



Marine
Management
Organisation

**A hypothetical
example of marine
plan use:
Decisions having
regard to the
South Marine
Plans (section
58(3) of the Marine
and Coastal
Access Act 2009)**



...ambitious for our seas and coasts

© Marine Management Organisation 2024

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/ to view the licence or write to:

Information Policy Team
The National Archives
Kew
London
TW9 4DU
Email: 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 Website: www.gov.uk/mmo

If referencing this document, please cite it as: A hypothetical example of marine plan use: Decisions having regard to the South Marine Plans (section 58(3) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009) (Marine Management Organisation 2024)

Contents

1. Introduction and scope	4
2. Worked example	5
3. More examples of Section 58(3) interactions	6
4. The Duty to Co-operate and land-sea policy interaction	12
5. 'Marine-proofing' a local plan	13
Annex A – Marine plan objectives	18
Annex B – Potential South Marine Plan Policy Interactions with Local Plans	23

1. Introduction and scope

Section 58(3) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (MCAA) states that a public authority must have regard to the appropriate marine policy documents in taking any decision:

- (a) which relates to the exercise of any function capable of affecting the whole or any part of the UK marine area, but
- (b) which is not an authorisation or enforcement decision.

MCAA defines “Public authorities” (section 322) as including local planning authorities, government departments and Ministers of the Crown. “Authorisation or enforcement” decisions are defined as relating to “the doing of any act which affects or might affect the UK marine area”. “Appropriate marine policy documents” includes marine plans and the Marine Policy Statement (as defined under MCAA section 59).

This document focusses on local plans produced by local planning authorities which have the potential to affect the marine area. When a local planning authority formally decides to adopt a local plan, it is taking a “decision” and must, therefore, have regard to marine plans pursuant to section 58(3).¹

However, this document will illustrate, through hypothetical examples, the benefits of “marine-proofing” the local plan through considering marine plans throughout the whole local plan-making process and not just at the point of taking the decision to adopt the local plan. For example, the MMO recognises that housing provision is a key aim of local planning authorities and recommends that strategic local plan policy development for housing considers marine plans and the impacts on the UK marine area as part of future housing site allocations, infrastructure, and access to the coast. For example, as a means of forecasting potential increases and impacts on coastal recreation and tourism

While focussed on local plans, other public authorities, such as the Environment Agency, will also find this document useful as a guide to the type of decisions they take pursuant to section 58(3) of MCAA.² Also, the Secretary of State must have regard to marine plans when taking a decision under the Planning Act 2008 to grant a Development Consent Order for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs)³ Statutory consultees in the NSIP process are not obliged to consider the relevant marine plans, but the MMO suggests that their representations to the Secretary of State will benefit from consideration of marine plans. The examples explored in this document refer to the [South Inshore and Offshore Marine Plans](#) (adopted in 2018, and referred to as the South Marine Plan from hereon) and the south inshore and offshore marine plan areas,

¹ For enforcement and authorisation decisions made under s.58(1) of MACAA 2009 see MMO (2020). [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\) can be accessed on the MMO Using Marine Plans webpage.](#)

² For a list of relevant bodies please refer to [MMO \(2019\). External Decision Making and Implementation Mapping of Marine Plans. A report produced for the Marine Management Organisation, MMO Project No: 1155, February 2019](#)

³ NSIPs are determined by the Secretary of State under the relevant National Policy Statement(s).

however, the approach described can be applied to the [East](#), [North East](#), [North West](#), [South East](#) and [South West Marine Plans](#).

Please note that this guidance uses the hypothetical worked examples purely for illustrative purposes only. It is designed as a helpful guide to the process. It does not provide step-by-step instructions. Importantly it should not be considered as giving an expectation that future decisions will be taken by the MMO in any particular way as each will be on a case-by-case basis. If having read this guide decision-makers remain unsure as to the application of section 58(3) of MCAA then they should seek their own independent professional advice.

The Duty to Co-operate⁴ (see section 4 below) under the [Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 S33A](#), (as amended by the [Localism Act 2011](#)) requires the MMO, local authorities and other public authorities to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis when developing marine plans, local plans and other management plans in the English inshore region, the English offshore region or any part of either of those regions. There is also a duty placed on all relevant authorities to have regard to the purposes for which National Parks are designated (under the [Environment Act 1995](#) Section 62). Under the [Town & Country Planning \(Local Planning\) \(England\) Regulations 2012](#), local planning authorities must co-operate with the MMO and other prescribed bodies to develop sound local plans. The MMO recommends this guidance as being useful for all public authorities when meeting these duties as part of their plan-making processes.

For coastal authorities, links between local plan policies and the marine plan are often fairly clear, particularly in the inter-tidal area (mean high water springs to mean low water springs) where an overlap between planning regimes exists.⁵

For inland authorities, even those with no tidal frontage or influence, the link to marine plans is more nuanced but still needs to be considered. For example, a land-based development that affects a river may eventually discharge into the sea and so affect the marine area.

2. Worked example

The following hypothetical example shows how a local planning authority should use marine plans as part of local plan development.

Tideharbour District Council is a coastal district council in England who are in the process of revising their local plan. The district contains a town with a small working port and a number of sites allocated for housing. The coastal strip is used for recreational and tourist activities and includes an underused aggregate unloading and processing facility. Tideharbour District Council has ambitions to regenerate the coastal community. Their

⁴ Although the land-use planning system is currently subject to a wide-ranging review the MMO still operates under current existing guidelines and obligations. The Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 will abolish the Duty to Cooperate mechanism and the Duty is proposed to be replaced with a “flexible alignment policy”. Furthermore, the MMO would expect the benefits of cooperation between land-use and marine planning to be recognised.

⁵ Local plans here include Neighbourhood Plans.

current local plan is being revised. The Duty to Co-operate applies to consideration of what revisions to the plan might be required (when considering any potential impacts upon the UK marine area). Tideharbour District Council are then required to have regard to the South Marine Plan when taking a MCAA s58(3) decision to adopt the revisions. They are a signatory to the [Coastal Concordat](#), which is a UK Government initiative to guide partnership working when consenting coastal (intertidal) development (see section 4.2 below).

Duty to Co-operate meetings (see section 4 below) have been held with the MMO Marine Planning team to consider which marine plan policies Tideharbour should have regard to under section 58(3) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act. The council are looking for support in developing the port opportunities and managing increased pressure on coastal recreation through a predicted population increase, due to new housing provisions. They would like to integrate both land and sea focused elements where possible to provide better economic and well-being benefits for the local community.

Tideharbour District Council have developed a [Statement of Common Ground](#) (SoCG) with neighbouring local authorities to identify strategic cross-boundary issues. The MMO have been approached as an additional signatory to the Statement. In this way cross-boundary matters of strategic relevance have also been identified between Tideharbour District Council and the MMO. This includes areas such as public access, safeguarding landing facilities for future economic activity, biodiversity gains, coastal erosion protection, consideration of seascape, and marine cultural heritage. The MMO have acknowledged those parts of the SoCG that are directly relevant to the strategic overlap between marine and land-use planning and require further cooperation.

