or existing instruments or processes is needed to address this, which could include investment in further research and promotion of the precautionary principle where environmental data are lacking or particular ecosystem processes are less well understood.

**Ecosystem approach/provision for environmental improvement**

It was noted that plans on land, such as the **National Planning Framework (NPF3)** and **Local Development Plans**, provide **strategic direction for environmental enhancement purposes** (beyond a simple statement of aspiration within the policies). Section 75 of the **Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act (1997)** also gives mandate for the provision of ‘**Planning Gain**’, whereby the value of a piece of land is increased as a result of planning permission being granted. This can result in environmental benefits through the establishment or enhancement of natural spaces as part of, or as a consequence of, the development (e.g. natural reserves or country parks). This principle is also set out in the NP3 and Local Development Plans.

**Action Planning/Plans**, a type of Development Plan Document (which set planning policies in Local Authority Areas), focus on areas of change or conservation to deliver planned growth, stimulate regeneration, protect areas sensitive to change through conservation policies, make proposals for enhancement and resolve conflicting objectives in areas where there is significant development pressure. Marine Plans will not always be able to deliver the enhancement, but the Action Plans can help make the links to mechanisms or processes that can.

**Land/sea join-up**

There are a number of coastal planning projects that were identified being good examples of linking terrestrial and marine planning, including the Argyll and Bute coastal footpath, Loch Etive and Loch Fyne Integrated Coastal Zone Management project and the Forth Bridges project. Working across the land-sea boundary for the Forth Bridges project in particular was considered a relatively good example of planning across the land-sea interface at a local scale and it involves Local Authorities working together, which is mutually beneficial.

Some attempt was made to address planning at the land/sea interface in 2006, when the Planning (Scotland) Act was extended to include aquaculture. It was recognised that development at sea can
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have an impact on land, as well as the reverse, and more needs to be done to understand the interaction of activities between the land and sea and how to improve planning at this interface.

2. Bearing in mind lessons from Q1, how can marine planning lead to a flourishing natural marine environment?
This question was designed to focus on whether principles for good and bad practice from land-use planning can be applied to planning within the marine environment. Further to this, it was considered whether marine planning could or should be used to enhance or improve the marine environment, how practitioners can ensure that there will be environmental benefits as a result of the planning process and whether obligations can be instilled through marine plans to deliver environmental benefits through the planning framework.

Planning Legislation and Processes
The ‘Wider Seas’ pillar of the Marine Nature Conservation Strategy for Scotland\(^\text{14}\) outlines the contribution of the use of cross-cutting policies and legislation to environmental assessment and management, which includes the provision under the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 for the National Marine Plan, Regional Marine Plans and marine protected areas, in addition to measures under the European Marine Strategy Framework Directive. In this context, it was further highlighted that the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000 can apply to both the terrestrial and the marine environment and in 2006 SNH submitted advice to the Scottish Executive on the potential for designating Coastal and Marine National Parks in Scotland\(^\text{15}\). The advice of SNH was that such a designation would not only enhance the potential for natural and cultural heritage and promote good practice, but would also provide greater opportunity for local people to be more involved in decision-making. National Park Plans, a legal requirement of National Park status, are designed to safeguard the distinctive qualities of the designated area and, in the event of the designation of CMNP in Scotland, would need to form part of the relevant regional marine plan for the area. Such a status could also serve to increase the robustness of any regional marine plan and provide a wide range of benefits to Scotland as a whole that a regional or national marine plan in itself could not.

There was some discussion around Action Planning, a land-use planning provision which is absent from both the National Marine Plan and Regional Marine Planning pilots so far. The inclusion of Action Planning in marine plans would enable the plans to do more than just influence licensable activities, but would also feed objectives and policies into other matters for delivery through other processes. This might include fisheries management, climate change mitigation and environmental enhancement.

Current systems of sectoral planning or guidance become subsidiary to the National (and Regional) Marine Plan(s), which provides the opportunity to get the hierarchy for planning right at the first attempt.

National collaboration
Co-operation across planning boundaries is necessary to ensure the success of marine planning and the consistency of marine plans, both locally (e.g. between local authorities) and at a large-scale (between terrestrial and marine). The Strategic Development Plans that cover Scotland’s four largest city regions were cited as good examples of the type of partnership between multiple local authorities that will be required for marine planning at the regional level.

