



Marine  
Management  
Organisation

**A hypothetical  
example of marine  
plan use:  
Decisions made  
having regard to  
the North East  
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/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government/licence/) to view the licence or write to:

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

Information about this publication and further copies are available from:

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

Tel: 0300 123 1032

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

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

## Contents

1. Introduction and scope.....	3
2. Worked example .....	4
3. More examples of Section 58(3) interactions .....	5
4. The Duty to Co-operate and land-sea policy interaction .....	11
5. 'Marine-proofing' a local plan .....	13
Annex A – Marine plan objectives .....	18
Annex B – Potential North East Marine Plan Policy Interactions with Local Plans ....	22

# 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).<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup> 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)<sup>3</sup> 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 [North East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plans](#) (adopted in 2021, and referred to as the North East Marine Plan from hereon) and the north east inshore and offshore marine plan

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.](#)

<sup>2</sup> 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](#)

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

areas, however the approach described can be applied to the [East](#), [North West](#), [South](#), [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-operate<sup>4</sup> (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.<sup>5</sup>

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

Seafordia 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.

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> Local plans here include Neighbourhood Plans.

Seafordia District Council has ambitions to regenerate the coastal community. Their 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). Seafordia District Council are then required to have regard to the North East 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 Seafordia 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.

Seafordia 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 Seafordia 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 Seafordia District Council and the MMO, Seafordia 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 North East 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 North East 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 South 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 North East 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 <a href="mailto:consultations@marinemanagement.org.uk">consultations@marinemanagement.org.uk</a> . See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for the south marine plan areas).	All

Subject	Example	Related North East Plan Objective (Annex A)
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 <sup>6</sup> . 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 the south 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 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 the south marine plan areas).	6, 11 (8, 9)
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 the south marine plan areas).	7, 10, 11, 12

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

Subject	Example	Related North East Plan Objective (Annex A)
Landscape designations and seascape	The MMO recognises that many designated landscapes <sup>7</sup> 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 the south 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 the south marine plan areas).	All

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

Subject	Example	Related North East Plan Objective (Annex A)
Conservation across the land-sea boundary	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 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 the south marine plan areas).	1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 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 policies 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 the south marine plan areas).	All

Subject	Example	Related North East Plan Objective (Annex A)
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 the south 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 the south marine plan areas).	All

Subject	Example	Related North East 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 <a href="#">Water Framework Directive</a> . See Table 2 and Annex B (Table 3 for the south 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 the south 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-operate aims to maximise the effectiveness of plan-making (and policies) by addressing any identified issues and “engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis”.<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> [Section 33a of Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004](#).

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.<sup>9</sup> This will aid in evidencing a consistency between relevant local plan policies and the appropriate marine policy documents<sup>10</sup> 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](mailto: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.<sup>11</sup> 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, and contribute to, land-based planning for coastal communities and economic regeneration.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup>

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](mailto:planning@marinemanagement.org.uk) or directly through the [Marine planning officers contact details](#) webpage.

---

<sup>9</sup> See paragraph 25 of the [National Planning Policy Framework 2019](#).

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> See [Marine Policy Statement](#) (2011), Section 1.3.5

<sup>12</sup> See, [A Description of the Marine Planning System for England](#), (Defra 2011). Ch. 6.

<sup>13</sup> See the [North East Marine Plan](#), p.13 and the [Marine Policy Statement](#) (2011) Section 1.3.4

## 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 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](mailto: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](mailto: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 NE-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:

#### NE-CC-1

*"Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts 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 - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.”*

## **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 North East 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’.<sup>14</sup>

Marine plans for the north west, south east and south west marine plan areas also have objectives based on the high-level marine objectives (HLMO) in the MPS.<sup>15</sup> These are listed alongside objectives for the north east in Table 2 below.<sup>16</sup> Marine Plan objectives for the south marine areas can be found in Table 3 below.

Annex A shows a description of all North East Marine Plan policies 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 north east 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).

---

<sup>14</sup> [Safeguarding our Seas report](#) (Defra 2002) p.3.

<sup>15</sup> Marine Policy Statement (2011) p. 11

<sup>16</sup> The [East](#) and [South](#) Marine Plans have independent sets of plan objectives. Those for the East Marine Plan are currently under review as part of the 3-year reporting cycle of marine plans.

**Table 2 – High Level Marine Objectives (for North East, North West, South East and South West Marine Plans)**

<b>Achieving a sustainable marine economy</b>	
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.
<b>Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society</b>	
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.
<b>Living within environmental limits</b>	
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.
----	--

**Table 3: Objectives of the South Marine Plan**

#	Objective	Relevant Policy Codes
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)
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)

#	Objective	Relevant Policy Codes
7	<p>To support the reduction of the environmental, social and economic impacts of climate change, through encouraging the implementation of mitigation and adaptation measures that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• avoid proposals' indirect contributions to greenhouse gas emissions</li> <li>• reduce vulnerability</li> <li>• improve resilience to climate and coastal change</li> <li>• consider habitats that provide related</li> <li>• ecosystem services</li> </ul>	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 <a href="#">Water Framework Directive</a> and Good Environmental Status under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, with respect to descriptors for marine litter, nonindigenous species and underwater noise.	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 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)

## Annex B – Potential North East 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 North East Marine Plans, adopted in 2021, are used as examples.

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
NE-ACC-1	<p><b>Access</b> Proposals demonstrating appropriate enhanced and inclusive public access to and within the marine area, including the provision of services for tourism and recreation activities, will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on public access should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts</p>	<p>The provision of appropriate public access is essential for realising the economic, environmental, and social benefits associated with the growth of sustainable tourism and recreation within the north east marine plan areas. NE-ACC-1 supports proposals for appropriate enhanced and inclusive public access to, and within, the marine area, including those providing services</p>	<p><b>Housing and other developments</b> - Policy could have relevance to strategic housing allocations and other green infrastructure plans near coastal locations where recreation space for higher population numbers/density is a consideration.</p> <p><b>Tourism &amp; Recreation</b> – Local Plans and other management plans should consider the potential economic benefits to local communities through marine tourism.</p>	6, 9

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	so they are no longer significant.	<p>for tourism and recreation activities.</p> <p>NE-ACC-1 also provides clarity on how public access should be protected, and ensures that proposals do not have a significant adverse impact on existing public access. Where proposals cannot avoid, minimise or mitigate significant adverse impacts to public access, they should not be supported.</p> <p>While NE-ACC-1 supports and protects public access to the marine area, in some circumstances, access restrictions may be required. Where they are incompatible with existing or proposed access</p>	<p><b>Conservation</b> – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p>	

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		restrictions, proposals for the provision of new public access should not be supported.		
NE-AGG-1	<p><b>Aggregates</b> 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 proposal is compatible with aggregate extraction.</p>	NE-AGG-1 safeguards marine aggregate licence areas from other activities, unless it is demonstrated that the other activities are compatible with marine aggregate extraction. This enables continuity of supply of construction aggregate and supports local and national objectives and economies.	N/A	2, 3
NE-AGG-2	<p><b>Aggregates</b> 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 proposal is</p>	NE-AGG-2 safeguards marine aggregate Exploration and Option Agreement areas to enable the aggregate industry to explore defined areas in order to identify commercially viable aggregate resources.	N/A	2, 3