Based on establishing the common ground between Tideharbour District Council and the MMO, Tideharbour District Council are able to consider the effective “marine proofing” (see section 5 below) of their emerging local plan. This ensures that strategic policies and ambitions are developed with regard to the South Marine Plan. This also means that marine plan policies and objectives are complementary to both marine and land-use planning ambitions, allowing future potential joint-working to further integrate land and sea focused elements. For example, sharing evidence bases and natural capital asset registers.

3. More examples of Section 58(3) interactions

The following gives further hypothetical (and non-exhaustive) examples (Table 1) of the ways in which marine plans could be considered by land-use planning and decision-making authorities. This is either statutorily, when taking decisions under section 58(3) of MCAA, or more generally as part of local plan and other management-plan making. Reference to the MPS and the marine plans in any relevant emerging local plan is welcomed by the MMO. It is for the public authority to ensure Section 58 of MCAA has been considered as part of the decision-making process. Each example below is linked to the appropriate South Marine Plan objective listed in Annex A, Table 2 below. At the policy level Annex B of this document shows the links between marine plan policies and

the potential links to land-use local plan development. For the North East, North West, South-East and South-West Marine Plans please refer to Annex A, Table 3.

Table 1 – Examples of how marine plans can be used to inform local plan development.

Subject	Example	Related South Plan Objective (Annex A)
Consultations	Public authorities must have regard to the appropriate marine policy documents (defined in MCAA s59 as including the MPS and adopted marine plans) when taking decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area, which are not authorisation or enforcement decisions including a decision to adopt a local plan. This includes any decision taken on what representations they should make as a consultee to marine plan development. It is also recommended marine plans are considered to promote compatibility of emerging local plans with marine plans. This could either be through general engagement with the MMO through the Duty to Co-operate, or more formally by seeking agreement on areas of significant cross-boundary issues and strategic priorities through a Statement of Common Ground. For requests for a consultee response under the Duty to Co-operate public authorities should email the MMO at consultations@marinemanagement.org.uk . See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for north east, north west, south east and south west marine plan areas).	All
Liaison between land-use and marine planners	In developing local plans public authorities could use the MPS and adopted marine plans to support integrated coastal management in coastal areas. ⁶ Local plans should reference the UK vision for the marine environment ('clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas'), and show how local plan policies and supporting text will contribute to that vision. Any Sustainability Appraisal supporting the local plan could consider the benefits or adverse effects on the UK marine area and highlight how local plan policies contribute to the UK marine vision as appropriate. See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for north east, north west, south east and south west marine plan areas).	All
Housing	Local planning authorities will need to consider whether housing allocations have a potential to increase coastal recreation when completed. Considering marine plans under Section 58(3) of MCAA could also enable local authorities and developers to negotiate environmentally sensitive	6, 11 (8, 9)

⁶ [Marine Policy Statement](#) (2011), Section 1.3. [South Marine Plan](#), paragraphs 15 and 17

Subject	Example	Related South Plan Objective (Annex A)
	housing schemes and drainage options with regard to impacts upon the marine environment, by signposting the requirements of the Water Framework Directive for example. See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for north east, north west, south east and south west marine plan areas).	
Marine Protected Areas	This includes any activities or developments which could result in adverse impacts on biodiversity. Public authorities will wish to have regard to the relevant marine plan when considering impacts of terrestrial development on such areas. Public authorities will wish to consider, where appropriate, measures to manage negative impacts. See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for north east, north west, south east and south west marine plan areas).	7, 10, 11, 12
Landscape designations and seascape	The MMO recognises that many designated landscapes ⁷ are located on the coast. Marine plans are sensitive to the specific statutory purposes of designated areas and the MMO planning team welcome liaison with relevant local planning authorities in developing an understanding of the interactions between marine and land-use planning policy frameworks. See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for north east, north west, south east and south west marine plan areas).	8, 9, 12 (10)
Safeguarding marine characteristics	The high monetary value of coastal and waterfront sites can lead to redevelopment pressure on underused or redundant sites. This creates a threat of sterilisation (the loss of potential of a coastal development site to return to its formal commercial or industrial use) of the coastal strip through redevelopment into housing/non-marine business uses and tourism-based activities. Such sterilisation may also lead to public access issues to the coast. Marine plans also seek to maintain port facilities for future economic growth. As much of the necessary infrastructure is above the tidal limit, successful delivery of marine plans is dependent on local planning authorities understanding the marine impacts of terrestrial development and having a favourable view to the creation of coastal safeguarding policies in local plans. Consequently, public authorities need to have regard to the potential for future marine-based use of underused or redundant landing facilities, particularly for marine aggregates. See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for north east, north west, south east and south west marine plan areas).	All
Conservation across the	Public authorities such as local planning authorities will have regard to environmental designations either side of the land-sea boundary and consider impacts of land-use policies as	1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,

⁷ Such as areas of outstanding natural beauty, national parks, Heritage Coasts and UNESCO World Heritage Sites.

Subject	Example	Related South Plan Objective (Annex A)
land-sea boundary	part of their plan-making. This may include the sharing of evidence bases between marine and local planning authorities. This is especially relevant where coastal ecosystems and heritage assets may straddle the intertidal area. See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for north east, north west, south east and south west marine plan areas).	12
Coastal change, defence, erosion and coastal flooding	Coastal erosion and flooding are considered by land-use planning through initiatives such as Coastal Change Management Areas. These draw on management strategies and advice from Shoreline Management Plans. Public authorities will wish to consider the effective alignment of land-use and marine planning regimes in coastal areas to reduce the risks of coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development. Marine plans can only seek to minimise the effects of coastal change, while local plan polices can manage the socioeconomic impacts of coastal change as part of integrated coastal zone management. There is potential for join up through integrated coastal policies to aid in mitigating and adapting to climate change, for example to help to tackle issues surrounding managed coastal retreat. See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for north east, north west, south east and south west marine plan areas).	All
Fisheries and aquaculture	Local planning authorities can show regard to fisheries and aquaculture when plan-making by considering potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing activity. For aquaculture, authorities may wish to have regard to the marine plan when considering the benefits of encouraging sustainable and competitive aquaculture development. As with other activities across the land-sea divide, marine plan polices encourage the growth of sustainable aquaculture and fisheries enterprises, with the socio-economic and environmental benefits being realised in local communities through land-use planning policies which aim to minimise negative impacts on fisheries/aquaculture through limiting/safeguarding against change of use of harbour facilities which have potential to grow in the future. See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for north east, north west, south east and south west marine plan areas).	2, 3, 4, 5 (8, 10, 11, 12)
Ports, shipping, marinas and other infrastructure	In developing local plans, local planning authorities may develop polices which aim to protect the efficiency and resilience of continuing port operations by having regard to the National Policy Statement for Ports, the Marine Policy Statement and appropriate adopted marine plan. For port and harbour infrastructure local planning authorities will wish to seek advice on any marine issues which may affect any proposed development sites. See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for north east, north west, south east and south west marine plan areas).	All

