



Marine  
Management  
Organisation

## A hypothetical example of marine plan use: Decisions in accordance with the marine plan (section 58(1) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009)



© Marine Management Organisation 2020

You may use and re-use the information featured in this publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. Visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/) to view the licence or write to:

Information Policy Team  
The National Archives  
Kew  
London  
TW9 4DU  
Email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

Information about this publication and further copies are available from:

Marine Management Organisation  
Lancaster House  
Hampshire Court  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
NE4 7YH

Tel: 0300 123 1032  
Email: [info@marinemanagement.org.uk](mailto:info@marinemanagement.org.uk)  
Website: [www.gov.uk/mmo](http://www.gov.uk/mmo)

If referencing this document, please cite it as: A worked example of the application of marine plans by a user and associated decision maker, 2020

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Background .....	2
3. Technical description.....	2
4. Proposal development.....	2
5. Pre-Application .....	4
6. Submission of Application .....	6
7. Decision-maker Assessment.....	6
8. Decision .....	7

## Tables

Table 1: Table showing policies relevant to The Great Oyster Company's site selection .....	5
---	---

## Annexes

Annex A – Plan Policy Assessment Table.....	8
---	---

## 1. Introduction

- 1 This document will take a hypothetical example, from the development of a proposal, through a marine licence application, to a licensing decision. It complements and illustrates the guidance provided in the marine plan documents<sup>1</sup>. This example will use the South Marine Plan as its appropriate marine policy document. It is aimed at plan users (applicants and decision makers).
- 2 The hypothetical example outlines how marine plans may be used in the context of section 58(1) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 whereby all authorisation or enforcement decisions must be made in accordance with the appropriate marine policy documents. It does not provide step-by-step instructions.
- 3 **Please note that this hypothetical worked example is purely for illustrative purposes only. It is designed as a helpful guide to the process. Importantly it should not be considered advice, or give an expectation that future applications will be considered in any particular way. Each application is individually considered on its own facts and circumstances, in accordance with the relevant statutory provisions and guidance applicable. Decisions taken in this example are not to be taken as representative of how the MMO will consider and decide future applications. If having read this guide applicants remain unsure as to the application process then they should seek their own independent professional advice.**
- 4 Marine plans provide a clear, evidence-based approach to inform decision-making by marine users and regulators on where activities might take place within the marine plan area. The vision and objectives of the marine plan aim to deliver sustainable development in the marine environment, through a combination of plan policies.
- 5 Marine plan policies should be applied proportionately, considering the scale, complexity and impact of a proposal. Several policies provide support for specific sectors. Other policies help identify potential challenges and offer direction. As a result, a marine plan:
  - provides a strategic approach to decision-making, considering future use and providing a clear approach to managing resources, activities and interactions within the marine plan areas
  - reduces burden, providing developers with greater clarity on where to invest, encouraging public authorities and plan users to communicate earlier in the process
  - enables projects to move more quickly from concept to consent, reducing the number of inappropriate or unfeasible proposals, saving time and resources
  - applies and clarifies national policy and existing measures, taking account of the issues, opportunities, and characteristics of busy marine plan areas – marine plans do not introduce new requirements.

---

<sup>1</sup> Implementation advice is found in chapter 3 of the South Marine Plan, chapter 4 and paragraphs 47-49 of the East Marine Plan, and chapter 3 of the North East, South East, South West and North West Marine Plans.

- 6 While this hypothetical example is within the South Marine Plan area, the approach described can be applied to any marine plan area. This example focuses on plan policy considerations and does not consider other aspects of licence applications or decisions in any detail, for example Habitats Regulations Assessments (HRA) or Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA).

## 2. Background

- 7 The Great Oyster Company intends to restore native oyster production within an estuary on the south coast of England.
- 8 Historic overfishing, changes to habitat and environment led to the collapse of the oyster fishery 10 years ago. The Great Oyster Company seeks to take advantage of current favourable conditions, including a reduction in terrestrial run-off and an increase in available dissolved oxygen, to test the viability of establishing a small-scale commercial oyster fishery. It plans to do this through the introduction of artificial reef structures, growing racks and native oyster seeding.
- 9 The site is within the South Marine Plan area, 400 metres offshore and will be accessed via a nearby harbour using small vessels. The estuary is adjacent to a Marine Protected Area (MPA) and contains a small but busy port. The area is used for a variety of commercial and recreational purposes including fishing (commercial and recreational), bulk transfer of products by sea, and is a popular recreational boating centre. The estuary has a number of sites important for overwintering birds and the estuary suffers from diffuse pollution from a number of sources, both terrestrial and marine.

## 3. Technical description

- 10 The Great Oyster Company propose to place 24 1m<sup>3</sup> rack structures and 18 1m<sup>3</sup> reef structures close to the shore. The project will last for seven years as a test to establish the suitability of the site. It is anticipated the oyster spat will grow in racks with some being planted out in the seabed and reef structures when a suitable size to naturally colonise appropriate areas. The proposed development will employ three full time equivalent (FTE) employees and five part-time in the first year, increasing to eight FTE by year seven.

## 4. Proposal development

- 11 In developing their proposal, The Great Oyster Company used the South Marine Plan policy assessment process (see table 2 on page 32 of the South Marine Plan) to assess the relevant plan policies in context. The Plan prioritises an order in which to consider policies (i-vi).
- 12 They used the [Explore Marine Plans](#) service to identify *general policies which cover the whole plan area (i)* and *spatial policies which prefer one activity over another (ii)* across a number of potential sites. The [Explore Marine Plans](#) results automatically exclude plan policies that do not spatially overlap with their sites of interest, e.g.
- [S-DEF-1](#) – there are no Ministry of Defence installations or exercise areas nearby.

