



Marine
Management
Organisation

We thank you for your time spent taking this survey.
Your response has been recorded.

Below is a summary of your responses

[Download PDF](#)

The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is required to monitor marine plans under Section 61 of the [Marine and Coastal Access Act \(2009\)](#).

This marine plan monitoring survey is relevant to the [South Marine Plan](#).

Your responses will help the MMO to understand policy effects and the effectiveness of policies in securing the objectives of the marine plan. Further monitoring details are provided in the most recent [Approach to Monitoring](#).

All survey data will be aggregated and anonymised in any published document.

Further details on how your information will be used is provided in our [Privacy Notice](#).

This survey is voluntary and should take less than an hour to complete.

You do not have to complete the survey in a single session. However, please be aware that your progress will be lost if your browser history is deleted.

We are unable to accept partially completed surveys. Therefore, please ensure that you respond to all relevant questions as fully as possible.

Completed surveys should be submitted by 30th June 2023.

We will send a completion reminder ahead of the closure date to all respondents who have started the survey and voluntarily provided contact details, but who are yet to submit the survey.

The questions in this survey cover different aspects of how you use the South Marine Plan.

To help you complete this survey, we recommend that you download a copy of the [South Marine Plan](#) for reference when answering the questions.

You may also wish to obtain an electronic copy of the survey to help you plan your response to the survey questions. An electronic copy of the survey can be obtained by submitting a request to:

planning@marinemanagement.org.uk

Organisations should consider whether it is most appropriate to submit a single response, or to take a departmental approach. Departmental responses should be clearly marked in the submitted survey. If you are submitting responses on behalf of an organisation, you should confirm whether you have the authority to do so before completing the survey. You should also consider whether you need to consult with other colleagues to obtain the relevant information needed to answer the survey questions.

Please reflect on the **last 18 months** when responding to the survey questions, unless otherwise instructed.

In the context of this survey, the term 'proposal' is used to refer to a new marine development or activity which is subject to management by public authorities. It may also refer to an expansion, or change of use, of existing developments and activities. Typically, proposals are subject to a formal decision-making process (eg marine licence applications).

Please only consider relevant proposals within the south marine plan areas

Please only consider relevant proposals within the south marine plan areas when completing this survey.

If you wish to submit responses in relation to any of England's other marine plan areas, you should **also** complete and submit the other relevant marine plan monitoring surveys.

Thank you for your help in strengthening our monitoring data.

We would like to know who is responding to the survey and what your role is.

I am responding to this survey as:

Please select all that apply

☒ **A decision-making authority (eg Local Planning Authority)**

☐ An applicant (eg for a marine licence)

☒ **An advisory body (eg statutory or non-statutory consultee)**

☐ Another stakeholder type (eg. recreation organisation or individual. Please specify)

Are you responding as an individual, or on behalf of your team or organisation?

☐ Individual representing my own opinions

☐ On behalf of my team or department (if so which team and organisation)

☒ **On behalf of my organisation (if so which organisation)**

Devon and Severn Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority

How would you rate your level of awareness of the South Marine Plan?

☒ **Involved in its development and use it regularly**

☐ Aware of it and use it regularly

☐ Aware of it and use it occasionally

☐ Know about it but don't use it

☐ No awareness of it

Please provide your preferred contact details below. This may be used to contact you regarding your answers to the survey which may include arranging a follow up interview to discuss your responses:

Email address

j.stewart@devonandsevernifca.gov.uk

Phone number

07720683624

This section is concerned with how marine plans have influenced day-to-day activities.

Over the last 18 months, have you or 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.

☒ **Yes**

☐ No

In the last 18 months, how often have you or your organisation referred to policies in the South Marine Plan when making the following kinds of decisions:

Note: 'Authorisation and enforcement decisions' 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).

'Other decisions' includes all non-authorisation and non-enforcement decisions; for example, decisions taken when developing a local minerals and aggregates plan.