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	compatible with aggregate extraction.	Proposals will only be supported if they are compatible with marine aggregate extraction. This enables future supply of construction aggregate and supports local and national objectives and economies.		
<b>NE-AGG-3</b>	<b>Aggregates</b> Proposals in areas of high potential aggregate resource that may have significant adverse impacts on future aggregate extraction should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - significant adverse impacts on future aggregate extraction so they are no longer significant. If it is not	NE-AGG-3 ensures that proposals consider areas of high potential aggregate resource, as defined by the British Geological Survey. It ensures that any 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	2, 3

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.			
NE-AIR-1	<p><b>Air quality and emissions</b></p> <p>Proposals must assess their direct and indirect impacts upon local air quality and emissions of greenhouse gases. Proposals that are likely to result in increased air pollution or increased emissions of greenhouse gases must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - air pollution and/or greenhouse gas emissions in line with current national and local air quality</p>	<p>Clean air is essential for life, health, the environment and the economy. Air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced to protect health, habitats and species and reduce the impacts of climate change. NE-AIR-1 ensures that proposals consider and address where they may cause direct or indirect air pollution or greenhouse gas emissions and manage these accordingly. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise or mitigate air pollution and/or greenhouse gas emissions</p>	<p><b>Emissions zone management</b> – Policy will have relevance to coastal local planning authorities and local plan objectives related to air quality and emissions. Any management plans should consider marine related emissions within monitoring and have regard to the marine plans in consideration of air quality and impact to the marine environment.</p> <p><b>Transport</b> – Policy can support any initiatives by county councils and unitary authorities to reduce pollution from traffic entering the marine environment</p>	3, 7

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	objectives and legal requirements.	in line with current national or local air quality objectives and legal requirements must not be supported.		
NE-AQ-1	<p><b>Aquaculture</b> Proposals within existing or potential strategic areas of sustainable aquaculture production must demonstrate consideration of and compatibility with sustainable aquaculture production. Where compatibility is not possible, proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on sustainable aquaculture production must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts on sustainable</p>	<p>The policy recognises that aquaculture is an important industry with the potential to grow, contributing to food supply and security. NE-AQ-1 seeks to protect both existing aquaculture operations as well as potential future opportunities for aquaculture, within spatially defined strategic areas of sustainable aquaculture production. These strategic areas have been spatially defined for species of commercial importance by considering environmental</p>	<p><b>Biodiversity</b> – Policy could have relevance to future/proposed land-use infrastructure/activity which may impact on water quality, marine ecology or biodiversity.</p> <p><b>Conservation</b> – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p>	2, 4

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	<p>aquaculture production so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.</p>	<p>factors, technical constraints, planning constraints and other users of the sea. The policy does not prevent non-aquaculture developments or activities; it supports sustainable aquaculture production by spatially defining areas where all proposals are required to demonstrate consideration of and compatibility with sustainable aquaculture. If this cannot be achieved, the policy stipulates proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on sustainable aquaculture should follow the steps in the mitigation hierarchy through avoiding, minimising or mitigating these impacts,</p>		

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		before being allowed to proceed if the regulator agrees with the proponent's overriding justification. While protecting opportunities for sustainable aquaculture production, the policy makes allowances for both non-significant adverse impacts on aquaculture, and significant adverse impacts that are outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.		
NE-AQ-2	<p><b>Aquaculture</b> Proposals enabling the provision of infrastructure for sustainable aquaculture and related industries will be supported.</p>	NE-AQ-2 aims to tackle barriers to aquaculture by encouraging the provision, maintenance and development of marine and land infrastructure to support sustainable aquaculture and related industries. This policy supports sustainable	<p><b>Safeguarding</b> – 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 re-development.</p> <p><b>Fisheries/Aquaculture</b> - Local planning authorities may wish to have regard to fisheries and</p>	1, 2

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>aquaculture projects by encouraging the direct development of infrastructure, as well as supporting connectivity between marine operations and land infrastructure, which will ensure that opportunities for aquaculture are realised. Due to the overlap between some shoreside aquaculture and fisheries infrastructure, NE-AQ-2 supports the integration of aquaculture with the fishing industry through the sharing of infrastructure and the diversification of fishers. This policy will also benefit employment and the development of skills in coastal communities.</p>	<p>aquaculture when plan-making by considering potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing and aquaculture activity.</p>	

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
NE-BIO-1	<p><b>Biodiversity</b> Proposals that enhance the distribution of priority habitats and priority species will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on the distribution of priority habitats and priority species must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.</p>	<p>Maintaining the distribution of priority habitats and priority species in the north east marine plan areas is important as it reduces habitat fragmentation, species isolation and supports strong, biodiverse communities which in turn provide ecosystem services. NE-BIO-1 encourages and supports proposals that enhance the distribution of priority habitats and priority species. NE-BIO-1 seeks to maintain the distribution of priority habitats and priority species through the management of significant adverse impacts. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate or, as a last</p>	<p><b>Biodiversity</b> – Policy could have relevance to future/proposed terrestrial infrastructure/activity which may impact on marine ecology or biodiversity.</p>	11, 12, 13

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		resort, compensate for significant adverse impacts, will not be supported.		
NE-BIO-2	<p><b>Biodiversity</b> Proposals that enhance or facilitate native species or habitat adaptation or connectivity, or native species migration, will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may cause significant adverse impacts on native species or habitat adaptation or connectivity, or native species migration, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) compensate for significant adverse</p>	Competition for space, increased levels of development, and predicted effects of climate change can affect the connectivity, adaptive ability and migration of habitats and species in the north east marine plan areas. NE-BIO-2 supports and encourages proposals that enhance or facilitate native species or habitat adaptation or connectivity, or native species migration. NE-BIO-2 requires proposals to manage negative effects which may significantly adversely impact the functioning of healthy,	<b>Coastal Infrastructure</b> – Policy could have relevance to any infrastructure above Mean Low Water Springs which needs to consider impacts upon marine biodiversity.	11, 12, 13

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	impacts that cannot be mitigated.	resilient and adaptable marine ecosystems. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate or, as a last resort, compensate for significant adverse impacts, will not be supported.		
NE-BIO-3	<p><b>Biodiversity</b> Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance coastal habitats, where important in their own right and/or for ecosystem functioning and provision of ecosystem 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 ecosystem services, and demonstrate</p>	In the north east inshore marine plan area, there are numerous important coastal habitats. Increased competition for space in and around these coastal habitats in the north east inshore marine plan area has resulted in coastal squeeze, a process where habitats have decreasing space between rigid coastal structures and rising sea level or coastal erosion. NE-BIO-3 encourages and supports	<p><b>Coastal Change</b> - 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> <p><b>Seascape/Designated landscapes</b> – Policy could have relevance for local authorities/National Parks/National Landscapes etc who wish to enhance or conserve the status of coastal habitats.</p>	8, 11, 12, 13

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate d) compensate for - net habitat loss.	proposals that deliver biodiversity gain by conserving, enhancing or restoring coastal habitats. NEBIO-3 also requires proposals to manage net habitat loss as a result of coastal squeeze, to support the functioning of healthy and resilient coastal and intertidal ecosystems. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate or, as a last resort, compensate for net habitat loss, will not be supported.	<b>Conservation</b> – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary	
<b>NE-CAB-1</b>	<b>Cables</b> Preference should be given to proposals for	Subsea cabling is important to the growth and sustainability of	N/A	3, 4