In the case of areas, such as the Solway Firth and the North Sea area, it is also necessary to work across national country boundaries, and accommodate different legislation, procedures and


authorities. Further to this, engagement of different sectors and marine users is essential – a healthy marine environment underpins the successful functioning of commercial fisheries and marine tourism and, to some extent, industries such as aquaculture.

**Ecosystem approach/environmental enhancement**

The strategic direction for enhancement was discussed, in that it would not necessarily be straightforward to give spatial direction for enhancement in the marine environment through planning, but it was agreed that this should be the aspiration. There needs to be a **greater improvement in the scientific understanding** of areas with the best potential for enabling enhancement (through spatial protection (reduction/removal of) or more proactive measures). Furthermore, an examination of policy to ensure that planners can maximise the potential for added benefits from marine protected areas (which would require implementing more ecosystem-based protection measures, rather than a feature-based approach). Marine planning should provide an opportunity to address issues beyond the species and habitat level, and help to manage or reduce wider ecosystem impacts (such as underwater noise, marine litter, non-indigenous species). The Shetland Marine Spatial Plan, one of the two regional pilot plans, was discussed as a good framework for planning. There is already good evidence that this model is resulting in a healthier marine environment, and managers are finding that they are better able to identify suitable areas for development.

A **target for environmental enhancement may be necessary** to identify a level to which a ‘natural’ marine environment is realistic, which would consider what is achievable, appropriate and/or beneficial to both the wider ecosystem and local and national communities. Setting out this vision would also require a level of public and stakeholder participation and awareness building, so there would not be confusion between the idea of working towards a pristine environment (which would be ideal, but not feasible) and establishing trend-based targets where planning and policy implementation enables a **move towards marine ecosystems that function more naturally**.

There was some discussion around the fundamental point that developments within the marine environment (and indeed, any natural environment) are going to produce a certain level of environmental impacts. Marine plans should provide guidance around ‘trade-offs’ of environmental protection, which will mean accepting a local environmental impact for a greater environmental gain (for example, renewable energy developments for long-term climate change mitigation).

Furthermore, it should be possible to identify **‘win-win’ scenarios** that can be enabled through marine planning, i.e. enhance natural processes that also provide social and economic benefits. It may be possible to build in the concept of planning gain (cf section 75 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997) into marine plans in an adapted way, but this would need to be based on agreed objectives for the marine plan/individual developments, a sound evidential base, and would likely need Government commitment and provision of resources.

Marine planning should help provide clarity to decisions regarding the local impacts of developments within the national and international context of large-scale issues, such as climate change. Where negative impacts from developments cannot be avoided altogether (e.g. by establishing protected areas to safeguard a particular feature or area of high biodiversity), or reduced (e.g. by novel development techniques), it may be necessary to offset the impact as part of a project or development. Some authorities, such as Brazil, assess a fee on development projects, which forms a percentage of the projected cost of a development and goes to a fund that is intended to pay for offsetting measures. Such measures could include the creation of new protected areas or the enhancement of existing ones. Larger-scale enhancement projects could also be considered as part of marine planning, such as re-wilding, but are currently being initiated as discrete projects, rather than as part of a planning system. It may be that a developer could
contribute to a re-wilding venture that fulfilled the criteria for offsetting the impact of the proposed project. However, offsetting and re-wilding have undergone little testing and it is the opinion of some that artificially restored or created areas of natural habitat (e.g. wetlands) rarely functioned as well as the natural areas that were lost.

The success of the Scottish marine plans will depend on the strength of development planning. Developers and some sea users don’t tend to agree that zoning is an effective way of planning in the marine environment, because it means an area is not ‘exclusive use’. Developers do not necessarily wish to be constrained but, without putting lines on a map and establishing boundaries, managers will have less control. The requirement for zoning would have to be assessed on a case-by-case basis; in some areas certain activities may be explicitly designated or excluded but in others a less definitive approach may be appropriate. It was also proposed that a combination of zoning and constraint mapping could be used depending on the level of certainty and sensitivity.

It was noted that, ideally, Scotland would embrace a vision for delivery of Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) targets at the scale of regional marine plans (which would contribute to or potentially go beyond MSFD requirements). However, there would be no way to measure this, as the MSFD monitoring programme operates at such a large scale; it would be difficult to translate this to the smaller scale that would be required. Nevertheless, clarity on the role of marine planning for delivering MSFD requirements would be valuable; individual Marine Planning Partnerships may then choose for themselves whether they will aim to go beyond that expectation.