Subject	Example	Related South Plan Objective (Annex A)
Surface water management, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and wastewater treatment and disposal	Local planning authorities and other public authorities such as the Environment Agency, will wish to maximise opportunities for co-existence of wastewater infrastructure with other marine environment activities, including the potential for compatible activities to co-exist with wastewater infrastructure with other marine activities. This includes consideration of the potential for wastewater infrastructure to mitigate marine impacts through design or location where appropriate. The link between fresh and marine waters is the Water Framework Directive . See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for north east, north west, south east and south west marine plan areas).	11
Tourism and recreation	Local plans and other management plans should consider the potential economic benefits to local communities through marine tourism. This includes the potential for additional pressure through increased housing provision on coastal and marine recreation. See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for north east, north west, south east and south west marine plan areas).	1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9

4. The Duty to Co-operate and land-sea policy interaction

4.1. Duty to Co-operate

The [Localism Act 2011](#) and the [National Planning Policy Framework](#) (NPPF) describes the legal duty for local planning authorities to co-operate with other planning authorities and organisations to seek to address strategic planning matters which impact beyond the local plan area. The Duty to Co-operate⁸ aims to maximise the effectiveness of plan-making (and policies) by addressing any identified issues and “engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis”.⁹ The MMO is a prescribed body as set out in Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the MMO is listed in Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as a body who is subject to the duty to co-operate.

Local authorities can also engage directly with the MMO through the SoCG process to determine the areas of strategic overlap between marine plans and an authority’s local plan.¹⁰ This will aid in evidencing a consistency between relevant local plan policies and the appropriate marine policy documents¹¹ at the public examination stage. See for example, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, [Section 20 \(5\) \(c\)](#). This approach will also enable public authorities to identify policies that will need to be considered for ‘marine-proofing’.

As part of marine plan development, the MMO has taken steps to ensure policy development is compatible with existing local development plans and other management plans. All Duty to Co-operate and SOCG queries may be made to the MMO planning consultations mailbox at consultations@marinemanagement.org.uk.

4.2. Land-sea policy interaction.

Coastal and estuarine environments have high socio-economic potential. Both marine and land-use planning regimes are committed to ensuring that coastal areas, and the activities which take place therein, are managed in an integrated and holistic way.¹² There are significant links between marine licensable activities at sea and the positive impacts upon the socio-economic welfare of coastal communities. Marine plan policies can interact with,

⁸ Although the land-use planning system is currently subject to a wide-ranging review the MMO still operates under current existing guidelines and obligations. The Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 will abolish the Duty to Cooperate mechanism and the Duty is proposed to be replaced with a “flexible alignment policy”. Furthermore, the MMO would expect the benefits of cooperation between land-use and marine planning to be recognised.

⁹ [Section 33a of Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004](#).

¹⁰ See paragraph 25 of the [National Planning Policy Framework 2019](#).

¹¹ Appropriate marine policy documents are any adopted marine plan for an area, or the MPS for areas without an adopted plan. See MCAA 2009 Section 59.

¹² See [Marine Policy Statement](#) (2011), Section 1.3.5

and contribute to, land-based planning for coastal communities and economic regeneration.¹³ Local planning authorities may therefore wish to consider the impacts of shared socio-economic aspects between marine and terrestrial realms.

The MMO has taken all reasonable steps to ensure compatibility with any relevant development plans and has had regard to all such plans, or their equivalent, in line with the principles of Integrated Coastal Zone Management. In this way land-sea interactions have been addressed.¹⁴

For coastal development consents under Section 58(1) of MCAA, use of the [Coastal Concordat](#) is recommended to ensure co-operation between the various authorities and consenting regimes. The MMO Marine Planning team includes a number of coastal-based marine planners who are able to collaborate with authorities and offer advice (in addition to statutory consultation responses) towards ensuring compatibility between local plans, the MPS, and marine plans. As well as providing advice following specific queries, the marine planners can also provide implementation training on how to effectively understand and implement marine plans. To get in contact with MMO marine planning to discuss your plan development, or to enquire about receiving training on the use of marine plans in decision making, please contact the marine planning team at planning@marinemanagement.org.uk or directly through the [Marine planning officers contact details](#) webpage.

5. ‘Marine-proofing’ a local plan

As required under section 58(3) of the MCAA 2008, planning authorities must have regard to marine plan policies when taking a decision to adopt a local plan. However, as outlined in previous sections it is recommended that the local plan be “marine-proofed” through consideration of marine plans throughout the local plan-making process. The MMO Marine Planning team will analyse local plans at consultation to assess evidence of the quality of the regard the authority has had to the relevant marine plans.

From a plan-led management view of the UK marine area, planning and policy interaction across the intertidal area will be more effective, useful and sustainable if land-use planners consider ‘marine-proofing’ future policy development. For example, public authorities may wish to consider the implications and impacts upon the UK marine area of local plan policies with a coastal application or relevance. This could include the possible sharing of registers of natural capital assets and evidence bases (where relevant and appropriate).

Marine-proofing requires consideration of the marine area when developing local plan strategic policies including those related to housing, transport, employment, infrastructure, and other strategic site allocations. Consideration of impacts upon the marine environment (and its environmental, economic and social elements) will need to recognise all relevant activities (including wastewater discharge, increased marine and land traffic into ports and landfall sites of marine cabling). There is a need to then explore the

¹³ See, [A Description of the Marine Planning System for England](#), (Defra 2011). Ch. 6.

¹⁴ See the [South Marine Plan](#), p.10 and the [Marine Policy Statement](#) (2011) Section 1.3.4

impacts of these activities such as coastal pollution, coastal erosion and impacts on visual amenity and landscape and seascape character while highlighting scope for co-existence with marine activities.

Non-strategic and development management policies, which direct planning application decisions as material considerations, can also be marine-proofed during policy development stages. For example, policies relating to sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) must have regard to marine plans (in addition to the requirements of the Water Framework Directive) in considering impacts upon the UK marine area.

Marine planners within the MMO are keen to engage with planning authorities and can advise on where marine plan policies can be integrated into local plan documents. Early engagement is encouraged, rather than relying on Regulation 18 consultation. Contact the MMO at planning@marinemanagement.org.uk. For marine planners to provide comments during consultation, please email the MMO planning consultations mailbox at Consultations.MMO@marinemanagement.org.uk.

5.1 ‘Marine-proofed’ local plan policy examples

The following are examples of policies which show good integration with marine plans. Please be aware that these examples are hypothetical and indicative, with a purpose to give additional guidance on how local plan policies can be improved to integrate more effectively with marine plans.

Benefits of aligning local plan policies with marine plan policies include provision of a stronger integrated policy framework and potential improvements to the consenting process for proposals which require both planning permission and a marine licence. Alignment, in their wording and aims, will facilitate more informed proposals from applicants which clearly show consideration for both local plan and marine plan policies.

Hypothetical examples of local plan policy wording which aligns with marine plan policies:

Example 1: Policy Example for Coastal Change

‘Within the Coastal Change Management Area (CCMA), as defined on the Policies Map, development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that:

- i. There would be no adverse changes to the coast, taking account of any impacts on biodiversity;*
- ii. It is necessary that the development be within the zone, if being concerned with a coastal activity that has a direct environmental, community or economic benefit. In exceptional circumstances, any structures must demonstrate that they are small scale, temporary in nature, and designed to minimise any risk of future erosion,*

iii. Development will not increase coastal erosion as a result of changes in surface water run-off,

iv. It will restore or enhance coastal habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration.'