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	cable installation where the method of protection 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.	telecommunications, offshore wind farms and electricity transmission. NE-CAB-1 supports and encourages cable burial where possible, to meet the needs of the sector while enabling co-existence with other users of the north east marine plan areas.		
<b>NE-CAB-2</b>	<b>Cables</b> Proposals demonstrating compatibility with existing landfall sites and incorporating measures to enable development of future landfall opportunities should be supported. Where this is not possible proposals will, in order of preference: a)	Subsea cabling is important to the growth and sustainability of telecommunications, offshore wind farms and electricity transmission. Existing and potential future landfall sites for subsea cables are not currently protected from other proposals and uses,	<b>Safeguarding</b> – 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.  <b>Seascape/Designated landscapes</b> – Policy could have relevance for local authorities/ National Parks/National	1, 3

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts on existing and potential future landfall sites so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	which may prevent these sites from being used as cable landfall locations. NE-CAB 2 seeks to avoid the loss of existing and potential future landfall sites, and supports all proposals that consider the requirement for future cable landfall opportunities, ensuring that socially and economically vital cable activities can continue.	Landscapes etc, who wish to strengthen the protection of natural and built heritage assets within or adjacent to the marine plan area.	
<b>NE-CAB-3</b>	<b>Cables</b> Where seeking to locate close to existing subsea cables, proposals should demonstrate compatibility with ongoing function, maintenance and decommissioning activities relating to the cable.	NE-CAB-3 protects the ongoing function, maintenance and decommissioning of subsea cables, up to the point of landfall.	<b>Coastal infrastructure</b> – This policy could be relevant for local infrastructure near cable landfall sites, requiring consideration of maintaining access routes for future cable maintenance and ensuring that no interference with cable operations occurs.	3, 4

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
NE-CBC-1	<p><b>Cross-border co-operation</b> Proposals must consider cross-border impacts throughout the lifetime of the proposed activity. Proposals that impact upon one or more marine plan areas or land-use environments must show evidence of the relevant public authorities (including other countries) being consulted and responses considered.</p>	<p>NE-CBC-1 requires a considered approach to enhance cross-border co-operation between the land-use and marine planning systems in the north east marine plan areas, the bordering English east marine plan areas and the jurisdiction of Scotland, Norway, Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands.</p>	<p><b>Cross-border cooperation</b> – There are differences in marine planning regimes across country borders for example within the UK, and the relevant marine plans in bordering areas may apply differently.</p>	<p>1-13 (all plan objectives)</p>
NE-CC-1	<p><b>Climate Change</b> Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on habitats that provide a</p>	<p>Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration will be supported. Habitats that provide flood defence and carbon sequestration contribute to natural resilience for coastal</p>	<p><b>Housing and other development</b> – Policy could have relevance to increases in greenhouse gas emissions.  <b>Conservation</b> – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use</p>	<p>6, 8, 11, 12</p>

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	flood defence or carbon sequestration ecosystem service must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.	communities that are vulnerable to coastal erosion and change. NE-CC-1 requires proposals to manage impacts, enabling these important habitats to continue to provide this valuable service. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate or, as a last resort, compensate for significant adverse impacts, will not be supported.	policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.  <b>Green Infrastructure and Recreation</b> – Policy could have relevance when considering planning for green infrastructure to enable space for marine habitats and wildlife that instil climate resilience.	
NE-CC-2	<b>Climate Change</b> Proposals in the north east marine plan areas should demonstrate for the lifetime of the project that they are resilient to the impacts of climate change and coastal change.	The effects of climate change are wide-ranging and can include sea level rise, coastal flooding and rising sea temperatures. NE-CC-2 adds provision to enable enhanced resilience of developments, activities and ecosystems within the	<b>Biodiversity</b> – Policy could have relevance to land-use infrastructure/activity which may impact on coastal protection or flood defences.  <b>Conservation</b> – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use	3, 6

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		north east marine plan areas to the effects of climate change and coastal change.	policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.	
<b>NE-CC-3</b>	<p><b>Climate Change</b> Proposals in the north east marine plan areas, and adjacent marine plan areas, that are likely to have significant adverse impacts on coastal change, or on climate change adaptation measures inside and outside of the proposed project areas, should only be supported if they can demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p>	<p>Large areas of the north east inshore marine plan area coastline are subject to or vulnerable to change. NE-CC-3 ensures proposals do not exacerbate coastal change, enabling communities to be more resilient and better able to adapt to coastal erosion and flood risk where identified. NE-CC-3 also supports proposals that do not compromise existing adaptation measures, which will enable an improvement in the resilience of coastal communities to coastal erosion and flood risk.</p>	<p><b>Coastal Change</b> – Policy could be relevant for local authorities with coast protection responsibilities who are considering establishing coastal change management areas.</p> <p><b>Coastal Change</b> - 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>	3, 6, 11, 12

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate significant adverse impacts will not be supported.		
NE-CCUS-1	<p><b>Carbon capture usage and storage</b> Decommissioning programmes for oil and gas facilities should demonstrate that they have considered the potential for re-use of infrastructure.</p>	The re-use of existing oil and gas infrastructure may bring cost savings for carbon capture, usage and storage projects. Re-using oil and gas infrastructure for carbon capture, usage and storage may also potentially benefit existing owners and operators of these oil and gas assets through maximising the economic life of their asset, as well as offering wider benefits supporting decarbonisation of the UK economy. This policy encourages the consideration of infrastructure re-use by oil	N/A	2, 3

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		and gas operators prior to decommissioning. The policy notes that reuse of infrastructure may not be a viable or realistic option, the aim is for the potential to be considered.		
NE-CCUS-2	<p><b>Carbon capture usage and storage</b></p> <p>Carbon capture, usage and storage proposals incorporating the re-use of existing oil and gas infrastructure will be supported.</p>	The re-use of oil and gas infrastructure can be economically beneficial for both oil and gas, and carbon capture, usage and storage operators, as well as offering wider economic and environmental benefits. This policy encourages re-use by supporting new carbon capture, usage and storage proposals that utilise still viable oil and gas infrastructure. This policy does not mean proposals that do not incorporate the re-use of	N/A	2, 3

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>existing oil and gas infrastructure will be disadvantaged or rejected in the proposal process. Although the re-use of infrastructure can be beneficial, there are many complicated considerations to have regard to, and the suitability of each piece of infrastructure for re-use must be considered on a case-by-case basis</p>		
<p><b>NE-CCUS-3</b></p>	<p><b>Carbon capture usage and storage</b> Proposals associated with the deployment of low carbon infrastructure for industrial clusters should be supported.</p>	<p>The government identified potential regional clusters which can be utilised for low carbon development in the Delivering clean growth: CCUS Cost Challenge Taskforce report and the subsequent plan, The UK carbon capture, usage and storage (CCUS) deployment</p>	<p><b>Coastal infrastructure</b> – policy can support the development of coastal facilities that facilitate Carbon Capture Use and Storage projects and provisions to these sites.</p> <p><b>Economy</b> – Local planning authorities may wish to consider the economic benefits to land-use</p>	<p>1, 2, 3, 8</p>

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>pathway: an action plan. NE-CCUS-3 supports the development of low carbon industrial clusters where low carbon infrastructure, including carbon capture, usage and storage technologies could be deployed. Encouraging developments associated with industrial clusters aims to reduce the capital costs of deploying carbon capture, usage and storage, maximising the economies of scale. The Energy Technologies Institute Strategic UK CCS Appraisal provides a comprehensive review of likely carbon dioxide storage sites in the UK. Figure 1 - Map of UK offshore infrastructure and potential carbon dioxide</p>	<p>based elements of marine supply chains.</p> <p><b>Safeguarding</b> – 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>	