Public/stakeholder participation in decision-making
Regional empowerment of fisheries management can help incentivise local industry to engage positively with the marine planning process – a good example of where this is already an established model is Shetland (Regulating Order/Shetland Shellfish Management Organisation). Other suggestions for this included empowering Inshore Fisheries Groups (IFGs) or similar groups, which would require the use of existing or new legislation, and altered governance structures, but could lay the foundations for fuller integration of fisheries management with marine planning. An external review of the IFGs is currently in progress and it should be noted that any redefinition of the role and constitution of IFGs should lay out the detail of interaction and shared remits with marine planning.

Organisations such as Planning Aid Scotland that have many years of experience in encouraging community participation in the terrestrial planning process could develop to providing a focal point for advice, training and resources in the marine planning system.

Right of Appeal was also discussed in relation to public involvement in decision-making. It was suggested that it should be made clear how the same concept would work in a marine context, under the national and regional marine plans. If the only right of appeal is via a legal route, it should also be considered in relation to the Aarhus Convention and it needs to be made clear how this would apply if any planning decisions were challenged.

3. What are the requirements to be able to deliver environmental enhancement through marine spatial planning?
This question focused on the highly topical issue of the practical needs for effective delivery of national and regional marine planning. In their recent report on the draft National Marine Plan, the Scottish Parliament’s Rural Affairs, Climate Change and Environment committee highlighted lack of resourcing as a major concern for the emerging Marine Planning Partnerships and their mandate for the delivery of regional marine planning. The focus of this part of the workshop was around what information or data are needed to inform marine planning and improve the evidence base, where

are the information gaps, what are the resource gaps and what tools will be needed for regional marine planning going forwards. Furthermore, there was some consideration of whether it is possible to align implementation of marine planning across different regions and how Marine Planning Partnerships and local authorities can maintain consistency at a national level.

It was suggested that it should be first noted that marine spatial planning would not always be the mechanism for the delivery of environmental enhancement, but that the plan should also feed into or inform other processes (e.g. via an action plan) that can deliver enhancement.

There needs to be a **long-term vision for environmental improvement through marine spatial planning**, with ambitious but realistic goals. If ‘sustainable [development]’ is the high level, overarching objective, as indeed it should be, this will filter down through all plans. As part of this vision, it is necessary to be clearer about what is meant by environmental enhancement and what the specific goals and aspirations for this are for the level of enhancement it is hoped marine plans will support.

It was suggested that planners could adopt a ‘carrot and stick’ model for directing developments and incentivising developers in the marine environment; it must be made beneficial to use one area of sea over another (i.e. the carrot on the stick). Furthermore, it needs to be clear how the adherence to the plan and implementation of a development will be monitored or regulated (i.e. the stick). There has been some criticism that this has not been delivered in some instances of terrestrial planning, such as some agricultural environmental enhancement schemes. For example, in the USA the 1936 Agricultural Conservation Programme\(^{17}\) was set up aiming to reduce commodity surplus by compensating and incentivising farmers to replace soil-depleting crops with soil-conserving crops. However, this initially failed as farmers applied their poorest ground into the conservation program while using the guaranteed government payments to develop and increase yields on their best ground.

There was a general observation that **the environment should be the first priority**, as currently although there is a presumption of sustainable development or use in the marine area, the environment may be superseded by social or economic needs. Planning legislation should be implemented from a policy and science base. This may need some work to change attitudes about planning, in order to move away from planning being primarily about the provision of services to being more about making more holistic changes.

**Collaboration**

There needs to be more collaboration between planners and other experts, such as environmentalists and social scientists; there was a perceived over-reliance on academic scientists by planners to direct planning or planning policy. This may require improvements to the mechanisms by which collaborating currently takes place, as well as looking to introduce new structures or projects to draw together a wider range of expertise.

It was suggested that a national annual conference for planners and practitioners between regions should be organised for information sharing and standardisation of practice, where possible. Further to this, a national perspective report to assess integration could be produced, possibly annually. This might also include looking at aspects such as cumulative impacts between different regions or sea areas, and providing insights into the marine planning process by those whose regional plans are further ahead than others.

**Public engagement**

\(^{17}\) [http://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/6522705.pdf](http://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/6522705.pdf)
It was noted that there is a difference between public engagement and raising public awareness. There is a notable lack of awareness of marine issues in general in more land-based communities (e.g. the Central Belt), where members of society generally know and understand very little about the marine environment, don't relate to it and, as a consequence, don't have an opinion on it. Information about the marine environment, including marine spatial planning, needs to be made more accessible to the general public, and this could be something as simple as changing the terminology used to describe the concept – i.e. not calling it marine spatial planning. Much needs to be done to simplify the concept of marine planning, but still ensuring that people are able to participate and engage in the process.