- 13 A number of the policies highlighted by the search were 'scoped out' by The Great Oyster Company where they were not found to be relevant to their proposal, e.g.
- [S-AGG-4](#) – the proposal does not require marine aggregates for construction.
  - [S-CAB-2](#) – there are no landfall sites for subsea cables in the area.
- 14 *Policies which support existing uses (iii)* were reviewed, these policies identified potential conflicts and ensure resolution with other marine users, e.g.
- [S-TR-2](#) – the estuary contains a significant amount of recreational vessel traffic. The Great Oyster Company does not know whether their proposal will have a significant impact on this. They decided to seek advice from the relevant decision maker (MMO).
- 15 *Policies safeguarding areas for future development (iv)* were reviewed, e.g. aggregate extraction and renewable energy.
- [S-AGG-1](#) – there are no areas subject to an Exploration and Option Agreement with The Crown Estate in the vicinity of the proposal.
  - [S-TIDE-1](#) – there are no areas under seabed agreement for tidal energy generation in the vicinity of the proposal.
- 16 Policies which *directly support certain sectors (v)* i.e. aquaculture and general marine skills and employment were reviewed e.g.
- [S-AQ-2](#) – directly supports the installation of infrastructure to enable the development of sustainable aquaculture. The Great Oyster Company's proposal to re-establish an oyster fishery fully met the requirements of the policy.
  - [S-EMP-1](#) and [S-EMP-2](#) – this proposal will help rejuvenate an historic oyster fishery and increase employment opportunities and skills in this traditional coastal community.
- 17 *Methodological policies which support preferred methods/best practice (vi)* were also considered e.g.
- [S-NIS-1](#) – the proposal introduces structures suitable for the settlement of non-indigenous species. The Great Oyster Company recognise the need to develop measures to regularly monitor for non-indigenous species colonising their structures and have a plan in place to report and destroy any organisms found.
- 18 The Great Oyster Company understood that its proposal was to be measured against each policy to consider how the proposal met the aims and requirements of the policy wording. Where there were instances where the application did not meet the criteria of the policy, or appeared to be in conflict with the South Marine Plan, The Great Oyster Company stated reasons why the application should still be supported, for example:
- [S-UWN-2](#) – while the proposal would generate ambient underwater noise through small boat operations, it is not at a significant level in the context of

local noise generating activities, and it would not be proportionate to the scale of the proposal to implement mitigation measures.

- 19 *It is entirely possible that apparent conflict identified between a single policy and a proposal is mitigated when considered in the context of the proposal and against all scoped-in policies.*
- 20 The Great Oyster Company's full assessment of their proposal against relevant policies is in Annex A. Each policy test was either met or an issue was identified and appropriate mitigation or adaptation was added to the proposal. If appropriate mitigation or adaptation was not possible, that site was considered non-viable.
- 21 Through policy review The Great Oyster Company gained an understanding of where their proposal would be best supported by policy, and where they might have to introduce new design and operating measures to eliminate or reduce their impact on other users or the environment. Along with technical considerations this informed the cost-benefit analysis used to make their final site selection.

## 5. Pre-Application

- 22 The Great Oyster Company has developed a proposal in accordance with, and compliant with, the relevant marine plan documents, referring to Chapter 3 of the South Marine Plan for guidance.
- 23 The Great Oyster Company found using the [Marine licence interactive self-service tool](#) that the proposal did not qualify for a self-service application and therefore needed a full application and assessment against plan policies. Following this The Great Oyster Company took the decision to request pre-application advice by submitting an enquiry through the [Marine Case Management System](#).
- 24 As part of the pre-application advice discussion, The Great Oyster Company raised their question about policy [S-TR-2](#), regarding their potential impact on tourism and recreation activities. The MMO suggested that a Navigational Risk Assessment and/or a consultation of local user groups may inform their proposal design and demonstrate they have sufficiently considered then avoided, minimise or mitigate their impact.
- 25 The Great Oyster Company understood that their application submission would be assessed by the MMO against all relevant plan policies, and that by demonstrating consideration of the policies, vision and objectives of the plan (proven through the submission of supporting evidence), they would benefit from a faster processing time and would be better prepared to answer any queries related to the proposal.

- 26 As part of the Explore Marine Plans check, The Great Oyster Company identified several policies relevant to its site selection. These policies have been divided into the six recommended categories. The policies are listed in full below against each category:

**Table 1: Table showing policies relevant to The Great Oyster Company's site selection**

#	Policy Theme	Relevant Policy Codes
1	<p>Check the policies which are relevant to all proposals and apply across the whole of the inshore and offshore plan areas</p> <p>These are likely to apply to you and set out considerations or points to be aware of.</p>	<p>S-ACC-1  S-ACC-2  S-BIO-1, S-BIO-2, S-BIO-3, S-BIO-4  S-CO-1  S-CC-1, S-CC-2, S-CC3, S-CC-4  S-HER-1  S-INF-1  S-MPA-1, S-MPA-2, S-MPA-4  S-NIS-1  S-SOC-1  S-UWN-1, S-UWN-2  S-WQ-1, S-WQ-2</p>
2	<p>Check definitive policies which show a clear preference for certain activities in certain locations. These provide support for the relevant activities, and preclude other activities or require them to be compatible.</p>	<p>S-DD-1</p>
3	<p>Check the policies which support existing use of the marine area. While these policies do not preclude other activities they require proposals to work through a number of steps to reduce impacts on existing activities to enable co-existence and manage conflicts.</p>	<p>S-DIST-1  S-FISH-2  S-PS-1  S-SCP-1  S-TR-2</p>
4	<p>Check the policies which safeguard areas for future development by certain sectors. These may support your sector, or require you to work through a number of steps to prevent affecting future activity if you wish to go there.</p>	<p>S-AQ-1</p>



#	Policy Theme	Relevant Policy Codes
5	Check for policies which directly support certain sectors, support diversification, skills enhancement or employment across all activities.	S-AQ-2 S-EMP-1, S-EMP-2 S-FISH-1, S-FISH-3
6	Check for policies which support preferred methods and approaches, including best practice and support identification of the best way to successfully achieve a proposal.	S-CC-1 S-ML-2 S-NIS-1

## 6. Submission of Application

- 27 The Great Oyster Company had completed the additional work and amendments to their proposal identified during pre-application.
- 28 Their application was submitted via the Marine Case Management System to the MMO, along with any relevant plan policy evidence, HRA or EIA.
- 29 Standard marine licences undergo a four week consultation period, in addition to providing supporting evidence, the pre-application consultation of local user groups conducted by The Great Oyster Company potentially reduced the number of negative formal consultation responses.