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>storage sites from the Department of Business Energy and Industrial Strategy consultation on Carbon capture, usage and storage (CCUS) projects: re -use of oil and gas assets shows the Teesside and Humberside (Easington / Dimlington) areas of existing industrial infrastructure, and potential storage sites which would support Industrial Clusters in the north east marine plan areas.</p> <p>Supporting development associated with industrial clusters also aims to enhance connectivity between marine operations and land infrastructure, which will</p>		

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>ensure that opportunities for carbon capture, usage and storage are realised. This policy will also benefit employment in coastal communities near industrial clusters, supporting the NE -INF1 and NE -EMP -1 policies.</p> <p>As carbon capture, usage and storage are at the early stages of deployment in the UK, the government guidance may change over the lifetime of the North East Marine Plan. This policy should be considered alongside the most recent government guidance, reflecting the current approach to the deployment of carbon capture, usage and storage.</p>		

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
NE-CE-1	<p><b>Cumulative effects</b> Proposals which may have adverse cumulative effects with other existing, authorised, or reasonably foreseeable proposals must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse cumulative and/or in-combination effects so they are no longer significant.</p>	<p>While cumulative effects are considered in relevant assessments and decision-making, the increasing use of the marine area reinforces the need to consider and address cumulative effects of both land-use and maritime projects, in line with the aims set out in the UK Marine Policy Statement. In conjunction with and in support of other relevant north east marine plan policies, this policy is intended to ensure relevant effects, including those that may seem less significant in their own right, are taken account of and addressed. In doing so, the policy will help to ensure that cumulative effects on the</p>	<p><b>Conservation</b> – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary that could have a cumulative effect alongside marine policies.</p>	<p>2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 13</p>

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		wider environment of the north east marine plan areas and other relevant receptors are effectively managed.		
NE-CO-1	<p><b>Coexistence</b> Proposals that optimise the use of space and incorporate opportunities for co-existence and co-operation with existing activities will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on, or displace, existing activities must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals must</p>	The north east marine plan areas, and in particular the inshore area, are likely to be busier in the future, and use of the space may become limited. To realise sustainable social, environmental and economic benefits it is therefore important to plan for and make efficient use of the space. NE-CO-1 encourages proposals to be spatially planned, take account of existing activities, and promote co-existence. The policy ensures that new proposals seek to avoid creating conflicts and to	<b>Coastal Change</b> - 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.	2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	state the case for proceeding.	minimise their footprint, or to optimise it where it may not be feasible to minimise.		
NE-DD-1	<p><b>Dredging and disposal</b>  In areas of authorised dredging activity, including those subject to navigational dredging, proposals for other activities will not be supported unless they are compatible with the dredging activity.</p>	Dredge areas, and the area surrounding these that are required for dredge activity to take place, may be adversely impacted by new proposals such as those that negatively impact the ability to access or egress from these sites. NE-DD-1 ensures continued safe access by vessels to ports and harbours over the lifetime of the North East Marine Plan. This policy discourages proposals that would cause significant adverse impacts on dredge activities, such as the need for related vessels to navigate to and	N/A	2

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		from authorised dredge areas.		
NE-DD-2	<p><b>Dredging and disposal</b> Proposals that cause significant adverse impacts on licensed disposal sites should not be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on licensed disposal sites must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate the significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for proceeding.</p>	<p>Disposal sites, and the surrounding areas that are required for the disposal activity to take place, may be adversely impacted by new proposals that negatively impact the ability to access or egress from these sites. NE-DD-2 ensures that disposal sites are not compromised, reducing the need to designate new disposal sites that are not intended for alternative use, and so reducing environmental impacts. This policy discourages proposals that would cause significant adverse impacts on disposal activities, such as the need for vessels to navigate safely to and</p>	<p><b>Coastal Change</b> – This policy may help inform and advise planning and coastal protection authorities when considering beneficial reuse of dredged materials.</p>	2

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>from disposal sites. Preserving licensed disposal sites, including where sites are being used for alternative use, will enable and facilitate the growth of ports and harbours within the north east inshore marine plan area. Over the 20-year life span of the Plan this may become more prevalent in the developing economic climate.</p>		
NE-DD-3	<p><b>Dredging and disposal</b> Proposals for the disposal of dredged material must demonstrate that they have been assessed against the waste hierarchy. Where there is the need to identify new dredge disposal sites, including for alternative use sites, proposals</p>	<p>As a result of dredging activity, disposal of dredge material is often required, whether this is direct disposal as a last resort in the waste hierarchy or deposit of material for alternative uses. This policy ensures that proposals have considered all steps within the waste</p>	N/A	2

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	<p>should be supported if they conform to best practice and guidance.</p>	<p>hierarchy prior to the disposal of dredge material as a last resort. The establishment of new disposal sites which are for alternative use should be supported. The establishment of new dredge disposal sites as a last resort in the waste hierarchy should only be explored after previous levels within the waste hierarchy have been considered, and the potential to utilise open, disused or closed sites has been fully investigated and discounted. In some cases, designated disposals sites cannot be used, for example where sediment size does not match or there are particular constraints. NE-</p>		

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		DD-3 then provides a source of best practice and guidance for the designation of new dredge disposal sites. This is required as the demand increases for new disposal sites, and encourages early consideration of impacts to avoid conflicts during the proposal process.		
NE-DEF-1	<p><b>Defence</b></p> <p>Proposals in or affecting Ministry of Defence areas should only be authorised with agreement from the Ministry of Defence.</p>	<p>There are a high number of defence activities and estates in the north east marine plan areas. Marine infrastructure can affect their continuity or future use. NE-DEF-1 aims to avoid conflict between defence activities and new proposals within the north east marine plan areas. This policy will ensure</p>	N/A	10

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		defence interests are not hindered.		
NE-DIST-1	<p><b>Disturbance</b> Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on highly mobile species through disturbance or displacement must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p>	<p>Disturbance and displacement from activities, including those that do not require authorisation such as tourism and recreation, can cause declines in some highly mobile species. NE-DIST-1 reduces the effects of disturbance and displacement by requiring proposals to manage impacts, highlighting good practice and encouraging strategic management of unauthorised activities. NE-DIST-1 enables people to appreciate marine biodiversity and act responsibly to protect and recover populations of rare, vulnerable and</p>	<p><b>Biodiversity</b> – Policy could have relevance to terrestrial infrastructure/activity which may impact on marine ecology or biodiversity.</p>	11, 12, 13

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		valued species. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate significant adverse impacts will not be supported.		
NE-EMP-1	<p><b>Employment</b> Proposals that result in a net increase in marine-related employment will be supported, particularly where they meet one or more of the following: 1) are aligned with local skills strategies and support the skills available 2) create a diversity of opportunities 3) create employment in locations identified as the most deprived 4) implement new technologies - in, and adjacent to, the north east marine plan areas.</p>	The creation and maintenance of quality jobs is a key component to delivering sustainable economic growth, and for ensuring that everyone is able to access its associated opportunities (Employment and Skills Strategies in England, United Kingdom). NE-EMP-1 supports existing national policies and strategies (eg the UK Marine Policy Statement and the UK's Industrial Strategy: building a Britain fit for the future) by encouraging decision-	<p><b>Safeguarding</b> – 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><b>Fisheries/Aquaculture</b> - 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><b>Tourism &amp; Recreation</b> – Local plans and other management plans should consider the potential</p>	2, 4

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		makers and proponents to deliver additional employment benefits from proposals, particularly those benefits associated with the listed policy criteria. NE-EMP-1 seeks to maximise sustainable economic activity, prosperity and opportunities for all, both now and into the future.	economic benefits to local communities through marine tourism.	
NE-FISH-1	<p><b>Fisheries</b></p> <p>Proposals that support a sustainable fishing industry, including the industry's diversification, should be supported.</p>	Commercial fisheries can be affected by changes to fish abundance, growth, distribution or behaviour. NE-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	<p><b>Fisheries/Aquaculture</b> - 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><b>Employment</b> – Local planning authorities may wish to consider the social benefits to additional employment opportunities for</p>	3, 4