Use of new technology and more advanced platforms for communication can be used to support marine planning and increase public awareness and engagement. This could include tools such as mapping, and other forms of visual data projection, social media and interactive information systems. Some of these tools have already been developed and rolled out into the public domain, such as the NMPi interactive mapping system\(^{18}\) and NMP Online\(^{19}\). It was suggested that more is needed to raise public awareness of these tools and highlight the relevance of marine planning to wider society.

**Resources**

A number of **key resource gaps** were identified as needing to be addressed to enable successful development of emerging Marine Planning Partnerships, and implementation of national and regional marine plans. An overall need is for good strategic direction and legislative support, in addition to key practical provisions which are considered essential for successful development of marine plans:

1. **Information**

   There are a wide range of requirements to **improve data availability and confidence** to help inform marine spatial plans, including what features/process have degraded and where; suitable areas/physical conditions for enhancement of a given feature/process; how features/processes support socio-economic interests (ecosystem services) and how these can be enhanced for maximum environmental and societal benefit. There is currently a **lack of understanding, and therefore a lack of control, of what is entering the marine environment**. There is also a need to make existing data that are collected in the marine environment more nationally standardised, so that it can be used more universally. An example of this are data collected by industries such as oil and gas or renewables through the Environmental Impact Assessment process which are not required to be made available for national datasets nor are they required to be collected or stored in a nationally used format (e.g. MEDIN)\(^{20}\), therefore it is currently difficult to track change using these data.

   More research is also needed on the environmental ‘tipping point’ of an ecosystem, or the **carrying capacity of a marine area**, to withstand multiple or increasing developments. It was suggested that developing marine plans are an opportunity to map the various constraints on activities in the marine environment and develop plans around it. Environmental benefits will come from being able to map environmental parameters, as well as the extent of activities in the marine environment, in one place, which has never been done before. In theory this is how the system should work, although in the reality of evaluating socio-economic needs this may not always be possible. There is an opportunity to influence and encourage this kind of planning in the emerging Marine Planning Partnerships, though it would need to acknowledge and account for a wider range of stakeholder views.

---


Part of this process to improve available information is to determine what a marine planner needs to know to be able to carry out their role. This not only includes assessing the minimum amount of data and the types of data required to inform the marine planning system around a particular marine feature or impact, but also the capacity and skills of marine planners to be able to understand, analyse and interpret these data. This will determine how and what data are collected as well as identifying the necessary skills base to process the information and base planning policy and decision on it (see also point 3).

2. Finance
It is already clear that there is a shortfall in funding and a need for a comprehensive assessment of funding requirements for marine planning in Scotland. The case for marine planning as a spending priority needs to be made strongly at a Scottish, and possibly UK, Government level.

During its scrutiny of the National Marine Plan, a member of the RACCE committee bleakly commented that "In the best of all possible worlds, there would be a group of enlightened regional planners in all the relevant local authorities who were... highly skilled and ready and able to produce detailed local and regional marine plans that involved all the stakeholders. That is not going to happen: there is no such resourcing for that for local government and such people do not exist in the local authorities that are involved". It was also commented that "Given the pressure on local authority resources, I do not think that there is any sign or evidence that [resource exists in the other local authorities...to replicate what has happened in Shetland, which has been largely successful]". 21

3. People
Qualified planning professionals in Scotland have reduced in the last number of years (pers. comm.), which highlights a general need for a recruitment drive in the field of planning. Further to this, and related to the lack of funding for marine planning, there is a clear need for improvements to the staff capacity for local authorities and planning organisations. This includes both more training for existing planners in specialist marine planning fields and more recruitment of experts in marine planning (and marine sectors) in addition to ensuring that local authorities and Marine Planning Partnerships have reliable access to external expertise.

A further suggestion to enable early interest in marine planning and increase recruitment of marine planners for the future was to introduce more marine expertise and training into university courses. This would include more dedicated courses in marine policy and planning, some of which already exist within Scottish and UK universities, and widening the exposure of marine planning in related courses, such as biodiversity teaching modules on engineering degrees.