## 7. Decision-maker Assessment

- 30 Upon receipt of the proposal, the MMO Marine Licensing function assessed how the application met the aims of the plan policies, checking the information already supplied by The Great Oyster Company. The MMO Marine Licensing function assessed the application following the same approach as the developer, this can be seen in plan policy assessment table in Annex A. This table lists those policies relevant to the application, together with the relevant considerations for each policy and an example of how the policy test could be applied to the proposed development.
- 31 As The Great Oyster Company had completed their own policy assessment, the application process progressed more quickly compared to an applicant who had not undertaken the assessment, saving both time and expense to the company. The pre-application discussions also helped ensure the policy assessment information provided was relevant and proportional.
- 32 If The Great Oyster Company had not provided evidence there would have been delay while the MMO Marine Licensing function made a new assessment against the South Marine Plan, this would be likely to have involved one or more requests for further information with the application held pending each time.
- 33 Once the MMO Marine Licensing function had considered the proposal application against plan policies The Great Oyster Company was asked for additional

information to address any outstanding policy considerations. For example, their method for monitoring water quality throughout the project lifetime.

## **8. Decision**

- 34 The final decision on whether to permit a marine licence was dependent on several other aspects (legislation) including HRA or EIA, however, the assessment against the marine plan was the key to plan-led decision making. In this example, the MMO was able to issue a marine licence to The Great Oyster Company and the proposal went ahead.

## Annex A – Plan Policy Assessment Table

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
1	S-ACC-1 - Proposals, including in relation to tourism and recreation, should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant adverse impacts on public access.	Provision for marine access is essential to enabling the economic and social benefits that will come from the growth of tourism and recreation in the south marine plan areas. S-ACC-1 requires proposals to manage impacts on public access to the marine area and contributes to the health and well-being of communities.	The proposed activity (deposit of 24 oyster racks in shallow water outside of any navigable channel) will not any impact on any public access. Access to the site will be by The Great Oyster Company's own boat launched from existing jetty infrastructure in nearby harbour. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP
1	S-ACC-2 - Proposals demonstrating enhanced public access to and within the marine area will be supported.	S-ACC-2 builds on S-ACC-1 by ensuring support will be given to proposals which enhance public access to the marine area, such as physical, digital, and interpretative access and signage. Support will also be given to proposals which enhance access by removing unsuitable access arrangements. Identifying positive impacts of a proposal does not negate the need to assess adverse impacts in line with relevant legislation. Enhancement is not a substitute for avoidance, protection or mitigation measures.	The proposed activity is not intended to enhance public access to and within the marine area. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the Marine Plan (MP).
1	S-BIO-1 - Proposals	Competition for space, increased levels of	RSPB and NE consulted as part of the

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	that may have significant adverse impacts on natural habitat and species adaptation, migration and connectivity must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise c) mitigate significant adverse impacts.	development and predicted effects of climate change can affect the south marine plan areas' natural habitats and species connectivity, ability to adapt to change and migrate. S-BIO-1 requires proposals to manage negative effects which may not enable the functioning of healthy, resilient and adaptable marine ecosystems. Proposals must consider the available evidence and identify any significant adverse impacts on natural habitat and species adaptation, migration and connectivity	proposal. Both confirm it unlikely that proposed activity will result in significant impacts on natural habitat and species adaptation, migration and connectivity. The draft HRA concludes that proposed project will not have an adverse impact on the integrity of the adjacent MPA, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
1	S-BIO-2 - Proposals that incorporate features that enhance or facilitate natural habitat and species adaptation, migration and connectivity will be supported.	S-BIO-2 supports proposals that incorporate features that enhance or facilitate natural habitat and species adaptation, migration and connectivity, enabling the environment to respond to climate change and development. This may include novel designs, and collaboration between developers and public authorities. Proposals should incorporate features which enhance or facilitate natural habitat and species adaptation, migration and connectivity within the south marine plan areas. Enhancement refers to measures taken which	The proposed activity will incorporate features that enhance or facilitate natural habitat and species adaptation, migration and connectivity.  The Great Oyster Company has stated the project aims to restore a collapsed native oyster fishery to achieve a sustainable oyster fishery and support jobs in the fishery sector.  It is noted 'UK native or European flat oysters ( <i>Ostrea edulis</i> ) are classified as a

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
		<p>have a positive impact, for example coastal protection works that enhance fish habitat by creating additional saltmarsh. Where artificial structures are used to recreate habitat, these proposals must be in line with policy S-NIS-1</p>	<p>priority species in the national Biodiversity Action Plan because of a population loss of 50 per cent over 25 years.'The proposed activity should be supported.</p> <p>The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>
1	<p>S-BIO-3 - Proposals that enhance coastal habitats where important in their own right and/or for ecosystem functioning and provision of goods and services will be supported. Proposals must take account of the space required for coastal habitats where important in their own right</p>	<p>In the south inshore marine plan area there is a lack of space for coastal habitats. This is due to coastal squeeze, a process where habitats have decreasing space between rigid coastal structures and rising sea level or coastal erosion. S-BIO-3 requires proposals to manage their impacts on these habitats to support the functioning of healthy, resilient and adaptable marine ecosystems. Proposals should include supporting information demonstrating how they enhance coastal habitats. Enhancement refers to measures taken which have a positive impact. An example of enhancement could include the creation of saltmarsh habitat as part of a coastal realignment scheme, which can provide natural flood and erosion defence</p>	<p>The proposed activity will not result in any loss of coastal habitat. Successful re-establishment of a native oyster colony will help improve water quality and thereby enhance ecosystem function. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	and/or for ecosystem functioning and provision of goods and services and demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate for net loss of coastal habitat.	while acting as important habitat for wading birds.	
1	S-BIO-4 - Proposals that enhance the distribution and net extent of priority habitats should be supported. Proposals must demonstrate that they will avoid reducing the distribution and net extent of priority habitats.	Maintaining the extent and distribution of priority and coastal habitats is important as it reduces habitat fragmentation, species isolation and supports strong, biodiverse biological communities. S-BIO-4 maintains the distribution and net extent of priority habitats throughout the south marine plan areas by ensuring proposals do not adversely affect them. Proposals must demonstrate that they avoid reductions in the distribution and net extent of priority habitats within the south marine plan areas	Proposed activity will not reduce net extent of priority habitats. The only priority habitat identified within 500m is intertidal foreshore. The proposed works are sub-tidal. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
1	S-CO-1 - Proposals will minimise their	Space within the south marine plan areas is limited and required to realise social,	The proposed location has been selected and agreed with the local Harbour Master