The example above links to and reflects the intentions of the climate change marine plan policies, in particular CC-1. Habitats that provide flood defence and carbon sequestration contribute to natural resilience for coastal communities that are vulnerable to coastal erosion and change. The wording of 'iv' is in line with the marine plan policy wording, further aligning these two policies. The CC-1 wording is as follows:

"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."*

Example 2: Policy Example for Enhancing the Natural Environment

'The protection and enhancement of the natural environment will be delivered by:

- 1. Ensuring the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment, biodiversity and geological resources and preserving terrestrial and marine local, national and international priority species and habitats.*
- 2. Supporting the role of natural capital assets and ecosystem services in absorbing carbon emissions and mitigating the likely effects of climate change including coastal habitats, taking full account of flood risk, water supply and demand and, where appropriate, coastal change.*
- 3. Securing net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures'*

This policy aligns with wording and intention of marine plan policies, including BIO-1, MPA-1 and MPA-2. These policies, along with the hypothetical example above, aim to maintain the distribution of priority habitats and species and their protected network of ecological coherence. This can be applied to terrestrial and marine habitats and species. Providing consistent aims and priorities across this gradient may help to provide a stronger network of habitats. BIO-1, MPA-1 and MPA-2 policy wording is as follows:

BIO-1

“Proposals 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”*

MPA-1

“Proposals that support the objectives of marine protected areas and the ecological coherence of the marine protected area network will be supported. 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 ecologically coherent network.”*

MPA-2

“Proposals that enhance a marine protected area’s ability to adapt to climate change and so enhance the resilience of the marine protected area network will be supported. 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”*

Example 3: Policy Example for Green and Blue Infrastructure

‘The Green and Blue Infrastructure Network, as identified on the Policies Map, will be high quality, attractive, well managed, resilient and multifunctional. It will deliver a range of social, economic, health and environmental benefits for all by:

- 1. Working with natural processes to improve quality river and coastal waters and protecting vulnerable coastal habitats;*
- 2. Supporting marine infrastructure which facilitates land-based activities, including the diversification or regeneration of sustainable marine industries.*
- 3. Utilising the Green and Blue Infrastructure Network to mitigate the impacts of climate change.*

4. Ensuring new Green and Blue Infrastructure provision is resilient to the effects of climate change and supports opportunities for nature-based climate change adaptation and mitigation'

This policy aligns with INF-1 policy, with regard to language and purpose. INF-1 policy wording is as follows:

“Appropriate land-based infrastructure which facilitates marine activity (and vice versa) should be supported.”

This allows for the support of both land and marine infrastructure, as well as infrastructure which facilitates activities in the marine area and on land. Often, activities on land may be reliant on marine infrastructure, and marine activities may be reliant on land-based infrastructure. Therefore, policies should encourage developments that facilitate integration with the other system.

Example 4: Supporting Text Extract for Leisure and Tourism Policy

'North East Inshore and North East Offshore Marine Plan (2021) policy NE-TR-1: Tourism and Recreation promotes and sustainable tourism and recreation activities in coastal areas. Where relevant, proposals should consider this policy alongside the plan policies.

Leisure and Tourism development within the Foreshore area should consider potential effects upon Seascape. Seascape considers landscape impacts and unique coastal considerations. Development proposals should consider the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) Seascape Character Assessment for the North East Inshore and Offshore marine plan areas (2018) and the North East Inshore and North East Offshore Marine Plan (2021) Seascape Policy NE-SCP-1.'

This example of supporting text links and signposts directly to a specific marine plan policy.

Annex A – Marine plan objectives

The South Marine Plan objectives (see Table 2 below) are written in the context of the UK [Marine Policy Statement](#) and the High Level Marine Objectives (HLMO). The objectives are designed to relate to and implement the [UK Marine Strategy](#). The objectives also link to government aspirations set out in other relevant strategies such as the [25 Year Environment Plan](#), [Clean Growth Strategy](#) and [Industrial Strategy](#). Together they aim to deliver sustainable development in the marine plan area, through the application of relevant policies, and meet the UK Government’s vision for ‘clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas’.¹⁵

Marine plans for the, north east, north west, south east and south west areas have objectives based on the high-level marine objectives (HLMO) in the MPS.¹⁶ These are listed in Table 3 below.¹⁷

Annex A shows a description of all South Marine Plan policies together with brief guidance as to how the objectives/policies could inform/support the ‘marine-proofing’ of local plan development.

Public authorities (adjacent to the marine plan area), in this case the south marine plan area, are recommended to use Table 2 and annex B as a reference point when taking account of marine plans whilst preparing their local plans. A fuller consideration of marine plans objectives will be found in the relevant adopted plans (the plan and its associated technical annex).

¹⁵ [Safeguarding our Seas report](#) (Defra 2002) p.3.

¹⁶ Marine Policy Statement (2011) p. 11

¹⁷ The East Marine Plan has an independent set of [plan objectives](#). These are currently under review as part of the 3-year reporting cycle of marine plans.

Table 2: Table showing the objectives of the South Marine Plan

#	Objective	Relevant Policy Codes (see annex A for description)
1	To encourage effective use of space to support existing, and future sustainable economic activity through co-existence, mitigation of conflicts and minimisation of development footprints.	S-AGG-1, S-AGG-2, S-AGG3 (aggregate extraction) S-AQ-1(aquaculture) S-CO-1 (co-existence) S-DD-1 (dredge and disposal) S-DEF-1 (defence), S-OG-1 (oil & gas) S-PS-1 (ports & shipping) S-TIDE-1 (tidal energy)
2	To manage existing, and aid the provision of new, infrastructure supporting marine and land-use activity.	S-AQ-2 (aquaculture) S-CAB-1, S-CAB-2 (cables) S-INF-1 (infrastructure) S-PS-2, S-PS-3 (ports & shipping)
3	To support diversification of activities which improve socio-economic conditions in coastal communities.	S-AGG-4 (aggregates) S-FISH-1 (fisheries) S-REN-1 (renewable energy) S-TR-1 (tourism & recreation)
4	To support marine activities that increase or enhance employment opportunities at all skills levels among the workforce of coastal communities, particularly where they support existing or developing industries within the south marine plan areas.	S-EMP-1, S-EMP-2 (employment)
5	To avoid, minimise, mitigate displacement of marine activities, particularly where of importance to adjacent coastal communities, and where this is not practical to make sure significant adverse impacts on social benefits are avoided.	S-FISH-2, S-FISH-3 (fisheries) S-SOC-1 (social benefits) S-TR-2 (tourism & recreation)