	In all cases	In the majority of cases	In some cases	Very rarely	Never	Not applicable – don't make those decisions	Don't know
Authorisation and enforcement decisions:	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other decisions:	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Which policies in the South Marine Plan did you consider when making the decisions referenced in the previous questions? Please select all that apply. Please provide a response for each policy.

	Yes	No	Don't know
S-ACC-1 (Public access)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-ACC-2 (Public access)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-AGG-1 (Aggregates)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-AGG-2 (Aggregates)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-AGG-3 (Aggregates)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-AGG-4 (Aggregates)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-AQ-1 (Aquaculture)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
S-AQ-2 (Aquaculture)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
S-BIO-1 (Environment and biodiversity)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
S-BIO-2 (Environment and biodiversity)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
S-BIO-3 (Environment and biodiversity)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
S-BIO-4 (Environment and biodiversity)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

biodiversity)	<div><div></div>Yes</div>	<div><div></div>No</div>	<div><div></div>Don't know</div>
· S-CAB-1 (Sub-sea cables)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-CAB-2 (Sub-sea cables)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-CC-1 (Climate change)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-CC-2 (Climate change)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-CC-3 (Climate change)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-CC-4 (Climate change)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-CO-1 (Co-existence)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-DD-1 (Dredging and disposal)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-DD-2 (Dredging and disposal)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-DEF-1 (Defence)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-DIST-1 (Disturbance)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-EMP-1 (Employment)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-EMP-2 (Employment)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-FISH-1 (Fisheries)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-FISH-2 (Fisheries)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-FISH-3 (Fisheries)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-FISH-4 (Fisheries)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-FISH-4-HER (Herring fisheries)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-HER-1 (Heritage assets)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-INF-1 (Infrastructure)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-ML-1 (Marine litter)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-ML-2 (Marine litter)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-MPA-1 (Marine protected areas)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>
· S-MPA-2 (Marine protected areas)	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div></div>

	Yes	No	Don't know
S-MPA-3 (Marine protected areas)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
S-MPA-4 (Marine protected areas)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-NIS-1 (Invasive species)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
S-OG-1 (Oil and gas)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-PS-1 (Ports and shipping)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-PS-2 (Ports and shipping)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-PS-3 (Ports and shipping)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-REN-1 (Renewables)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-SCP-1 (Seascape)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-SOC-1 (Social benefits)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
S-TIDE-1 (Tidal energy)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-TR-1 (Tourism and recreation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-TR-2 (Tourism and recreation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-UWN-1 (Underwater noise)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-UWN-2 (Underwater noise)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-WQ-1 (Water quality)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
S-WQ-2 (Water quality)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

If possible, please provide examples of how and/or why you or your organisation considered specific marine plan policies when making decisions:

D&S IFCA, when responding to consultations on marine licence applications, will refer to the South Marine Plans including some or all of the policies listed above. In most cases the focus is on impacts of the proposal on existing fisheries opportunities and impacts on continued access to these opportunities in the area, co-location aspects, impacts on the habitats and biodiversity in the area of the proposed development and the designated features of MPAs, and the policy relating to aquaculture opportunities. Policies are also considered when authorising exemptions from our Byelaws for certain activities (e.g. for fishing for scientific purposes otherwise than in accordance with a relevant Permit). The policies are also considered during the impact assessments for byelaws. For example, Although they are not all key drivers for the development of the Mobile Fishing Permit

Byelaw 2022, Marine Plan objectives are recognised either directly or indirectly. Another example is in D&S IFCA's management of the Waddeton Order, where aquaculture of Pacific oysters is practiced. In managing the Order, D&S IFCA has implemented a thorough biosecurity plan, which is in accordance with S-NIS-1.

This question is about how different factors are considered in decision-making.

Over the last 18 months, how much do you agree that you or your organisation has 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.