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	use of space and consider opportunities for co-existence with other activities.	environmental and economic benefits. S-CO-1 enables proposals to be spatially planned and make appropriate use of available space by minimising footprints. Those activities that can co-exist, should do so	to avoid any adverse impact on other users of the sea, including any dredging activities. The local kayaking club has also indicated the proposed location will not adversely impact on any established recreational boating activities. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
1	S-CC-1 - Proposals must consider their contribution to greenhouse gas emissions arising from unintended consequences on other activities. Where such consequences are likely to result in increased greenhouse gas emissions, proposals should demonstrate that they will, in order of	S-CC-1 addresses the indirect greenhouse gas emissions of a proposal. Indirect emissions are those that have occurred due to the impositions of a proposal on other activities. Proposals must include and consider available evidence and identify interactions which may result in indirect greenhouse gas emissions.	The proposed activity will generate greenhouse gas emissions when transporting and installing the structures. Considering the scale of the proposed works no further information is considered necessary.  The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	<p>preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate unintended consequences on other activities.</p>		
1	<p>S-CC-2 - Proposals should demonstrate for the lifetime of the proposal that: 1) they are resilient to the effects of climate change 2) they will not have a significant adverse impact upon climate change adaptation measures elsewhere. In respect of 2) proposals should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate the significant adverse</p>	<p>S-CC-2 makes sure that proposals should not compromise existing adaptation measures, which will enable improvement of the resilience of coastal communities to coastal erosion and flood risk. S-CC-2 enables enhanced resilience of developments, activities and ecosystems within the south marine plan areas to the effects of climate change. Proposals that are likely to have a significant adverse impact on existing climate change adaptation measures, such as those highlighted in reports through the National Adaptation Programme, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference, avoid, minimise or mitigate significant adverse impacts upon these climate change adaptation measures</p>	<p>The proposed cages have been designed to be stable and durable. They are considered to be resilient to the effects of climate change.</p> <p>The proposed activity will not have a significant adverse impact upon climate change adaptation measures elsewhere.</p> <p>The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>



Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	impacts upon these climate change adaptation measures.		
1	S-CC-3 - Proposals in and adjacent to the south marine plan areas that are likely to have a significant adverse impact on coastal change should not be supported	Large areas of the south marine plan coastline are subject to or vulnerable to change. S-CC-3 makes sure proposals do not exacerbate coastal change, enabling communities to be more resilient and able to adapt better to coastal erosion and flood risk where identified. Proposals should demonstrate they have consulted with relevant public authorities. Specifically the Environment Agency, Catchment Partnerships, relevant Coast Protection Authorities, coastal groups and/or lead local flood authorities. Consultation should be carried out at the earliest opportunity, particularly in relation to considering how proposals might help support existing coastal adaptation policies. Public authorities should also apply this policy to proposals in adjacent terrestrial areas due to the interconnected nature of terrestrial and marine processes	The proposed activity will not have a significant adverse impact on coastal change. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
1	S-CC-4 - Proposals that may have a significant adverse	Habitats that provide flood defence and carbon sequestration provide natural resilience for coastal communities that are	The proposed activity is unlikely to have an impact on habitats that provide a flood defence or carbon sequestration service.

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	<p>impact on habitats that provide a flood defence or carbon sequestration ecosystem service must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant adverse impacts</p>	<p>vulnerable to coastal erosion and change. S-CC-4 requires proposals to manage impacts, enabling these important habitats to continue to provide this valuable service. Proposals should identify and describe habitats within the immediate vicinity and determine whether those habitats provide carbon sequestration or flood defence ecosystem services</p>	<p>It is probable the proposal will add to the flood resilience of the location. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>
1	<p>S-HER-1 - Proposals that may compromise or harm elements contributing to the significance of heritage assets should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate compromise or harm. If it is not possible to mitigate,</p>	<p>The south marine plan areas have many significant cultural assets. Some have little protection despite their contribution to the character of the south marine plan areas and tourism economy. Whilst some of these are protected through existing statutory designations, others are not. S-HER-1 makes sure that proposals do not have an adverse impact on marine and coastal heritage assets, regardless of their designation status. This enables the diversity of the marine environment ensuring the cultural heritage is protected. Proposals should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference, avoid, minimise or</p>	<p>No heritage assets will be compromised by this proposal. It is likely the successful re-establishment of this traditional fishery will add to the heritage value of this coast. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	the public benefits for proceeding with the proposal must outweigh the compromise or harm to the heritage asset.	mitigate compromise or harm upon all heritage assets including those newly identified or discovered, or non-designated assets that are yet to be assessed for designation	
1	S-INF-1 - Appropriate land-based infrastructure which facilitates marine activity (and vice versa) should be supported.	Many marine activities in the south marine plan areas are reliant on land based infrastructure and vice versa. S-INF-1 supports integration between marine and land- use plans in providing adequate infrastructure, especially where that infrastructure will predominantly support activity in the other environment. S-INF-1 enables public authorities to consider how a proposal may influence land-based or marine activity and their associated infrastructure.	Proposed activity will utilise existing infrastructure, including existing jetty and landing stages within the harbour. The increased use of the facilities will help secure future use of landing infrastructure and avoid potential for redevelopment into other uses. This is a new proposal which will support and increase current use without over-burdening existing landing capacity. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
1	S-MPA-1 - Proposals that support the objectives of marine protected areas and the ecological	S-MPA-1 makes sure proposals take account of adverse impacts on individual sites and the overall MPA network, protecting important habitats, species and geological features, enabling the successful and continued management of these sites.	The proposed oyster modules are not intended to support the objectives of marine protected areas and the ecological coherence of the marine protected area network. This is not a reason to support the proposal.