#	Objective	Relevant Policy Codes (see annex A for description)
6	To maintain and enhance inclusive public access to, and within, the south marine plan areas appropriate to its setting.	S-ACC-1, S-ACC-2 (access)
7	To support the reduction of the environmental, social and economic impacts of climate change, through encouraging the implementation of mitigation and adaptation measures that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid proposals' indirect contributions to greenhouse gas emissions • reduce vulnerability • improve resilience to climate and coastal change • consider habitats that provide related • ecosystem services 	S-CC-1, S-CC-2, S-CC-3, SCC-4 (climate change)
8	To identify and conserve heritage assets that are significant to the historic environment of the south marine plan areas.	S-HER-1 (heritage)
9	To consider the seascape and its constituent marine character and visual resource and the landscape of the south marine plan areas.	S-SCP-1 (seascape)
10	To support marine protected area objectives and a well-managed ecologically coherent network with enhanced resilience and capability to adapt to change.	S-MPA-1, S-MPA-2, S-MPA3, S-MPA-4 (marine protected areas)
11	To complement and contribute to the achievement or maintenance of Good Ecological Status or Potential under the Water Framework Directive and Good Environmental Status under the Marine Strategy	S-ML-1, S-ML-2 (marine litter) S-NIS-1 (non-indigenous species) S-UWN-1, S-UWN-2 (underwater noise) S-WQ-1, S-WQ-2 (water

#	Objective	Relevant Policy Codes (see annex A for description)
	Framework Directive, with respect to descriptors for marine litter, nonindigenous species and underwater noise.	quality)
12	To safeguard space for, and improve the quality of, the natural marine environment, including to enable continued provision of ecosystem goods and services, particularly in relation to coastal and seabed habitats, fisheries and cumulative impacts on highly mobile species.	S-BIO-1, S-BIO-2, S-BIO-3, S-BIO-4 (biodiversity) S-DD-2 (dredge & disposal) S-DIST-1 (disturbance) S-FISH-4, S-FISH-4-HER (fisheries)

Table 3 – High Level Marine Objectives (for North East, South East, South West, and North West Marine Plans)

Achieving a sustainable marine economy	
1	Infrastructure is in place to support and promote safe, profitable and efficient marine businesses.
2	The marine environment and its resources are used to maximise sustainable activity, prosperity and opportunities for all, now and in the future.
3	Marine businesses are taking long-term strategic decisions and managing risks effectively. They are competitive and operating efficiently.
4	Marine businesses are acting in a way which respects environmental limits and is socially responsible. This is rewarded in the marketplace.
Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society	
5	People appreciate the diversity of the marine environment, its seascapes, its natural and cultural heritage and its resources and can act responsibly.
6	The use of the marine environment is benefiting society as a whole, contributing to resilient and cohesive communities that can adapt to coastal erosion and flood risk, as well as contributing to physical and mental wellbeing.
7	The coast, seas, oceans and their resources are safe to use.
8	The marine environment plays an important role in mitigating climate change.
9	There is equitable access for those who want to use and enjoy the coast, seas and their wide range of resources and assets and recognition that for some island and peripheral communities the sea plays a significant role in their community.
10	Use of the marine environment will recognise, and integrate with, defence priorities, including the strengthening of international peace and stability and the defence of the United Kingdom and its interests.
Living within environmental limits	
11	Biodiversity is protected, conserved and, where appropriate, recovered, and loss has been halted.
12	Healthy marine and coastal habitats occur across their natural range and are able to support strong, biodiverse biological communities and the functioning of healthy, resilient and adaptable marine ecosystems.
13	Our oceans support viable populations of representative, rare, vulnerable, and valued species.

Annex B – Potential South Marine Plan Policy Interactions with Local Plans

This annex indicates which marine plan policies may influence or would be useful to consider in developing a local plan by planning authorities. Policies from the South Marine Plans, adopted in 2018, are used as examples.

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
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.	<p>Housing - Policy could have relevance to strategic housing allocations near coastal locations where recreation space for higher population numbers/density is a consideration.</p> <p>Tourism & Recreation – Local Plans and other management plans should consider the potential economic benefits to local communities through marine tourism.</p>	6
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	Housing - policy could have relevance to strategic housing allocations near coastal locations where recreation space for higher population	6

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>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.</p>	<p>numbers/density is a consideration.</p> <p>Conservation – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p> <p>Tourism & Recreation – Local plans and other management plans should consider the potential economic benefits to local communities through marine tourism.</p>	
S-AGG-1	<p>Proposals in areas where a licence for extraction of aggregates has been granted or formally applied for should not be authorised, unless it is demonstrated that the other development or activity is compatible with aggregate extraction.</p>	<p>The south marine plan areas produce 7Mt of aggregates annually; 42% of the marine aggregates extracted in English waters. S-AGG-1 safeguards aggregate licence areas from other activities, unless it is demonstrated that the other activities are compatible with aggregate extraction. This enables continuity of supply of construction aggregate and supports local and national economies.</p>	N/A	1

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
S-AGG-2	Proposals within an area subject to an Exploration and Option Agreement with The Crown Estate should not be supported unless it is demonstrated that the other development or activity is compatible with aggregate extraction.	S-AGG-2 safeguards aggregate exploration and option agreement areas to enable the aggregate industry to identify commercially viable aggregate resource in the south marine plan areas. Proposals will only be supported if they are compatible with aggregate extraction.	N/A	1
S-AGG-3	Proposals in areas where high potential aggregate resource occurs should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant adverse impacts on aggregate extraction, d) if it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	S-AGG-3 makes sure that proposals consider areas of high potential aggregate resource, as defined by the British Geological Survey. It makes sure that any influences impacts on access to commercially viable marine sand and gravel resources in the future are managed, enabling secure access to sufficient supply of aggregate resources.	N/A	1
S-AGG-3	Proposals in areas where high potential aggregate resource occurs should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant adverse impacts on aggregate extraction, d) if it is not possible to mitigate	S-AGG-3 makes sure that proposals consider areas of high potential aggregate resource, as defined by the British Geological Survey. It makes sure that any influences impacts on access to commercially viable marine sand and gravel resources in	N/A	1

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	the future are managed, enabling secure access to sufficient supply of aggregate resources.		
S-AGG-4	Where proposals require marine aggregates as part of their construction, preference should be given to using marine aggregates sourced from the south marine plan areas. If this is not appropriate, proposals should state why.	S-AGG-4 encourages the use of locally sourced marine aggregate. This will enable social, economic and environmental benefits to the south marine plan areas and encourage sustainable use of marine aggregates.	Minerals Policies – Although locally sourced aggregate may not be suitable for all purposes mineral planning authorities and Aggregate Working Parties should be aware of the policy.	3
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 significant adverse impacts on sustainable aquaculture, d) if it is not	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	Biodiversity – Policy could have relevance to future/proposed land-use infrastructure/activity which may impact on water quality, marine ecology or biodiversity. Conservation – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.	1

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	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		
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.	<p>Safeguarding – Policy could be relevant to local authorities looking to safeguard shore-based facilities for future marine use, where there is pressure to allow non-marine redevelopment.</p> <p>Fisheries/Aquaculture - Local planning authorities may wish to have regard to fisheries and aquaculture when plan making by considering potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing and aquaculture activity.</p>	2
S-BIO-1	Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on natural habitat and species adaptation, migration and connectivity must demonstrate	Competition for space, increased levels of development and predicted effects of climate change can affect the south marine plan areas' natural	Coastal Infrastructure – Policy could have relevance to any infrastructure above Mean Low Water Springs which needs to	12