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		sustainable use of marine resources.	coastal communities from a diversifying fishing industry.	
<b>NE-FISH-2</b>	<p><b>Fisheries</b> Proposals that enhance access for fishing activities should be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on access for fishing activities must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.</p>	<p>A sustainable fishing industry provides benefits to coastal communities and contributes to UK food security. Fisheries activities are restricted in where and when they can operate, making the access to these activities vulnerable. NE-FISH-2 supports enhanced access for sustainable fishing activities and seeks to limit significant adverse impacts from other marine activities on access for fishing activities, enabling continued sustainable marine resource use and generating prosperous, resilient and cohesive coastal communities. This</p>	<p><b>Fisheries/Aquaculture</b> - 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, 9

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		policy covers not only fishing activity, but also the transit routes to and from sites and any berthing/beaching or landing/loading points.		
<b>NE-FISH-3</b>	<p><b>Fisheries</b></p> <p>Proposals that enhance essential fish habitat, including spawning, nursery and feeding grounds, and migratory routes, should be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on essential fish habitat, including spawning, nursery and feeding grounds, and migratory routes, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate -</p>	Sustainable fish populations rely upon specific habitats throughout their life. NE-FISH-3 recognises that the protection of habitats and the services they provide can enhance fish populations, supporting the long-term existence of the fisheries and contributing to Good Environmental Status, as described in the Marine Strategy Part One: UK updated assessment and Good Environmental Status. NE-FISH-3 encourages and supports	N/A	11, 12, 13

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	proposals that deliver biodiversity gain for essential fish habitats. NE-FISH-3 enables sustainable use of marine resources within environmental limits, alongside productive fisheries, by requiring proposals to avoid impacts on essential fish habitats or, if avoidance of impacts is not possible, to manage impacts on essential fish habitats.		
NE-HER-1	<p><b>Heritage assets</b> Proposals that demonstrate they will conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets will be supported. Where proposals may cause harm to the significance of heritage assets, proponents must</p>	This policy aims to conserve and enhance marine and coastal heritage assets by considering the potential for harm to their significance. This consideration will not be limited to designated assets and extends to	<p><b>Housing-</b> Policy could have relevance to strategic housing allocations near coastal locations where potential impacts on coastal heritage is a consideration.</p> <p><b>Seascape/Designated landscapes</b> – Policy could have relevance for local authorities/National Parks/National</p>	5, 6, 9

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - any harm to the significance of heritage assets. If it is not possible to mitigate, then public benefits for proceeding with the proposal must outweigh the harm to the significance of heritage assets.	those non-designated assets that are, or have the potential to become, significant. The policy will ensure that assets are considered in the decision-making process and will make provisions for those assets that are discovered during developments.	Landscapes etc who wish to strengthen the protection of natural and built heritage assets within or adjacent to the marine plan area.  <b>Conservation</b> – Policy could have relevance in considering impacts of land-use policies on heritage assets either side of the land-sea boundary.	
NE-INF-1	<b>Infrastructure</b> Proposals for appropriate marine infrastructure which facilitates land-based activities, or land-based infrastructure which facilitates marine activities (including the diversification or regeneration of sustainable marine industries), should be supported.	Many marine activities in the north east and adjacent marine plan areas are reliant on land based infrastructure. Similarly, activities on land may also be reliant on marine infrastructure. Supporting infrastructure development, diversification and regeneration will provide socio economic benefits	<b>Coastal Change</b> - 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.  <b>Fisheries/Aquaculture</b> - Local planning authorities may wish to have regard to fisheries and aquaculture when plan-making by considering potential economic,	1

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>and facilitate marine businesses, including those that are land-based. NE-INF-1 supports the integration of the marine and land-use systems. It does so by encouraging proposals (and other measures) that maintain or improve existing, or provide new, sustainable marine or land-based infrastructure that facilitates activity in the other system.</p>	<p>social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing and aquaculture activity.</p> <p><b>Economic growth/Coastal infrastructure:</b> 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><b>Tourism and Recreation:</b> 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 a way that supports both environmental sustainability and economic growth.</p>	

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
NE-INF-2	<p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <p>(1) Proposals for alternative development at existing safeguarded landing facilities will not be supported.</p> <p>(2) Proposals adjacent and opposite existing safeguarded landing facilities must demonstrate that they avoid significant adverse impacts on existing safeguarded landing facilities.</p> <p>3) Proposals for alternative development at existing landing facilities (excluding safeguarded sites) should not be supported unless that facility is no longer viable or capable of being made viable for waterborne transport.</p> <p>(4) Proposals adjacent and opposite existing landing</p>	<p>Landing facilities in the north east inshore marine plan area are critical for enabling industries including shipping, tourism, recreation and leisure, construction, aggregates and waste. By protecting existing landing facilities, identifying the difference in safeguarding, NE-INF-2 mirrors similar provisions in land-use planning and supports the continued operation of vital existing landing facilities.</p>	<p><b>Housing and other developments</b> – local planning authorities managing land-use developments adjacent to landing facilities may wish to ensure that the area remains dedicated to maritime activities. Plans could include requirements for impact assessments demonstrating how they will avoid or minimise interference with port operations eg traffic management.</p> <p><b>Safeguarding</b> – 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, eg minerals infrastructure for the landing, processing and onward transportation of marine aggregates</p>	1

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	<p>facilities (excluding safeguarded sites) that may have significant adverse impacts on the landing facilities should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p>			
NE-INNS-1	<p><b>Invasive non-native species</b> Proposals that reduce the risk of introduction and/or spread of invasive non-native species should be supported. Proposals must put in place appropriate measures to avoid or minimise significant adverse impacts that would arise through the introduction and transport of invasive non-native</p>	<p>The north east marine plan areas have a high risk of introducing or spreading invasive non-native species which may damage the marine area and harm populations of native flora and fauna. NE-INNS-1 aims to avoid or minimise damage to the marine area from the introduction or transport of invasive non-native species. Proposals that do</p>	<p><b>Biodiversity</b> – Potential links to biosecurity plans.</p>	<p>7, 11, 12, 13</p>

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	species, particularly when: 1) moving equipment, boats or livestock (for example fish or shellfish) from one water body to another 2) introducing structures suitable for settlement of invasive non-native species, or the spread of invasive non-native species known to exist in the area.	not put in place appropriate measures to avoid or minimise significant adverse impacts that would arise through the introduction and transport of invasive non-native species will not be supported. NE-INNS-1 also aims to support those projects that attempt to reduce the risk and/or introduction of invasive non-native species, such as eradication projects.		
<b>NE-INNS-2</b>	<b>Invasive non-native species</b> Public authorities with functions to manage activities that could potentially introduce, transport or spread invasive non-native species should implement adequate biosecurity	NE-INNS-2 aims to avoid or minimise the introduction and spread of marine invasive non-native species by encouraging public authorities with relevant functions throughout the north east to implement adequate biosecurity measures,	<b>Biodiversity</b> – Potential links to biosecurity plans.	7, 11, 12, 13