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	<p>coherence of the marine protected area network will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may have adverse impacts on the objectives of marine protected areas and the ecological coherence of the marine protected area network must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate adverse impacts, with due regard given to statutory advice on an ecologically coherent network.</p>	<p>Proposals that support the objectives of marine protected areas should include information demonstrating how this will be achieved. The conservation objectives for individual sites are provided by the statutory nature conservation bodies and describe whether the condition of features for which the site is designated should be maintained or restored. Where proposals support the objectives of marine protected areas, public authorities should assess if they support the ecological coherence of the network and seek advice from the statutory nature conservation bodies on a case-by-case basis</p>	<p>The proposal is unlikely to have an adverse impact on the objectives of marine protected areas and /or the ecological coherence of the marine protected area network.</p> <p>The MMO has drafted a HRA and concluded that the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the MPA, either alone or in-combination with other plans of projects.</p> <p>Consultation with NE confirms this view. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>
1	S-MPA-2 - Proposals that enhance a marine protected area's	The effects of climate change on habitats and species poses a challenge to designated marine protected area sites in the south marine plan areas. S-MPA-2 makes sure	The proposed oyster modules are not intended to enhance a marine protected area's ability to adapt to climate change and so enhance the resilience of the

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	<p>ability to adapt to climate change and so enhance the resilience of the marine protected area network will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may have adverse impacts on an individual marine protected area's ability to adapt to the effects of climate change and so reduce the resilience of the marine protected area network, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate adverse impacts.</p>	<p>proposals account for adverse impacts on individual marine protected areas ability to adapt to climate change, improving resilience and working towards a well-managed marine protected area network.</p> <p>Proposals should include supporting information demonstrating how they will enhance the ability of marine protected areas to adapt to climate change. Proposals are still required to be in compliance with relevant legislation and regulations including Habitats Regulations Assessment, Marine and Coastal Access Act, Environmental Impact Assessment and other national legislation.</p> <p>Enhancement refers to measures taken which have a positive impact, eg removal of hard coastal defence structures in favour of soft engineering which enables habitat roll back</p>	<p>marine protected area network. This is not a reason to support the proposal.</p> <p>The proposal has no potential to impact on an individual marine protected area's ability to adapt to the effects of climate change and/ or reduce the resilience of the marine protected area network.</p> <p>The MMO has completed a HRA and concluded that the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the MPA, either alone or in-combination with other plans of projects.</p> <p>NE has been consulted and agrees with this view.</p> <p>The Great Oyster Company considered the policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>
1	S-MPA-4 - Until the ecological	It is important to makes sure that possible locations for further marine protected areas,	NE consultation has confirmed there are no features, which may form part of the

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	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 <sup>14</sup> 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.	which may be needed to complete the network, remain in sufficient condition to merit designation. S-MPA-4 makes sure proposals do not prevent the future inclusion of features which may be required to enhance network coherence. The focus of S-MPA-4 is on Features of Conservation Importance, priority habitats and species, and Annex 1 habitats. When assessing proposals, public authorities should consider Features of Conservation Importance, Annex 1 habitats, and species listed under the S41 list (2006 Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act) and Oslo/Paris Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North- East Atlantic. Where it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding, including how the proposal supports the South Marine Plan vision, objectives and other plan policies	MPA network, are at risk from the proposed works. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
1	S-NIS-1 - Proposals must put in place appropriate measures to avoid or minimise significant adverse	As the south marine plan areas are so close to the continent and have one of the busiest shipping channels in the world, there is a high risk of introducing or spreading invasive non-native species. S-NIS-1 aims to avoid or minimise damage to the marine area from the	The Great Oyster Company has considered the risk of introducing invasive non-native species (INNS) as a result of the proposed works and has concluded that 'the introduction of the small new modules is extremely unlikely

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	impacts on the marine area that would arise through the introduction and transport of non-indigenous species, particularly when: 1) moving equipment, boats or livestock (for example fish and shellfish) from one water body to another 2) introducing structures suitable for settlement of non-indigenous species, or the spread of invasive non-indigenous species known to exist in the area.	introduction or transport of invasive non-native species. Proposals are required to be in compliance with relevant legislation and regulations including Habitats Regulations Assessment, Environmental Impact Assessment, Ballast Water Management Convention and National Policy Statements where they apply	to increase the establishment of INNS.' They have also detailed a protocol for regularly checking their structures for INNS colonisation.  EA and NE were consulted to confirm their views as no measures to avoid or minimise risk of spreading INNS has been proposed by The Great Oyster Company. EA have provided a standard protocol which has been in agreed in principle by the applicant and will form a licence condition to the marine licence.  The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
1	S-SOC-1 - Proposals that enhance or promote social benefits will be supported.	S-SOC-1 requires proposals to manage negative impacts on activities with social benefits in an order of preference - avoid, minimise or mitigate impacts which result in the displacement of other existing or	The Great Oyster Company has liaised with the local commercial fishing community to ensure no displacement of existing fishing activities will take place. A minor change to the location of the