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise c) mitigate significant adverse impacts.	<p>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.</p> <p>Proposals must consider the available evidence and identify any significant adverse impacts on natural habitat and species adaptation, migration and connectivity.</p>	<p>consider impacts upon marine biodiversity.</p> <p>Coastal Change - Local planning authorities will wish to consider the effective alignment of land-use and marine planning regimes in coastal areas to reduce the risks of coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development.</p>	
S-BIO-2	Proposals that incorporate features that enhance or facilitate natural habitat and species adaptation, migration and connectivity will be supported.	<p>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.</p> <p>Proposals should incorporate features which enhance or facilitate natural habitat and</p>	<p>Biodiversity – Policy could have relevance to future/proposed land-use infrastructure/activity which may impact on marine ecology or biodiversity.</p>	12

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>species adaptation, migration and connectivity within the south marine plan areas.</p> <p>Enhancement refers to measures taken which 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>		
S-BIO-3	<p>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 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.</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</p>	<p>Seascape/Designated landscapes – Policy could have relevance for local authorities/AONB/National Parks etc who wish to enhance or conserve the status of coastal habitats.</p> <p>Conservation – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p> <p>Coastal Change - Local planning authorities will wish to consider the effective alignment</p>	12

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		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 while acting as important habitat for wading birds.	of land-use and marine planning regimes in coastal areas to reduce the risks of coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development.	
S-BIO-4	<p>Proposals that enhance the distribution and net extent of priority habitats should be supported.</p> <p>Proposals must demonstrate that they will avoid reducing the distribution and net extent of priority habitats.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Proposals must demonstrate that they avoid reductions in the distribution and net extent of priority habitats within the south marine plan areas.</p>	Seascape/Designated landscapes – Policy could have relevance for local authorities/AONB/National Parks etc who wish to enhance or conserve the status of coastal habitats.	12
S-CAB-1	Preference should be given to proposals for cable installation where the method of installation	Submarine cabling is important to the growth and sustainability of telecommunications, offshore	N/A	2

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	<p>is burial. Where burial is not achievable, decisions should take account of protection measures for the cable that may be proposed by the applicant. Where burial or protection measures are not appropriate, proposals should state the case for proceeding without those measures.</p>	<p>wind farms and electricity transmission. S-CAB-1 supports and encourages cable burial where possible to meet the needs of the sector whilst enabling the maximum potential opportunity for other uses of the busy south marine plan areas. S-CAB-1 supports infrastructure that encourages marine businesses.</p>		
S-CAB-2	<p>Proposals that have a significant adverse impact on new and existing landfall sites for subsea cables (telecoms, power and interconnectors) 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>UK subsea cables need protection to make sure the safety and security of the energy supply and telecoms networks. Landfall sites for subsea cables are not currently protected from other uses, which may prevent these sites being used as cable landfall locations. S-CAB-2 supports the need to avoid displacement of this economically and socially vital activity enabling business to be profitable and efficient.</p>	<p>Safeguarding – Policy could be relevant to local authorities looking to safeguard shore-based facilities for future marine employment use, where there is pressure to allow non-marine redevelopment.</p> <p>Seascape/Designated landscapes – Policy could have relevance for local authorities/ National Parks/National Landscapes etc, who wish to strengthen the protection of natural and built heritage assets within or adjacent to the marine plan area.</p>	2

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
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.	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>Housing and other development – Policy could have relevance to increases in greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Conservation – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p>	7
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 impacts upon these climate change adaptation measures.	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	<p>Biodiversity – Policy could have relevance to land-use infrastructure/activity which may impact on coastal protection or flood defences.</p> <p>Conservation – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p>	7

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		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.		
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	<p>Coastal Change – Policy could be relevant for local authorities with coast protection responsibilities who are considering establishing coastal change management areas.</p> <p>Coastal Change - Local planning authorities will wish to consider the effective alignment of land-use and marine planning regimes in coastal areas to reduce the risks of coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development.</p>	7

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		policies. Public authorities should also apply this policy to proposals in adjacent terrestrial areas due to the interconnected nature of terrestrial and marine processes.		
S-CC-4	Proposals that may have a significant adverse 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.	Habitats that provide flood defence and carbon sequestration provide natural resilience for coastal communities that are 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.	Biodiversity – Policy could have relevance to land-use infrastructure/activity which may impact on coastal protection or flood defences.	7
S-CO-1	Proposals will minimise their use of space and consider opportunities for co-existence with other activities.	Space within the south marine plan areas is limited and required to realise social, environmental and economic benefits. S-CO-1 enables proposals to be spatially planned and make appropriate	Coastal Change - Local planning authorities will wish to consider the effective alignment of land-use and marine planning regimes in coastal areas to reduce the risks of coastal	1

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		use of available space by minimising footprints. Those activities that can coexist, should do so.	change by avoiding inappropriate development.	
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 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.	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 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	N/A	1

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		dredging and disposal which is essential in enabling continued access by vessels to ports and harbours.		
S-DD-2	Proposals must identify, where possible, alternative opportunities to minimise the use of dredged waste disposal sites by pursuing re-use opportunities through matching of spoil to suitable sites.	Re-use or recycling of dredge material supports the growth of industry and increases available space within development areas in the south marine plan areas. It can also reduce the pressure on existing marine habitats with some materials being able to support beneficial re-use and ecosystem services. S-DD-2 enables the re-use or recycling of dredge material reducing the need to dispose of excavated material at marine disposal sites.	Coastal Change – This policy may help inform and advise planning and coastal protection authorities when considering beneficial reuse of dredged materials.	12
S-DEF-1	Proposals in or affecting Ministry of Defence Areas should only be authorised with agreement from the Ministry of Defence.	There are a high number of defence activities and estates in the south marine plan areas. Marine infrastructure can affect their continuity or future use. S-DEF-1 will avoid conflict between defence activities and new proposals within the plan areas. It will make sure that defence interests are not impeded. <u>If the Ministry of</u>	N/A	1

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<u>Defence objects to a proposal the development or activity will not be authorised.</u>		
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 impacts on highly mobile species.	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.	Biodiversity – Policy could have relevance to land-use infrastructure/activity which may impact on marine ecology or biodiversity.	12
S-EMP-1	Proposals that develop skills related to marine activities, particularly in line with local skills strategies, will be supported.	Government seeks to bring supply and demand in the skills and labour market closer together. SEMP-1 supports proposals that enhance or create marine related skills opportunities to enable	Safeguarding – Policy could be relevant to local authorities looking to safeguard shore-based facilities for future marine employment use, where there is pressure to allow non-marine redevelopment.	4