Conclusions
Marine spatial planning is a relatively recent concept and few long-term records exist to demonstrate its use as a management tool within a multi-use environment. The obligation to implement a statutory marine spatial plan under the Marine (Scotland) Act (2010) signifies the first time such a project has been undertaken in Scotland and the process is largely exploratory as a consequence. The National Marine Plan must set a national and international standard, providing a robust framework under which regional marine plans can be developed to ensure sustainable use and, where possible, enhancement of the marine environment and reduce conflict between users.

A series of high-level recommendations have been derived from the discussion within and following this workshop. These recommendations are summarised here:

• Government must take action to **address the widely recognised lack of resources for marine planning, and prioritise spending on marine planning**,** which should start with a review of resource requirements** to support national and regional marine planning going forwards. This should include staffing and training needs, funding and equipment or tools.

• **Marine planning should work across all three pillars of the Marine Nature Conservation Strategy for Scotland** to help ensure the integrity of natural ecosystems are maintain and strengthened for the long-term and that benefits to society are secured. Government and planning bodies should ensure that:
  o Environmental protection and enhancement should be a key focus of marine plans
  o Developments should seek to maximise environmental benefits, including enhancement of the marine environment where possible

• **Early stakeholder and public engagement**, including land-locked communities and terrestrial sectors, and exploring ways to make marine planning relevant to wider Scottish society at a scale that is meaningful to them. There is a clear and definite **need for significant awareness-raising efforts** about the marine environment and marine issues at a national level.

• **Improve mechanisms for cross-boundary collaboration**, which should prioritise both join-up between terrestrial and marine planning and between Scottish Marine Regions whilst also ensuring international dialogue and collaboration. This links closely with resource requirements, as provision of further funds will be necessary to support collaborative working efforts.

Following on from this workshop, LINK members (in collaboration with colleagues and interested participants of the workshop), will further reflect on these recommendations and consider potential ways to take these forwards as actions. LINK members welcome the input of any colleagues who wish to collaborate further within the scope of these recommendations and explore the possibility of joint projects.
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## Appendix 1
The survey design used to assess perceptions of the marine environment and marine planning in participants and interested contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Participant response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name (optional – please leave blank if you prefer to remain anonymous)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work area/role</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How healthy do you think Scottish seas are?</td>
<td>Very healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In relation to all aspects of Scotland’s natural heritage, how important do you consider the marine environment to be in terms of its contribution to:</td>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (goods and people)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being of coastal communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being of land-locked communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural hazard regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality/cycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal economic activities (e.g. tourism)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should spatial planning in the marine environment contribute to its enhancement?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe marine spatial planning in one word.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think marine planning or marine issues are relevant to your field of work?</td>
<td>Highly relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you personally deal with marine planning or marine issues in your role?</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2
Slides from the keynote presentation delivered by Rachel Shucksmith about the development of the Shetland Marine Spatial Plan.

Regional marine spatial planning - the Shetland experience
Rachel Shucksmith
Marine Spatial Planning Manager
NAFC Marine Centre UHI

MSP in Scotland
- 11 proposed marine regions across Scotland
- Shetland and Clyde first statutory regional marine plans developed under Marine Act ~expected in 2015
- Western Isles and Orkney Islands 2016

Spatial Planning Framework
- 2006- SMSP initiated through SSMEI pilot
- Guided by a local and national steering group
- Funded by Marine Scotland, SNH, Crown Estate, Leader, SIC, NAFC,
- 2008- 2nd edition - voluntarily adopted
- 2010- 3rd edition launched, end of pilot

Spatial Planning Framework
- The SMSP continued after the SSMEI pilot ended
- Funding from Marine Scotland and NAFC Marine Centre UHI
- Guided by local Advisory Group

Spatial Planning Framework
- 4th edition launched for consultation in January 2014*
- Adopted on a statutory basis by the SIC in January 2015
- Integration of terrestrial and marine planning

Spatial Planning Framework
- 5th edition will be developed under the Marine Act
- Advisory group will become a marine planning partnership
- Guidance by a national group co-ordinated by Marine Scotland

Developing a regional marine plan
- Understanding plan area requires information on distribution of marine uses and features:
  - Natural heritage
  - Cultural/ community use
  - Economic uses
Spatial Data

- Understand current condition of the marine environment
- Understand how it is being used
- Understand regional trends
- Inform 'state of the environment assessment'


Spatial Data

Verification process key*:
- Identify data gaps
- Notice errors, difficult to do at a national level
- Increase confidence
- Increase buy-in


Spatial Data

- Spatial data key to guide current and future use
- Identify policy areas
- Link policy to spatial data
- Could be used for spatially specific measures or polices e.g. MPAs
- Not adopted zoning