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
a. Potential to develop skills related to marine activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
b. Local strategies that emphasise development of skills related to marine activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
c. Opportunities for a net increase in marine-related employment (particularly in line with skills available in the south marine plan areas, and adjacent areas)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
d. Climate change adaptation measures (developments or activities that reduce or protect against impacts of climate change)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
e. Proposals incorporating features that enhance biodiversity or geological interest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
f. Demonstration of enhanced public access to and within the marine area	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
g. Support for the development of supply chains within the marine renewable energy sector	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
h. Adverse cumulative effects with other existing, authorised, or reasonably foreseeable proposals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

Climate change adaptations has more consideration in more recent times in particular regarding seaweed farm applications and seagrass restoration projects. Adverse cumulative effects e.g. on nursery habitats seem to have increased e.g. cumulative and in-combination effects of pollution and recreational anchoring on seagrass (see response to later question re recreational anchoring impacts on seagrass)

This section is about public access.

In the last 18 months, have you or your organisation observed changes to public access to, and within, the south marine plan areas?

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

If you are able to expand on your response to the previous question, please provide examples of how public access has changed, and/or how the south marine plan policy was considered:

There appears to be more marine developments that negatively impact access to existing fishing opportunities than in previous years.

This section is about how marine plans have affected (or will affect) you or your organisations activities.

How have you or your organisation's administration/business costs over the last 18 months been affected by including the South Marine Plan in your process and decision-making?

- ☐ Costs have reduced
- ☐ No change in costs
- ☒ **Costs have increased**
- ☐ Don't know

Do you expect the inclusion of the South Marine Plan in your processes and decision-making to impact your administration/business costs over the next five years?

- ☐ Costs will reduce
- ☐ No change in costs
- ☒ **Costs to increase**
- ☐ Don't know

In relation to your answers to the two previous questions, please provide further details or case examples where available:

In 2022 D&S IFCA employed a Marine Development Officer. Part of their role is to deal with Marine Licence Applications, some of which are proposed developments in the South Marine Plan area. Consideration of Marine Plan policies are undertaken when responding to these applications. In addition, the Deputy Chief Officer and Senior Environment Officer have spent a considerable amount of time responding, and providing further responses in some instances, to Marine Licence Applications for mariculture and other developments in both the South West and South Marine Plan areas. Consideration of Marine Plan policies is also an important part of Byelaw development and authorisation of exemptions from D&S IFCA's byelaws, as outlined in previous responses. Defra has provided funding to all IFCAs to support the Marine Prioritisation Programme. This additional funding will help support the cost of the existing Marine Development Officer, the Senior Environment Officer,

will help support the cost of the existing Marine Development Officer, the Senior Environment Officer and the Deputy Chief Officer's time in the work relating to responding to Marine Licence applications and having regard for Marine Plan policies when making the decisions outlined in the responses. With the likely increase in renewable energy developments (such as floating wind farms) and seaweed farms further costs associated with decision making including policies of the Marine Plan will create an additional resource cost in officers' time.

How has the South Marine Plan affected you or your organisation's 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.

- ☐ Better placed
- ☐ Worse placed
- ☐ No difference
- ☒ Don't know

Where possible, please give examples to support your response to the previous question:

This section is concerned with how marine plan policies have been considered in proposals to a **formal decision-making process** (such as a marine licence application), in the last 18 months.

Have you or your organisation been involved in developing and/or submitting a proposal to a formal decision-making process within the south marine plan area?

- ☒ Yes - Please state in what capacity (i.e. applicant, consultant, advisory body)

Consultant on marine licence applications, also in the processes of making amended byelaws.

- ☐ No

Are you or your organisation aware of the enhancements to the [Marine Case Management System](#) that launched in 2022, whereby an applicant is

required to carry out a marine plan policy assessment?

- ☐ Yes – submitted or developed an application using it
- ☒ **Yes – aware of the changes but haven't submitted or developed an application**
- ☐ No – not aware of the changes

Following the launch of the applicant-facing marine plan assessment on the Marine Case Management System, do you or your organisation feel your consideration of the South Marine Plan has changed?