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>maximum sustainable activity, prosperity and opportunities for all. Proposals should demonstrate where training 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.</p>	<p>Fisheries/Aquaculture - Local planning authorities may wish to have regard to fisheries and aquaculture when plan-making by considering potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing and aquaculture activity.</p>	
S-EMP-2	<p>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.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Safeguarding – Policy could be relevant to local authorities looking to safeguard shore-based facilities for future marine employment use, where there is pressure to allow non-marine redevelopment.</p> <p>Fisheries/Aquaculture - Local planning authorities may wish to have regard to fisheries and aquaculture when plan-making by considering potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other</p>	4

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>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.</p>	<p>developments on fishing and aquaculture activity.</p> <p>Tourism & Recreation – Local plans and other management plans should consider the potential economic benefits to local communities through marine tourism.</p>	
S-FISH-1	<p>Proposals that support the diversification of a sustainable fishing industry and or enhance fishing industry resilience to the effects of climate change should be supported.</p>	<p>Climate change can affect commercial fisheries by altering fish abundance, growth, 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</p>	<p>Fisheries/Aquaculture - Local planning authorities may wish to have regard to fisheries and aquaculture when plan-making by considering potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing and aquaculture activity.</p>	3

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		enable understanding of industry requirements and identify where they can support areas that are already diversifying.		
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	Fisheries/Aquaculture - Local planning authorities may wish to have regard to fisheries and aquaculture when plan-making by considering potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing and aquaculture activity.	5

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		identifying issues at scoping stage.		
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 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.	N/A	5
S-FISH-4	Proposals that enhance essential fish habitat, including spawning, nursery and feeding grounds, and migratory routes should be supported. Proposals must demonstrate that they will,	Sustainable fish populations rely upon specific habitats throughout their life. S-FISH-4 recognises protection of habitats and the services they provide can enhance fish populations,	N/A	12

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant adverse impact on essential fish habitat, including, spawning, nursery, feeding grounds and migration routes.	supporting the long-term existence of the fisheries and contributing to Good Environmental Status. SFISH-4 enables sustainable use of marine resources within environmental limits alongside productive fisheries by requiring proposals to manage impacts on these habitats.		
S-FISH-4-HER	Proposals will consider herring spawning mitigation in the area highlighted on Figure 26 (in the technical annex) during the period 01 November to the last day of February annually.	The south marine plan areas include a number of important herring spawning zones; these are located within the Southern Bight and Downs areas. S-FISH-4-HER highlights these zones and makes sure proposals mitigate any potential impacts. Specific mitigation measures are provided. S-FISH-4-HER identifies areas where development is now able to take place if impacts are mitigated. This will enable sustainable development whilst protecting herring stock.	N/A	12
S-HER-1	Proposals that may compromise or harm elements contributing to the significance of heritage assets should demonstrate that	The south marine plan areas have many significant cultural assets. Some have little protection despite their	Housing- Policy could have relevance to strategic housing allocations near coastal locations where potential	8

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	<p>they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate compromise or harm. If it is not possible to mitigate, the public benefits for proceeding with the proposal must outweigh the compromise or harm to the heritage asset.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Proposals should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference, avoid, minimise or 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.</p>	<p>impacts on coastal heritage is a consideration.</p> <p>Seascape/Designated landscapes – Policy could have relevance for local authorities/AONB/National Parks etc who wish to strengthen the protection of natural and built heritage assets within or adjacent to the marine plan area. Could be used to enhance policy and objectives which are based on the Sandford Principle, as set out in Section 62(1) of the Environment Act 1995.</p> <p>Conservation – Policy could have relevance in considering impacts of land-use policies on heritage assets either side of the land-sea boundary.</p>	
S-INF-1	<p>Appropriate land-based infrastructure which facilitates marine activity (and vice versa) should be supported.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Coastal Change - Local planning authorities will wish to consider the effective alignment of land-use and marine planning regimes in coastal areas to reduce the risks of coastal</p>	2

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>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.</p>	<p>change by avoiding inappropriate development.</p> <p>Fisheries/Aquaculture - Local planning authorities may wish to have regard to fisheries and aquaculture when plan-making by considering potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing and aquaculture activity.</p> <p>Economic growth: By encouraging infrastructure that supports both marine and land-based industries, these policies can help local plans promote sustainable economic diversification, particularly in areas reliant on marine resources.</p> <p>Tourism & Recreation – Local planning authorities could use policy INF-1 to promote the development of tourism facilities that enhance access to coastal and marine environments, ensuring these are developed in</p>	

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
			a way that supports both environmental sustainability and economic growth.	
S-ML-1	Public authorities should ensure adequate provision for and removal of beach and marine litter on amenity beaches.	Litter at sea often originates on land. Increase in development, recreation and tourism in the south marine plan areas may result in increased litter, and an adverse impact on the environment on which these activities rely. Addressing marine litter along the coastline is an important step towards dealing with this problem. S-ML-1 aims to reduce litter at amenity beaches in the south inshore marine plan area.	Litter management – Policy will have relevance to coastal local planning authorities and local plan objectives related to litter. All waste management planning, processes and activities should consider their impact upon the marine environment and have regard to marine plans in consideration of marine litter.	11
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.	Litter management – Policy will have relevance to coastal local planning authorities and local plan objectives related to litter.	11

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		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.		
S-MPA-1	Proposals that support the objectives of marine protected areas, and the ecological coherence of the marine protected area network will be supported. 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.	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. 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	<p>Biodiversity – Policy could have relevance to land-use infrastructure/activity which may impact on marine ecology or biodiversity.</p> <p>Conservation – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p> <p>Coastal Change - Local planning authorities will wish to consider the effective alignment of land-use and marine planning regimes in coastal areas to reduce the risks of coastal</p>	10

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		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.	change by avoiding inappropriate development.	
S-MPA-2	Proposals that enhance a marine protected area's ability to adapt to climate change and so enhance the resilience of the marine protected area network will be supported. 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.	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 proposals account for adverse impacts on individual marine protected area's ability to adapt to climate change, improving resilience and working towards a well-managed marine protected area network. 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,	<p>Biodiversity – Policy could have relevance to land-use infrastructure/activity which may impact on marine ecology or biodiversity.</p> <p>Conservation – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p>	10

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		Marine and Coastal Access Act, Environmental Impact Assessment and other national legislation. Enhancement refers to measures taken which have a positive impact, e.g. removal of hard coastal defence structures in favour of soft engineering which enables habitat roll back.		
S-MPA-3	Where statutory advice states that a marine protected area site condition is deteriorating, or that features are moving or changing due to climate change, a suiTable boundary change to ensure continued protection of the site and coherence of the overall network should be considered.	Within the south marine plan areas, marine protected areas are generally small in size so are more susceptible to climate change. S-MPA-3 makes sure flexibility by supporting boundary changes to improve resilience of the marine protected area network. S-MPA-3 enables adaptive management to help mitigate the loss of features within sites, and support adaptation to climate change.	Biodiversity – Policy could have relevance to future/proposed land-use infrastructure/activity which may impact on marine ecology or biodiversity.	10
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	It is important to make sure that possible locations for further marine protected areas, which may be needed to complete the network, remain in sufficient condition to merit designation. S-MPA-4 makes sure proposals	Biodiversity – Policy could have relevance to future/proposed land-use infrastructure/activity which may impact on marine ecology or biodiversity.	10