Spatial Data

- Constraint level match policy framework
- High constraint= one high value feature of international importance e.g. natura site or multiple activities of local/national importance


Uses of data- zoning

- General lack of support for zoning
- Inflexible
- Uses and knowledge of the marine environment changes
- Based on challengeable assumptions
- Renewables sector requested further spatial guidance*

Spatial Data

- Time consuming
- Pre-NMIP
- Quicker and easier for future regions
- Central location to display local and national data sets


Uses of data- zoning

- Guides development towards areas of low constraint
- Does not prevent development in areas of high constraint but must show mitigation

*www.nsof.ac.uk
Guidance for marine renewables

- Does not guarantee development success
- Base line surveying may reveal unknown constraints
- Allows model to be updated as new data becomes available
- Increase planning success

Review of SMSP

- Spatial data and policy framework used in decision making
- Identifies constraints developers were unaware of
- Avoid conflict guiding development away from areas of known constraint
- Shetland a more ‘attractive’ place to come*


Conclusions

- Spatial data underpins marine spatial planning process
- Local data collection is likely to be required, particularly relating to community/cultural use
- Development of NMPI will provide a significant resource to future marine regions

Fisheries management

- Worked with local fisheries management group SSMO identify areas sensitive to dredge fisheries
- Series of closed areas relating to maerl, horse mussels, seagrass
- Industry led
- Gained MSC accreditation

Review of SMSP

- Used as an evidence base:
  - to protect fishing grounds
  - identify and protect natural heritage features

Conclusions

- SMSP shown to guide decision making
- Provision of spatial data particularly valued by stakeholders
- Zoning not adopted
- Focusing on linking spatial data to a policy framework

Thank you,
Any Questions?

Rachel.Shucksmith@uhi.ac.uk
www.nafc.ac.uk/smssp.aspx
Slides from the keynote presentation delivered by Anne-Michelle Slater about a marine planning exchange project in the North Sea.

**A Marine Planning Exchange at a sea-basin level**
Anne Michelle Slater and Alison MacDonald
University of Aberdeen

**Project development and progression to date**
Anne Michelle Slater et al, 'An Examination of the Viability and Appropriateness of a Marine Planning Exchange for UK Waters' Final Report to the Planning Exchange Foundation, April 2012
- Outcomes and other projects
- North Sea Conference Workshop, June 2014
- Outcome

**What is a marine planning exchange?**
- ‘Still centre of knowledge’
- No physical structure
- Not
  - a decision making forum;
  - dispute resolution;
  - no ownership of information or data
- Access to information for ‘community’ as well as regulators / developers / NGOs
- Access through an information platform

**ACCESS**
- To provide information
  - for ‘the community’
  - regulators
  - developers
  - NGOs
  - others
- Through an information platform (website)

**What already exists?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK level</th>
<th>European level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**January 2015**

- Report
- Each North Sea country law
- policy
- licensing/planning bodies
- identified
to highlight gaps or potential gaps
where the information could not be obtained.

**Why is a planning exchange at a sea-basin level required?**
- Assumptions across and within disciplines
- Data and information: fragmentation
- Resources: wasted
- Opportunities: missed
- Coordination and cooperation legally required
- Bigger picture (holistic approach)

**Considerations**
1. What area of the North Sea should be covered?
2. Who is the target audience?
3. What information already exists?
4. How much detail should be/can be provided?
5. Is national law needed?

**Is national law needed?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Draft Report findings: Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Existing legal obligations within
  the North Sea are comparable
  between countries.
- Complex web of national
  legislation, competencies and
  institutional governance structures.
- Need for accuracy and
  consistency in legal information.

**How would it differ from existing sources?**

- ...there are no mapping tools that provide integrated information on all the activities for which the authorities have developed overall frameworks under the management plans.

Including national law provides a strong foundation: it adds value.

A NSMPX – provides the ‘tool’
1. Facilitate fulfilment of legal obligations
2. Increases transparency
3. Scientific sense: ecologically managing the North Sea
4. Economic sense
5. Enhances knowledge and understanding

Aberdeen workshop outcomes
• Overall general support
• Why not do Irish Sea too?
• Awareness of existing data and how to use it appropriately
• Drawing on well established land use planning tool (The Planning Exchange)
• The role of spatial planning: lessons from both MSP projects and pilots and land use planning

Final thought
What is the role of marine spatial planning?

Lessons from:
• MSP projects and pilots?
• Land use planning?