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	Proposals must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant adverse impacts which result in the displacement of other existing or authorised (but yet to be implemented) activities that generate social benefits.	authorised (but yet to be implemented) activities that generate social benefits.	structures has been agreed to ensure existing pot-fishermen have access to their traditional grounds which lie close to the location of this proposed activity. A signed agreement between The Great Oyster Company and the local fishermen's association has been submitted as part of the supporting evidence with the application. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
1	S-UWN-1 - Proposals generating impulsive sound, must contribute data to the UK Marine Noise Registry as per any currently agreed requirements. Public authorities must take account of any	Impulsive sounds can have an adverse effect on marine life and human enjoyment of marine areas. S-UWN-1 supports the established noise registry to record, assess, and manage the distribution and timing of impulsive sounds sources. S-UWN-1 encourages data collection to determine current baselines and levels of impulsive sound in the marine environment enabling effective marine management and protection of biodiversity or viable populations of species. Proposals should provide information	The proposed works will not generate impulsive noise and The Great Oyster Company will not be requested to submit data to the UK Marine Noise Registry.  The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.



Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	currently agreed targets under the UK Marine Strategy part one descriptor 11.	to the Marine Noise Registry (through a licence condition) on the projected noise generated from the proposed activity prior to it taking place, and following the completion of the activity, the actual noise generated, in line with the requirements of the consenting regime under which the proposals are approved, or on a voluntary basis where no consenting process is currently in place.	
1	S-UWN-2 - Proposals that generate impulsive sound and/or ambient noise must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant adverse impacts on highly mobile species, d) if it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for	Underwater noise levels have increased with marine space use. Noise can affect highly mobile species, including causing chronic stress and death at higher intensities. S-UWN-2 supports management of underwater noise requiring proposals to take appropriate noise reduction actions. Proposals should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference, avoid, minimise or mitigate significant adverse impacts of underwater noise on highly mobile species	<p>The proposed works will not generate impulsive noise. The vessel used to install the structures and for ongoing operational activities will generate ambient noise.</p> <p>Considering that the proposal is in an area of high marine traffic, it is considered unlikely that this will have any impact on highly mobile species.</p> <p>The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	proceeding.		
1	S-WQ-1 - Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts upon water environment, including upon habitats and species that can be of benefit to water quality must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant adverse impacts.	<p>Much of the economic and cultural prosperity of the south marine plan areas is reliant on water quality. Activities can place stress on water bodies such that, in parts of the south marine plan areas water quality requires improvement. S-WQ-1 seeks to manage impacts on water quality, and the habitats and species which benefit water quality through the ecosystem service they provide.</p> <p>Public authorities should consider water quality when authorising land-based infrastructure. Examples of land-based infrastructure that should be considered include land-based handling and disposal facilities for refuse, waste water and sewage to support recreational, residential and commercial boating and shipping activities. Proposals may be required to undertake a Water Framework Directive Assessment as part of obtaining regulatory consent for their activity. Being exempt from the need to undertake an assessment does not exempt proposals from policy S-WQ-1 or S-WQ-2</p>	<p>The following is stated in the application: 'One of the key aims of the oyster restoration project is to increase oyster populations to levels that restore important ecological functions, including water filtration and nutrient cycling; habitat and community structure; and adequate brood stock to sustain regional populations.'</p> <p>The Great Oyster Company has provided a WFD Assessment as the site location is within 2km of a designated site. EA have also been consulted.</p> <p>It is considered unlikely that the proposed works will have an adverse impact on the water environment, including habitats and species that can be of benefit to water quality.</p> <p>The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>
1	S-WQ-2 - Activities	Habitats such as coastal saltmarsh, intertidal	As per WQ-1. The proposal will deliver

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	that can deliver an improvement to water environment, or enhance habitats and species which can be of benefit to water quality should be supported.	mudflats, seagrass, reed beds and natural blue mussel beds provide ecosystem services which maintain and can improve water quality. S-WQ-2 encourages activities improving water quality including habitat restoration, bioremediation and voluntary measures. WQ-2 aims to support activities that will improve water quality, or enhance habitats and species which benefit water quality. Examples of relevant activities include, but are not limited to: habitat restoration works, provision of natural sediment settling areas, building in beneficial features as part of good design, development of bioremediation sites such as those suggested by the MMO 1105 report, activities undertaken by water authorities such as waste water treatment and water infrastructure provision	water quality improvements and should therefore be supported. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
2	S-DD-1 - Proposals within or adjacent to licensed dredging and disposal areas should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate	There are a substantial number of existing maintenance dredging and disposal sites within the south marine plan areas. Dredging activities support the socio-economic benefits of port developments from direct and indirect job creation. S-DD-1 enables identification of dredging and disposal areas, clarifies requirements and encourages early consideration of the effects on maintenance	The proposed site location is near to the estuary navigation dredge area. Although not ideal, a compromise in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding has been reached between The Great Oyster Company and the local harbour allowing colocation of activities where possible within marine planning. The site has been chosen and agreed with the local harbour