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	measures to avoid or minimise the risk of introducing, transporting or spreading invasive non-native species.	increase awareness of invasive non-native species and provide suitable guidance to help reduce their adverse impacts on the marine environment, which could include the eradication of existing invasive species.		
NE-ML-1	<p><b>Marine litter</b></p> <p>Public authorities must make adequate provision for the prevention, re-use, recycling and disposal of waste to reduce and prevent marine litter. Public authorities should aspire to undertake measures to remove marine litter within their jurisdiction.</p>	<p>Litter at sea often originates on land. Increase in development, access, recreation and tourism in the north east marine plan areas may result in increased litter, and an adverse impact on the environment on which these activities rely. Preventing marine litter through effective waste management is vital. Addressing marine litter along the coastline is also</p>	<p><b>Litter/waste management –</b></p> <p>Relevance to coastal local planning authorities and local plan objectives related to litter. All waste management planning, processes and activities should consider the impact of litter on the marine environment.</p>	7, 11

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		an important step towards dealing with this problem.		
NE-ML-2	<p><b>Marine litter</b> Proposals that facilitate waste re-use or recycling to reduce or remove marine litter will be supported. opportunities on offer in the marine plan areas attract visitors to the area. Proposals that could potentially increase the amount of marine litter in the marine plan areas must include measures to, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - waste entering the marine environment.</p>	<p>The natural landscapes, wildlife and recreational opportunities on offer in the marine plan areas attract visitors to the area. An increase in visitors and in coastal and marine development could lead to an increase in litter. NE-ML-2 makes sure proposals avoid, minimise or mitigate waste entering the marine environment and encourages support for improvements in waste management and removal of marine litter, during construction and over the lifetime of the development. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise or mitigate waste entering the marine</p>	<p><b>Litter/waste management</b> – Policy will have relevance to coastal local planning authorities and local plan objectives related to litter.</p>	7, 11

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		environment will not be supported.		
NE-MPA-1	<p><b>Marine protected areas</b> 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 must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts, with due regard given to statutory advice on an ecologically coherent network.</p>	<p>Marine protected areas in the north east marine plan areas make a significant contribution towards the UK's network of ecologically coherent marine protected areas. NE-MPA-1 encourages and supports proposals for activities that further the conservation objectives of marine protected areas. NE-MPA-1 also ensures proposals take account of adverse impacts on individual sites and the overall network, protecting important habitats, species and geological features, and enabling the successful and continued management of these sites. Proposals that</p>	<p><b>Biodiversity</b> – Policy could have relevance to terrestrial infrastructure/activity which may impact on marine ecology or biodiversity.</p> <p><b>Conservation</b> – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p> <p><b>Coastal Change</b> - 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>	11, 12, 13

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		cannot avoid, minimise or mitigate adverse impacts should not be supported.		
NE-MPA-2	<p><b>Marine protected areas</b> Proposals that enhance a marine protected area's ability to adapt to climate change, enhancing the resilience of the marine protected area network, will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may have adverse impacts on an individual marine protected area's ability to adapt to the effects of climate change, and so reduce the resilience of the marine protected area network, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts.</p>	<p>The effects of climate change on habitats and species poses a challenge to designated marine protected area sites in the north east marine plan areas. NE-MPA-2 ensures proposals account for adverse impacts on each impacted individual marine protected area's ability to adapt to climate change, improving resilience and working towards a well-managed marine protected area network.</p> <p>Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise or mitigate adverse impacts should not be supported.</p>	<p><b>Biodiversity</b> – Policy could have relevance to terrestrial infrastructure/activity which may impact on marine ecology or biodiversity.</p> <p><b>Conservation</b> – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p>	11, 12, 13

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
NE-MPA-3	<p><b>Marine protected areas</b> 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.</p>	<p>Anthropogenic activities such as the burning of fossil fuels, deforestation, farming and methane release from animal farming have serious adverse impacts on the climate. These impacts include, but are not limited to, increased ocean acidity, temperature shifts, and increased storm activity. Climate change may result in marine protected area feature migration and/or feature displacement due to shifts in ranges of habitats and species. NE-MPA-3 ensures flexibility by supporting boundary changes to improve the resilience of the marine protected area network.</p>	<p><b>Biodiversity</b> – Policy could have relevance to future/proposed terrestrial infrastructure/activity which may impact on marine ecology or biodiversity.</p>	11, 12, 13

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		NE-MPA-3 enables adaptive management to help mitigate the loss of features within sites, and support adaptation to climate change.		
NE-MPA-4	<p><b>Marine protected areas</b> Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on designated geodiversity must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) avoid</li> <li>b) minimise</li> <li>c) mitigate</li> </ul> <p>- adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p>	Geodiversity in the north east marine plan areas has formed over billions of years. With natural change happening slowly over a long timescale, geodiversity is particularly vulnerable to human impacts. NE-MPA-4 makes sure proposals account for significant adverse impacts on designated geodiversity, protecting important geological and geomorphological features that underlie and determine the character of our landscape and seascape.	<p><b>Biodiversity</b> – Policy could have relevance to future/proposed terrestrial infrastructure/activity which may impact on marine ecology or biodiversity.</p> <p><b>Conservation</b> – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary.</p> <p><b>Coastal Change</b> - 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>	11

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise or mitigate significant adverse impacts should not be supported.		
NE-OG-1	<p><b>Oil and gas</b> 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.</p>	<p>The potential to extract oil and gas is important to the UK's energy supply. However, oil and gas exploration and production (within existing licence areas) may require access to the same area of seabed as other sector proposals. This policy protects the supply of oil and gas by safeguarding areas where there are existing licences. However, this does not sterilise areas for other activities as proposals that demonstrate compatibility with oil and gas activities may be supported. The</p>	N/A	2, 3

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>policy gives clarity on dealing with potential future conflicts with other users who may want to use the same space as oil and gas extraction activities, by supporting co-existence opportunities for different users of the north east marine plan areas. This supports the UK in meeting its energy and security objectives, as activities that may impact or sterilise areas that may be used for potential oil and gas extraction would hinder the fulfilment of the objectives of the UK Marine Policy Statement and the UK's energy objectives.</p>		
<b>NE-OG-2</b>	<p><b>Oil and gas</b> Proposals within areas of geological oil and gas</p>	<p>Maximising the economic recovery of oil and gas resources may require</p>	<p><b>Safeguarding</b> – Policy could be relevant to local authorities looking to safeguard shore-based facilities</p>	<p>2, 3</p>

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	<p>extraction potential demonstrating compatibility with future extraction activity will be supported.</p>	<p>access to discoveries of deposits that have not yet been developed. However, other proposals may require access to the same area of seabed as these resources and, therefore, to future potential oil and gas production. This policy safeguards areas identified as having geological potential for future oil and gas extraction by ensuring that proposals have regard to future oil and gas activity prior to gaining support. The policy gives clarity on dealing with potential future conflicts with other users who may want to use the same space as oil and gas extraction activities by supporting co-</p>	<p>for future marine employment use, where there is pressure to allow non-marine redevelopment.</p>	

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>existence opportunities for different users of the north east marine plan areas. This supports the UK in meeting its energy and security objectives, as activities that may impact or sterilise areas that may be used for potential oil and gas extraction would hinder the fulfilment of the objectives of the UK Marine Policy Statement and the UK's energy objectives.</p>		
NE-PS-1	<p><b>Ports, harbours and shipping</b> In line with the National Policy Statement for Ports, sustainable port and harbour development should be supported. Only proposals demonstrating compatibility with current port and harbour activities</p>	<p>Ports and harbours are essential to realising economic and social benefits for the north east marine plan areas and the UK. NE-PS-1 makes sure that proposals do not restrict current port and harbour activity or future growth, enabling long-term</p>	<p><b>Ports, shipping and marinas</b> - 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</p>	1, 2, 3