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	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.	do not prevent the future inclusion of features which may be required to enhance network coherence. The focus of SMPA-4 is on Features of Conservation Importance, priority habitats and species, and Annex 1 habitats.	<p>Conservation – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p> <p>Coastal Change - Local planning authorities will wish to consider the effective alignment of land-use and marine planning regimes in coastal areas to reduce the risks of coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development.</p>	
S-NIS-1	Proposals must put in place appropriate measures to avoid or minimise significant adverse 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 nonindigenous species, or the spread of invasive non-	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 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	Biodiversity – Potential links to biosecurity plans.	11

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	indigenous species known to exist in the area.	Impact Assessment, Ballast Water Management Convention and National Policy Statements where they apply.		
S-OG-1	Proposals in areas where a licence for oil and gas has been granted or formally applied for should not be authorised unless it is demonstrated that the other development or activity is compatible with the oil and gas activity.	The potential to extract oil and gas from the south marine plan areas is important to the UK's energy supply as well as supporting economic recovery for this industry. S-OG-1 enables oil and gas licence blocks to be safeguarded and potential conflict for the same space to be managed. S-OG-1 encourages engagement, negotiation and co-location where possible.	N/A	1
S-PS-1	Proposals that may have a significant adverse impact upon current activity and future 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	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 long-term strategic decisions, and supporting competitive and efficient port and shipping operations.	Ports, shipping and marinas - In developing local plans, local planning authorities must consider and seek to minimise negative impacts on shipping activity, freedom of navigation and navigational safety. For port and harbour infrastructure local planning authorities will wish to seek advice on any marine issues which may affect any proposed development sites.	1

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	should state the case for proceeding.			
S-PS-2	Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under- keel clearance must not be authorised within International Maritime Organization routing systems unless there are exceptional circumstances.	Within the south marine plan areas there are International Maritime Organization routing systems which are essential for shipping activity, freedom of navigation and navigational safety. SPS-2 confirms that proposals that compromise these important navigation routes should not be authorised. S-PS-2 enables and supports safe, profitable and efficient marine business.	N/A	2
S-PS-3	Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under- keel clearance which encroach upon high density navigation routes, or that pose a risk to the viability of passenger ferry services, must not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances.	The south marine plan areas are very busy with respect to high density navigation routes and passenger services. S-PS-3 confirms that proposals that pose a risk to safe navigation or the viability of these routes and services should not be authorised S-PS-3 aims to protect these routes and services by enabling and promoting safe, profitable and efficient marine businesses.	N/A	2

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
S-REN-1	Proposals that support the development of supply chains associated with the deployment of renewable energy will be supported.	Supply chains play an important role in developing technology, reducing associated costs of infrastructure and realising the economic and social benefits of renewable energy to the UK economy. S-REN-1 recognises the importance of the supply chain within the lifecycle of renewable energy projects. S-REN-1 enables public authorities to support proposals that will reduce costs, ensuring that businesses are operating competitively and with a long-term strategy.	Economy – Local planning authorities may wish to consider the economic benefits to land-based elements of marine supply chains.	3
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) 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.	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	Housing - policy could have relevance to strategic housing allocations near coastal locations where potential impacts on seascape is a consideration. Seascape/Designated landscapes – Policy could have relevance for local authorities/AONB/National Parks etc who wish to strengthen the protection of natural and built heritage assets within or adjacent to the marine	9

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		demonstrate measures taken to avoid, minimise or mitigate impacts on the area's visual resource or character.	<p>plan area. Could be used to enhance policy and objectives which are based on the Sandford Principle, as set out in Section 62(1) of the Environment Act 1995.</p> <p>Conservation – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p>	
S-SOC-1	Proposals that enhance or promote social benefits will be supported. 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.	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 authorised (but yet to be implemented) activities that generate social benefits.	Fisheries/Aquaculture - Local planning authorities may wish to have regard to fisheries and aquaculture when plan-making by considering potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing and aquaculture activity.	5
S-TIDE-1	Proposals in areas under seabed agreement for tidal energy generation should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid, b) minimise, c) mitigate significant	Areas for tidal energy development are limited by the natural features needed to create tidal currents sufficient to power tidal stream devices. S-TIDE-1 provides protection to	N/A	1

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	adverse impacts d) if it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	areas identified for tidal energy developments from other new activities that could affect the sites ability to generate energy. It enables the development of safe, profitable and efficient marine businesses.		
S-TR-1	Proposals supporting, promoting or facilitating tourism and recreation activities, particularly where this creates additional utilisation of related facilities beyond typical usage patterns, should be supported.	S-TR-1 supports tourism and recreation which are important and established sectors within the south marine plan areas. S-TR-1 enables diversification to provide a greater range of opportunities for employment, improve resilience to times of economic uncertainty and help reduce adverse impacts on natural and historic heritage and peoples' experience of them.	Tourism & Recreation – Local plans and other management plans should consider the potential economic benefits to local communities through marine tourism.	3
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.	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	Tourism & Recreation – Local plans and other management plans should consider the potential economic benefits to local communities through marine tourism.	5

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		wellbeing benefits to people that tourism and recreation bring.		
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 currently agreed targets under the UK Marine Strategy part one descriptor 11.	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 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	Tourism and Leisure - Although a material consideration for intertidal developments (under Section 58(1) of the MCAA), local planning authorities adjacent to Marine Protected areas (for example) may wish to consider noise impacts upon the marine environment from development as part of developing strategic policies for tourism, leisure and recreational activities.	11

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		voluntary basis where no consenting process is currently in place.		
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 proceeding.	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.	Conservation – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.	11
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.	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	Housing - Policy could have relevance to strategic housing allocations near coastal locations where potential impacts on water quality is a consideration. Mitigation could be through sustainable drainage schemes, for example. Surface/Wastewater management -	11

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>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, wastewater 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>Local planning authorities and other public bodies such as the Environment Agency, will wish to maximise opportunities for coexistence of wastewater infrastructure with other marine environment activities, including the potential for compatible activities to co-exist with wastewater infrastructure with other marine activities. This includes consideration of the potential for wastewater infrastructure to mitigate marine impacts through design or location where appropriate.</p> <p>Transport – Policy can support any initiatives by county councils and unitary authorities to reduce pollution from traffic entering the marine environment.</p>	
S-WQ-2	Activities that can deliver an improvement to water environment or enhance habitats and species which can be of benefit to water quality should be supported.	Habitats such as coastal saltmarsh, intertidal mudflats, seagrass, reed beds and natural blue mussel beds provide ecosystem services which maintain and can improve water	Housing- Policy could have relevance to strategic housing allocations near coastal locations where potential impacts on water quality is a consideration. Mitigation could	11

Policy Code	Policy Text	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under Section 58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>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 wastewater treatment and water infrastructure provision.</p>	<p>be through sustainable drainage schemes, for example.</p> <p>Transport – Policy can support any initiatives by county councils and unitary authorities to reduce pollution from traffic entering the marine environment</p>	