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	significant adverse impacts on licensed dredging and disposal areas, d) if it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	dredging. This policy protects dredging and disposal activities in or adjacent to licensed dredging and disposal areas against other new proposals, including cables or built infrastructure that negatively impact ability to access or egress from these sites. The intent is to prevent activities that would compromise dredging and disposal which is essential in enabling continued access by vessels to ports and harbours	master to avoid any impact on other users of the sea, including dredging activities. The proposed activity will have no impact on licensed disposal sites. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
3	S-DIST-1 - Proposals, including in relation to tourism and recreational activities, within and adjacent to the south marine plan areas must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant cumulative adverse physical disturbance or displacement	Cumulative disturbance and displacement from activities, including those that do not require authorisation such as tourism and recreation, has caused a decline in some highly mobile species. S-DIST-1 reduces cumulative impacts by requiring proposals to manage impacts, highlighting good practice, and encouraging strategic management of unauthorised activities. Proposals must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference, avoid, minimise or mitigate adverse impacts of physical disturbance and include supporting information that is proportionate to the proposal	It is considered unlikely that the proposed activity will result in significant adverse physical disturbance or displacement impacts on highly mobile species. Vessel movements to and from the site will be limited to essential trips only (no more than 3 times per week except for emergencies). This will be monitored through a licence condition. NE, local IFCA and EA consultation confirm this view. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	impacts on highly mobile species.		
3	S-FISH-2 - Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on access to, or within, sustainable fishing or aquaculture sites must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant adverse impacts, d) if it is not possible to mitigate the significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	Sustainable fishing and aquaculture industries provide benefits to coastal communities and contribute to UK food security. These activities are restricted in where they can operate, making them vulnerable to loss of access caused by surrounding sea use. S-FISH-2 limits impacts of other marine activities on fishing and aquaculture access, enabling maximum marine resource use and generating prosperous, resilient and cohesive coastal communities. Proposals will identify potential impacts on access. Identification of impacts and appropriate measures may require consultation with the fishing industry and the preparation of co-existence and fisheries liaison plans, with relevant regulatory bodies identifying issues at scoping stage	Proposed activity will have no significant adverse impacts on access to, or within, sustainable fishing or aquaculture sites. The proposed works, are relatively small in scale and the required access will be sensitively managed (see S-DIST-1). The policy supports aquaculture use and the increased access requirements are considered to be manageable and unlikely to have any significant impacts on existing or known future activities. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
3	S-PS-1 - Proposals that may have a significant adverse impact upon current activity and future	Ports and harbours are essential to realise economic and social benefits for the south marine plan areas and the UK. S-PS-1 makes sure proposals do not restrict current port and harbour activity or future growth, enabling	The Great Oyster Company has demonstrated that the proposed activity will have no impact on any future expansion plans of the local harbour. The Great Oyster Company has worked

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	<p>opportunity for expansion of port and harbour activities should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant adverse impacts, d) if it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.</p>	<p>long-term strategic decisions, and supporting competitive and efficient port and shipping operations.</p>	<p>closely with the Harbour Master to ensure the avoidance of any potential impact by selecting a discrete site which will not impinge on harbour operations. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>
3	<p>S-SCP-1 - Proposals that may have a significant adverse impact upon the seascape of an area should only be supported if they demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b)</p>	<p>Seascape is important due to the prevalence of protected landscapes, their beauty and association with tourism and recreation activities. S-SCP-1 adds clarity to existing national policy by identifying the visual resource and important characteristics of the south marine plan areas, enabling these policies to be better supported. Proposals which may have a significant adverse impact on seascape, should demonstrate measures taken to avoid,</p>	<p>The proposed activity is sub tidal and will have no long term impact on the seascape of the area, except at exceptionally low tides. Vessel movements will be conducted by small boats at times of the day unlikely to impact upon the visual amenity of the area. The estuary is a popular boating area and the additional movements of the maintenance and harvesting vessel will not add to the overall background of</p>

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	<p>minimise, c) mitigate significant adverse impacts upon the seascape of an area, d) if it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding</p>	<p>minimise or mitigate impacts on the area's visual resource or character</p>	<p>vessel movements. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p>S-TR-2 - Proposals that enhance or promote tourism and recreation activities will be supported. Proposals for development must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities.</p>	<p>Tourism and recreation are growth industries in the south marine plan areas. S-TR-2 makes sure that any new development does not have an adverse impact on tourism and recreation activities. S-TR-2 enables the south marine plan areas to continue to benefit from the significant contributions to the economy, and health and well-being benefits to people that tourism and recreation bring.</p>	<p>The Great Oyster Company did not know whether their proposal will have a significant impact on this. Having sought advice from the relevant decision maker (MMO), The Great Oyster Company consulted local users groups (eg. harbour master, yacht club and recreational fishers) to ensure the proposed development was able to identify and avoid any significant adverse impacts. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
4	<p>S-AQ-1 - Proposals for sustainable aquaculture in identified areas of potential sustainable aquaculture production will be supported. Proposals in existing or within potential sustainable aquaculture production areas must demonstrate consideration of and compatibility with sustainable aquaculture production. Where compatibility is not possible, proposals must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise c) mitigate</p>	<p>Aquaculture is an important industry in the south inshore marine plan area, with the potential to increase supply, contributing to food security in the UK. S-AQ-1 enables the continuation of existing production and sustainable expansion of aquaculture to maximise opportunities. S-AQ-1 highlights current and potential sites for future expansion, where other industries are required to demonstrate their compatibility with aquaculture. Where proposals support sustainable aquaculture production, relevant supporting information should be included. Adverse impacts must be addressed in addition to describing any positive impacts. Evidence in support of sustainable aquaculture production is not a substitute for avoiding, mitigating or minimising adverse impacts</p>	<p>This policy supports aquaculture development in areas identified as suitable for sustainable development. The Great Oyster Company has supplied supporting information to show how potential adverse impacts will be addressed. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>



Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	significant adverse impacts on sustainable aquaculture, d) if it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.		
5	S-AQ-2 - Proposals that enable the provision of infrastructure for sustainable fisheries and aquaculture and related industries will be supported.	Fisheries and aquaculture are important particularly to coastal communities in the south marine plan areas. S-AQ-2 makes sure support is given to proposals that provide supporting infrastructure either at sea or on land for fisheries and aquaculture to support safe, profitable and efficient marine businesses. This encourages supporting infrastructure for these industries, enabling their benefits to be realised.	The proposed restoration of the fishery and resultant improvements to water quality, will result in evidence that will influence sustainable fisheries and aquaculture infrastructure. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
5	S-EMP-1 - Proposals that develop skills related to marine activities, particularly in line with local skills	Government seeks to bring supply and demand in the skills and labour market closer together. S-EMP-1 supports proposals that enhance or create marine related skills opportunities to enable maximum sustainable activity, prosperity and opportunities for all. Proposals should demonstrate where training	The proposal will employ 8 full time equivalent and part-time staff and increase marine skills through this activity. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	strategies, will be supported.	opportunities can be identified for new and existing marine activities, throughout the lifetime of the plan. This should be proportionate to the size of the proposal. Where proposals of a smaller scale may not have the scope to meet the policy requirements these should be outlined with reasons why	
5	S-EMP-2 - Proposals resulting in a net increase to marine related employment will be supported, particularly where they are in line with the skills available in and adjacent to the south marine plan areas.	The south marine plan areas have employment structures with significant variation within and between local authority areas. S-EMP-2 encourages public authorities to consider the employment benefits of a proposal and how the required skills equate to those of the plan area. It enables maximum sustainable activity, prosperity and opportunities for all, now and in the future. Proposals should demonstrate where employment opportunities can be identified for new and existing marine activities within the south marine plan areas. This should be proportional to the size of the proposal. Proposals that are not of sufficient size to meet the policy requirements should outline reasons why	The proposed activity will increase employment in the area and develop new skills related to aquaculture. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
5	S-FISH-1 - Proposals that	Climate change can affect commercial fisheries by altering fish abundance, growth,	The proposal will underpin good environmental practices, leading to