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	<p>will be supported. Proposals within statutory harbour authority areas or their approaches that detrimentally and materially affect safety of navigation, or the compliance by statutory harbour authorities with the Open Port Duty or the Port Marine Safety Code, will not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances. Proposals that may have a significant adverse impact upon future opportunity for sustainable expansion of port and harbour activities, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they</p>	<p>strategic decisions, and supporting competitive and efficient port and shipping operations. NE-PS-1 provides clarity on how the economic interests and statutory duties of ports and harbours should be protected, and makes sure new development does not restrict current activities or future growth, or compliance with the Port Marine Safety Code. This policy protects the efficiency and resilience of continuing port operations, and further port development (UK Marine Policy Statement, Section 3.4.7). The sustainable development of ports (increase in shipping activity) is supported by the UK Marine Policy</p>	<p>which may affect any proposed development sites.</p>	

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	<p>are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.</p>	<p>Statement (Section 3.4.10). This policy also complements and supports the National Policy Statement for Ports, setting provisions for port growth in the context of the management and development of other activities. Policy NE-PS-1 supports the government policy for ports (National Policy Statement for Ports). It is recognised that although not all ports are able, or wish, to grow physically, there will remain a need to be commercially viable through adaptation, change, and diversification. Also recognised is the need to ensure safe navigation both within and in the</p>		

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>approaches to ports, at present and in the future. Harbour masters are recognised experts in navigational safety within their jurisdictional areas. Accordingly, the policy recognises that their views regarding how proposals affect safety of navigation, the Open Port Duty and compliance with the Port Marine Safety Code should be sought and given significant weight. NE-PS-1 confirms that proposals that compromise these important duties should not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances. Authorisation of proposals that impact upon compliance with these</p>		

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>core duties are expected to be exceedingly rare. This policy supports continued port maintenance and repairs, diversification and other sustainable port development that contribute to long-term economic growth and prosperity.</p>		
NE-PS-2	<p><b>Ports, harbours and shipping</b> Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under keel clearance must not be authorised within or encroaching upon International Maritime Organization routing systems unless there are exceptional circumstances.</p>	<p>International Maritime Organization routing systems are essential for shipping activity, freedom of navigation and navigational safety. Within the north east marine plan areas there are currently no such routing systems. However, International Maritime Organization routing systems may or may not be introduced over the lifetime of the</p>	N/A	1, 2

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>Plan. NE-PS-2 confirms that proposals that compromise these important navigation routes should not be authorised. NE-PS-2 enables and supports safe, profitable and efficient marine businesses. NE-PS-2 specifies that developments should not be authorised where the use of International Maritime Organization routing systems may be compromised.</p> <p>Authorisation of proposals that impact upon the use of International Maritime Organization routing systems are very rare.</p>		
<b>NE-PS-3</b>	<b>Ports, harbours and shipping</b>	The north east marine plan areas are very busy with respect to high-density	N/A	1, 2

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	<p>Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under keel clearance which encroaches upon high density navigation routes, strategically important navigation routes, or that pose a risk to the viability of passenger services, must not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances.</p>	<p>navigation routes, strategically important navigation routes and passenger services. NE-PS-3 confirms that proposals that pose a risk to safe navigation or the viability of these routes and services should not be authorised. NE-PS-3 aims to protect these routes and services by enabling and promoting safe, profitable and efficient marine businesses.</p> <p>NE-PS-3 focuses on minimising negative impacts on shipping activity, protecting the economic interests of ports, harbours, shipping and the UK economy overall, and affording protection to the 1, 2 101 areas used by high</p>		

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		intensities of traffic (UK Marine Policy Statement 3.4.2). It also gives effect to provisions in the National Planning Policy Framework (Section 37), which aims to encourage sustainable transport.		
NE-PS-4	<p><b>Ports, harbours and shipping</b> Proposals promoting or facilitating sustainable coastal and/or short sea shipping as an alternative to road, rail or air transport will be supported where appropriate.</p>	Short sea shipping provides a sustainable alternative for the transport of goods. NE-PS-4 aims to support sustainable coastal or short sea shipping where appropriate as an alternative to road, rail or air methods lowering carbon dioxide emissions and reducing road congestion. Bulk volumes are moved quickly with a reduction in administrative burden and increased efficiency through	<b>Transport</b> – local planning authorities could use this policy to support the use of short sea shipping as a transport route instead of land-based transport to reduce traffic and improve land-based emissions/air quality.	3

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>economies of scale. Short sea routes also allow the transshipment of cargo from large vessels landing into major European ports to the UK (and through direct movements of smaller bulk materials), reducing costs, improving reliability and allowing smaller ports to expand through the establishment of increased numbers of short sea shipping routes where suitable. Policy NE-PS-4 supports the government policy for ports (National Policy Statement for Ports, Section 3.1.4, Section 3.3.5 and Section 3.4.14). The short sea shipping market is expected to grow over the lifetime of the marine plan, providing a flexible and specialised</p>		

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>service. There are, however, several factors to consider in what is a price-sensitive market. In particular, the relatively lower costs of road transport, time constraints on delivery of goods and the availability of government subsidies.</p>		
NE-REN-1	<p><b>Renewables</b> Proposals that enable the provision of renewable energy technologies and associated supply chains, will be supported.</p>	<p>Supply chains play an important role in developing technology, reducing the associated costs of infrastructure and realising the economic and social benefits of renewable energy to the UK economy. NE-REN-1 recognises the importance of the supply chain within the lifecycle of renewable energy projects. NE-REN-1 enables public authorities to support</p>	<p><b>Economy</b> – Local planning authorities may wish to consider the economic benefits to land-use based elements of marine supply chains.</p> <p><b>Employment</b> – Local planning authorities may wish to consider the social benefits to additional employment opportunities for coastal communities or additional economic support through local business involvement within the supply chain.</p>	2, 3, 8

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>proposals that will reduce costs, ensuring that businesses are operating competitively and with a long-term strategy. Developing a strong supply chain will not only support the domestic installation of offshore wind but could contribute to establishing a successful export market, particularly in relation to the emerging floating offshore wind industry. The Offshore Wind Sector Deal outlines a commitment to increase UK supply chain content to 60% by 2030. This policy supports proposals that indicate how they will draw on and develop the UK supply chain as part of their development.</p>	<p><b>Sustainable development &amp; climate change</b> – local planning authorities may wish to consider the benefits of renewable energy use to their communities and how this contributes towards nationwide net zero goals.</p>	

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
NE-REN-2	<p><b>Renewables</b> Proposals for new activity within areas held under a lease or an agreement for lease for renewable energy generation should not be authorised, unless it is demonstrated that the proposed development or activity will not reduce the ability to construct, operate or decommission the existing or planned energy generation project.</p>	<p>Renewable energy technologies contribute to the diversification and decarbonisation of the electricity grid. NE-REN-2 protects areas identified for energy developments from other activities that could affect the sites ability to generate energy. It enables the development of safe, profitable and efficient marine businesses.</p>	<p><b>Safeguarding</b> – 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>	2, 3, 8
NE-REN-3	<p><b>Renewables</b> Proposals for the installation of infrastructure to generate offshore renewable energy, inside areas of identified potential and subject to relevant assessments, will be supported.</p>	<p>Offshore wind is the current favoured offshore renewable energy generating technology in the UK. The “offshore wind high potential future development areas” layer highlights areas of least constraint for fixed foundation offshore wind energy generation and</p>	<p><b>Coastal infrastructure</b> – policy can support the development of coastal facilities that facilitate renewable projects and provisions to these sites.</p>	2, 3, 8