- ☐ Significantly increased consideration
- ☒ **Moderately increased consideration**
- ☐ Moderately decreased consideration
- ☐ Significantly decreased consideration
- ☐ No change

In relation to your answers to the previous questions, we would like to know how you have found the applicant-facing marine plan assessment on the Marine Case Management System:

We have not used the applicant-facing marine plan assessment, we are only aware of this through our role as consultees

When deciding whether or not to develop or submit a proposal to a formal decision-making process, did you or your organisation consider the south marine plan policies?

- ☐ Yes – proposal was submitted
- ☐ Yes – proposal was not submitted
- ☐ No
- ☒ **Not applicable – not involved in decision to submit a proposal**

This question is about south marine plan policy **S-MPA-4**:

Until the ecological coherence of the marine protected area network is

confirmed, proposals should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:

- a) avoid
- b) minimise
- c) mitigate adverse impacts on features that may be required to complete the network
- d) if it is not possible to mitigate adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.

In the last 18 months, when assessing proposals in relation to policy **S-MPA-4**, which of the following factors were considered? Please check all that apply, and provide details where possible.

☐ Impacts on [Features of Conservation Importance \(FOCI\)](#) .

☐ Impacts on [Annex 1 habitats](#) identified in The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

☐ 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).**

I don't have information on this to hand at the time of submitting the response

This section is about water quality.

In the past 18 months, have you or your organisation observed 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.

☐ Water quality has improved

☒ **Water quality has deteriorated**

☐ No change observed

☐ Water quality is not something my organisation is aware of

In relation to your answers to the previous question about water quality, please provide further details or examples of how the South Marine Plan has contributed to changes in water quality:

My organisation does not have specific data on water quality, but there are broad stakeholder concerns about levels of CSO discharges and other pollution events from water companies, farmland etc, in addition to sedimentation impacts in the Exe estuary.

This section is about co-existence.

In the last 18 months, have you or your organisation 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.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Don't know

This question is about cumulative effects.

In the last 18 months, have you or your organisation observed any adverse cumulative effects in the south marine plan area?

Note: cumulative effects are the combined, similar effects that result from incremental changes caused by other past, present or reasonably foreseeable actions, together with the current proposal

- ☒ Yes (if so please explain)

Cumulative impacts of recreational anchoring on seagrass beds: There is evidence that anchoring of recreational vessels has an impact on seagrass beds. An anchor landing on a patch of seagrass can bend, damage and break shoots (Montefalcone et al. 2004). Collins et al. (2010) studied the impacts of anchoring on *Zostera marina* in Studland Bay, Dorset. Sediment in bare patches caused by anchoring and mooring chain damage was less cohesive and more mobile. It contained less organic material and had a lower silt fraction. Collins et al. (2010) stated that when an anchor and chain is pulled up and dragged over the bottom following the