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
	support the diversification of a sustainable fishing industry and or enhance fishing industry resilience to the effects of climate change should be supported.	distribution, or behaviour. S-FISH-1 supports long-term strategic proposals that enable the fishing industry to diversify or build in resilience to manage climate change risks and maximise opportunities for sustainable use of marine resources. Proposals should demonstrate how opportunities for diversification of the fishing industry or development of resilience to climate change are supported. Proposals could also demonstrate that they have consulted with the fishing industry during the early stages of project development to enable understanding of industry requirements, and identify where they can support areas that are already diversifying.	improved water quality and greater biodiversity; all of which will aid in ameliorating the effects of climate change. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
5	S-FISH-3 - Proposals that enhance access to, or within sustainable fishing or aquaculture sites should be supported.	Through co-existence and co-location of facilities, S-FISH-3 enables support for sustainable fishing and aquaculture by supporting proposals that enhance access to sites. Where fishing and aquaculture activities occur, proposals should demonstrate that they have assessed the extent to which these activities could operate in the vicinity of the same footprint proposed by the development and considered opportunities to enhance access or maximise co-existence by	The Great Oyster Company has consulted with the local fishing community to ensure there is co-existence and no conflict between fishing and aquaculture activities. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
		<p>minimising the use of space and mitigating conflicts. The development of co-existence and fisheries liaison plans is one example of how this may be achieved</p>	
6	<p>S-CC-1 - Proposals must consider their contribution to greenhouse gas emissions arising from unintended consequences on other activities. Where such consequences are likely to result in increased greenhouse gas emissions, proposals should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate unintended consequences on other activities.</p>	<p>S-CC-1 addresses the indirect greenhouse gas emissions of a proposal. Indirect emissions are those that have occurred due to the impositions of a proposal on other activities. Proposals must include and consider available evidence and identify interactions which may result in indirect greenhouse gas emissions</p>	<p>The proposed activity will generate greenhouse gas emissions when transporting and installing the structures. Considering the scale of the proposal and proportionality, no additional information is considered necessary from The Great Oyster Company. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.</p>

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
6	S-ML-2 - The introduction of litter as a result of proposals should be avoided or minimised where practicable and activities that help reduce marine litter will be supported.	The natural landscapes, wildlife and recreational opportunities on offer in the south marine plan areas attract visitors to the area. More visitors and increases in coastal development are likely to increase litter. S-ML-2 makes sure proposals avoid or minimise introducing litter to the marine area, and encourages voluntary action to protect the marine environment and the services it provides for people. Proposals should demonstrate the consideration of potential introduction of litter. Proposals should avoid, or where this is not possible, minimise introductions of litter to the marine environment during the construction period and throughout the lifetime of the proposal	The proposed oyster modules will not result in the introduction of litter and therefore no measures to minimise/avoid litter is considered to be necessary. The Great Oyster Company has considered ways of reducing production of marine litter through their ancillary activities and will ensure they recycle any waste produced wherever possible. A protocol for sustainable use of materials and recycling of all waste has been supplied with the supporting application documents. The Great Oyster Company considered policy sufficiently and therefore compliant with the MP.
6	Policies scoped out of assessment	<p>S-DEF-1. Proposals in Ministry of defence Areas</p> <p>S-OG-1. Proposals in areas licensed for oil and gas extraction</p> <p>S-TIDE-1. Proposals for tidal energy extraction</p> <p>S-AGG-1. Proposals in areas licensed for aggregate extraction</p>	These are the plan policies ‘scoped out’ of a search in the Explore Marine Plans’ tool. Scoped out means they are not directly relevant to the decision-making process. Some policies, however, may prove relevant as the consideration of the proposal develops, for example with regards to future changes to an MPA boundary (S-MPA-3).

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
		<p>S-AGG-2. Proposals in areas subject to an exploration/option agreement for aggregate extraction</p> <p>S-AGG-3. Proposals in areas with potential high aggregate resource</p> <p>S-AGG-4. Preference for marine aggregates sourced locally</p> <p>S-PS-2. Proposals that reduce keel-clearance in IMO routes</p> <p>S-PS-3. Proposals that reduce keel-clearance in high density navigation routes</p> <p>S-CAB-1. Preference given to buried cables as method of installation.</p> <p>S-CAB-2. Proposals impacts landfall sites for subsea cables</p> <p>S-REN-1. Proposals supporting development of supply chains for renewable energy.</p> <p>S-TR-1. Proposals supporting tourism/recreation</p> <p>S-MPA-3. Proposals to change boundaries of MPAs</p> <p>S-MPA-4. Protection of ecological networks</p>	

Policy walk-through step	Policy	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy aims are met by the proposed licence application (summary)
		S-ML-1. Removal of beach and marine litter S-FISH-4. Proposals enhancing essential fish habitat S-FISH-4-HER. Herring spawning mitigation S-DD-2. Alternatives uses for dredged materials	