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>indicates potential future areas for leasing. This dataset reflects the latest understanding of areas with high potential, incorporating the original technical constraints analysis (see the “Resource and Constraints Assessment Methodology Report” available on the Marine Data Exchange). NE-REN-3 supports the identification of future leasing rounds and provides a level of certainty for other activities as to where future development may occur. Figure 14 identifies the portion of the plan area that has a high potential for the future development of offshore wind. NE-REN-3 is in place to facilitate</p>		

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		the identification of sites for future offshore renewable energy development. Spatial areas for all technology types will be updated, as required, based on improved understanding of constraints and technical advancements in new technology. Proponents and decision-makers should refer to Explore Marine Plans for the most up-to-date data.		
NE-SCP-1	<b>Seascape and landscape</b> Proposals should ensure they are compatible with their surroundings and should not have a significant adverse impact on the character and visual resource of the seascape and landscape of the area. The location,	The aim of the policy is to manage significant adverse impacts on the seascape and landscape of the north east inshore and offshore marine plan areas. It will make sure that an area's value, quality and its capacity to accommodate change is	<b>Landscape</b> – supports development of landscape and scenic quality policies.  <b>Housing</b> - Policy could have relevance to strategic housing allocations near coastal locations where potential impacts on coastal heritage is a consideration.	5, 9

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	<p>scale and design of proposals should take account of the character, quality and distinctiveness of the seascape and landscape. Proposals that may have a significant adverse impact on the seascape and landscape of the area should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate, the public benefits for proceeding with the proposal must outweigh significant adverse impacts to the seascape and landscape of the area. Proposals within or relatively close to</p>	<p>considered and that the scale and design of a proposal is compatible with its surroundings. The policy's primary aim is to make provisions for those areas of seascape without statutory designation. The policy also supports those areas with existing statutory designation such as National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and World Heritage Sites. Defined Heritage Coasts are also supported although they do not hold statutory designation.</p>	<p><b>Designated landscapes</b> – 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> <p><b>Conservation</b> – Policy could have relevance in considering impacts of land-use policies on heritage assets either side of the land-sea boundary.</p>	

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	<p>nationally designated areas should have regard to the specific statutory purposes of the designated area. Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>			
NE-SOC-1	<p><b>Social benefits</b> Those bringing forward proposals should consider and demonstrate how their development shall enhance public knowledge, understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of the marine environment as part of (the design of) the proposal.</p>	<p>NE-SOC-1 seeks to increase the general knowledge, understanding, appreciation and enjoyment by people of the many values provided by the marine environment through encouraging proposals that incorporate these factors.</p>	<p><b>Fisheries/Aquaculture</b> - Local planning authorities may wish to have regard to fisheries and aquaculture when plan-making by recognising their social benefits and considering potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing and aquaculture activity.</p> <p><b>Green Infrastructure/recreation</b> – Policy could have relevance when considering planning for green</p>	5, 6, 9

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
			infrastructure to enable space for marine habitats and access to recreational opportunities in nature for local communities' general benefit, enjoyment and education.	
NE-TR-1	<p><b>Tourism and recreation</b> Proposals that promote or facilitate sustainable tourism and recreation activities, or that create appropriate opportunities to expand or diversify the current use of facilities, should be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p>	<p>Tourism and recreation are widely recognised as important sectors within the north east marine plan areas, providing numerous economic and social benefits to coastal communities and visitors to the region. NE-TR-1 supports these growth industries through promotion of sustainable tourism and recreation at appropriate locations. It also encourages diversification of activities, for example through the extension of operating seasons or development of alternative uses for</p>	<p><b>Tourism &amp; Recreation</b> – Local plans and other management plans should consider the potential economic benefits to local communities through marine tourism.</p> <p><b>Green Infrastructure/recreation</b> – Policy could have relevance when considering planning for green infrastructure to enable space for marine habitats and access to recreational opportunities in nature for local communities.</p>	6, 9

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>facilities to create additional employment opportunities, while reducing adverse impacts on natural resources and heritage assets. To minimise stakeholder conflict, this policy also addresses the potential impact of proposals on existing tourism and recreation use, or future potential activities; those proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate significant adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities are unlikely to be supported.</p>		
NE-UWN-1	<p><b>Underwater noise</b> Proposals that result in the generation of impulsive sound must contribute data to the UK Marine</p>	<p>Impulsive sounds can have an adverse effect on marine life and human enjoyment of marine areas. NE-UWN-1</p>	<p><b>Tourism and Leisure</b> - Although a material consideration for intertidal developments (under s58(1) of the MCAA), local planning authorities adjacent to Marine Protected areas</p>	13

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	Noise Registry as per any currently agreed requirements. Public authorities must take account of any currently agreed targets under the Marine Strategy Part One Descriptor 11.	supports the established noise registry to determine baselines, levels of impulsive sound and management options through the recording and assessment of the distribution and timing of impulsive sound sources in the marine environment. This will enable effective marine management and protection of biodiversity or viable populations of species.	(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.  <b>Coastal development</b> – local authorities may wish to consider this policy when conducting any developments on either side of the land-sea boundary where land-based noise may be transferred to the marine environment.	
NE-UWN-2	<b>Underwater noise</b> Proposals that result in the generation of impulsive or non-impulsive noise must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts on highly mobile species	Underwater noise levels have increased with marine space use. Noise can affect highly mobile species, including causing chronic stress and death at higher intensities. NE-UWN-2 supports management of underwater noise,	<b>Conservation</b> – Policy could have relevance in considering environmental impacts of land-use policies on either side of the land-sea boundary and for the consideration of mitigation measures to reduce noise pollution to the marine environment.	11, 13

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
	<p>so they are no longer significant.</p> <p>If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for proceeding.</p>	<p>requiring proposals to take appropriate noise reduction actions. NE-UWN-2 enables clear and proportionate regulation to make sure marine activity respects environmental limits and protects biodiversity.</p>		
NE-WQ-1	<p><b>Water Quality</b></p> <p>Proposals that protect, enhance and restore water quality will be supported. Proposals that cause deterioration of water quality must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - deterioration of water quality in the marine environment</p>	<p>Much of the economic and cultural prosperity of the north east marine plan areas is reliant on water quality. Activities can place stress on water bodies such that, in parts of the north east marine plan areas, water quality requires improvement. NE-WQ-1 supports activities with a primary objective to protect, enhance and restore water quality.</p>	<p><b>Housing-</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Surface/Wastewater management -</b></p> <p>Local planning authorities and other public bodies such as the Environment Agency, will wish to maximise opportunities for coexistence of wastewater</p>	7, 11

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		<p>NE-WQ-1 also manages activities that may cause deterioration of water quality by ensuring that adverse impacts from proposals must be avoided, minimised and mitigated. With the exception of the derogations identified in Section 17 and 19 of The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 there should be no residual adverse impacts on inshore water bodies.</p> <p>From one nautical mile out to the outer limit of the UK Exclusive Economic Zone there should be no adverse impacts on water quality in line with The</p>	<p>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><b>Transport</b> – Policy can support any initiatives by county councils and unitary authorities to reduce pollution from traffic entering the marine environment.</p> <p><b>Litter/waste management</b> – Policy will have relevance to coastal local planning authorities and local plan objectives related to litter and waste.</p>	

Policy Code	Policy Wording	Policy Aim	Example to show how policy could inform/support local plan development under s58(3) of MCAA	Plan Objective
		Marine Strategy Regulations 2010		