movement of the boat it cuts leaves and pulls the rhizomes from the seabed. It cuts into the seagrass rhizome mat, tearing a hole in its fabric. This forms an anchor scar and damage is exacerbated by wave action. Chains attached to anchors from moored boats leave bare patches, which are typically 1–4m² (Collins et al 2010). In Studland Bay where the edge of the rhizome was exposed, burrowing crabs undermined the edge of the surviving seagrass bed (Collins et al., 2010). The results from this study suggested that recovery of seagrass beds is not straight forward and can take several years if damaged (Collins et al., 2010). Collins et al. (2010) found sediment cores taken from seagrass showed a higher abundance of species compared to the anchor and mooring scars (total fauna count of seagrass to scar ratio was 1134:339). The diversity of taxa was also higher in seagrass compared to scar areas, with 50 and 38 families/species, respectively, found in their samples (Collins et al. 2010). Unsworth et al., (2017) assessed the scale of loss of eelgrass from swinging moorings and found that the average area affected was 122 m² per mooring, concluding that loss of this sub-feature is small but significant at a local scale. Anchoring by recreational crafts, which has been shown to be a damaging activity, has not been assessed in protected areas (e.g. Torbay MCZ) by the relevant Authority, in this case the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and is not currently being managed by them. D&S IFCA suggests that monitoring and assessment of this activity is important. Collins, K., A. Suonpaa, and J. Mallinson (2010) The impacts of anchoring and mooring in seagrass, Studland Bay, Dorset, UK. Underwater Technology, 29:117–123. Montefalcone, M., M. Chiantore, A. Lanzone, C. Morri, G. Albertelli, and C. N. Bianchi (2008) BACI design reveals the decline of the seagrass *Posidonia oceanica* induced by anchoring. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 56:1637–1645. Unsworth, R. K. F., Williams, B., Jones, B.L. and Cullen–Unsworth, L. C. (2017) Rocking the Boat: Damage to Eelgrass by Swinging Boat Moorings. Frontiers in Plant Science, 8:1309. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2017.01309 In addition, in to provide more context to our response to the previous question on co-existence: Co-existence is an area where a great deal of input from D&S IFCA's officers has become more important and time consuming. Many of the proposals for development in the D&S IFCA's district exclude fishing opportunities rather than provide opportunities for co-existence. Many Marine Licence Applications that D&S IFCA is dealing with do not thoroughly consider the impacts of the developments on existing uses and users of the area and do not promote co-existence. Therefore in this regard D&S IFCA has not seen an increase in the number of proposals that promote co-existence.

☐ No

This question is about fisheries.

Over the last 18 months, are you aware of any impacts on the following factors within the fishing industry, as a result of the South Marine Plan?

	Only positive impacts	Some positive impacts	No impacts	Some negative impacts	Only negative impacts	Positive and negative impacts	Don't know
Access to fishing grounds	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Spawning areas, nursery areas, or essential fish habitat	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Diversification of a sustainable fishing industry	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Only positive impacts	<input type="radio"/> Some positive impacts	<input type="radio"/> No impacts	<input type="radio"/> Some negative impacts	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Only negative impacts	<input type="radio"/> Positive and negative impacts	<input type="radio"/> Don't know
Enhancement of the fishing industries resilience to climate change	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

If you indicated that you are aware of any impacts to the factors above, please provide additional information, including examples if possible:

As already outlined, many of the MLAs are for developments that exclude the fishing industry often in the interest of one private developer. Often there is little or no consultation with the industry and when it does happen it is because D&S IFCA has highlighted the need for engagement and often offered support in this regard by contacting members of the fishing industry and arranging meetings. Where there is a desire for the applicant to engage there have been positive outcomes, where the proposed location of the development has been moved to reduce or remove the impact. This does not happen in many instances.

Are you or your organisation a port or harbour representative?

Note: This includes responding on behalf of organisations that represent ports or harbours, and port or harbour users.

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

In the last 18 months, have you or your organisation consulted with a port or harbour authority during the development of a proposal?

Note: A proposal can be for a new activity or a change to an existing activity that results in the change of authorisation or authorisation conditions, and that is subject to management by public authorities.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☒ Not applicable - no proposals put forward

How did you or your organisation find out about this survey? (Please select all that apply)

- ☒ **Direct email**
- ☐ Social media
- ☒ **Marine Planning Newsletter**
- ☐ MMO email signature
- ☐ MMO Blog
- ☐ Bob Earll – CMS newsletter
- ☐ Event
- ☐ Meeting with Marine Planner
- ☐ Internal email within my workplace
- ☒ **Coastal Partnership**
- ☐ Other (please specify)

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?

	Yes	No
To receive general updates about marine planning (we will add your contact information to our stakeholder database):	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To arrange a follow-up interview to discuss your responses to the survey:	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide your preferred contact details below:

Email address

Phone number

