

## Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

# Marine Conservation Zones: Consultation on proposals for designation in 2013

## Annex C – Consultation response form and data submission form

### Consultee Information

Please provide the contact details as stated below, in order that we can acknowledge that we have received your response, and inform you once the Government response to the consultation is published.

Name: **Molly Scott Cato MEP**

Organisation: **Member of the European Parliament for the South West of England**

Sector/interest: **Marine conservation in the South West**

Sub sector:

Email address: [office@mollymep.org.uk](mailto:office@mollymep.org.uk) / [dorwilts@mollymep.org.uk](mailto:dorwilts@mollymep.org.uk)

### Confidentiality

This consultation is in line with the Code of practice on Consultations. This can be found at [www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/resource-library/consultation-principles-guidance](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/resource-library/consultation-principles-guidance)

Copies of responses will be made available to the public on request. If you do not want your response . including your name, contact details and any other personal information . to be publicly available, please say so clearly in writing when you send your response to the consultation. Please note, if your computer automatically includes a confidentiality disclaimer, that won't count as a confidentiality request.

Please explain why you need to keep details confidential. We will take your reasons into account if someone asks for this information under freedom of information legislation. But, because of the law, we cannot promise that we will always be able to keep those details confidential.

We will summarise all responses and place this summary on our website at: [www.defra.gov.uk/consult](http://www.defra.gov.uk/consult)

This summary will include a list of names of organisations that responded but not people's personal names, addresses or other contact details.

Do you want your response to be confidential? **No**

If yes, please state your reason: **N/A**

## Evidence

When providing evidence/data as part of a response to a question please note that:

- When providing environmental or socio-economic evidence/data as part of your consultation response, please complete the Data Submission Form at the end of this document
- The submission of data to Defra during the Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) consultation confirms the Data Owner's agreement to grant the Defra Marine Family<sup>1</sup> permission to access, hold and use the material for the purposes of further informing the recommendations, designation and management of MCZs and related MPAs.
- We encourage openness and transparency in the provision and use of data and information. Where material may be confidential and/or have commercial value and cannot be made widely available we may still make high level information on the data (e.g. metadata) publically available. Should there be any restrictions on the use of information submitted then please identify these within your response.
- Natural England and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee, in partnership with the Wildlife Trusts, have developed best-practice guidelines for data providers on collecting and submitting data to support designation of MCZ; this can be accessed here: <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-6658>. While we will consider all information submitted during the consultation, following these guidelines will assist Defra and its agencies in making the best use of the available information.
- Please submit the following information for environmental and/or socio-economic data being submitted. **Please note that if the information requested is not provided we may be unable to use the data you submit.**
- As part of the consultation process please consider the questions below. When responding to a site-specific question please state clearly which site(s) you are referring to.

---

<sup>1</sup> Defra Marine Family refers to Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra); Natural England, Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC), Marine Management Organisation, Inshore Fisheries Conservation Authority, Environment Agency and Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (CEFAS).

## **Site specific questions applicable to all proposed second tranche sites**

Q1. Do you agree that this sites and specified features should be designated? Please explain and provide evidence to support your views as necessary.

**We very much welcome the inclusion of the following sites as recommended Marine Conservation Zones (rMCZs) in the consultation documents and would welcome these sites within the South West constituency being taken through to designation as Marine Conservation Zones:**

**South West Waters: Western Channel**

**South West Waters: Mounts Bay**

**South West Waters: Land's End**

**South West Waters: North West of Jones Bank**

**South West Waters: Greater Haig Fras**

**South West Waters: Newquay and the Gannel**

**South West Waters: Hartland Point to Tintagel**

**South West Waters: Bideford to Foreland Point**

**All of these sites have many features that warrant protection via designation as MCZs.**

**However, we were very disappointed to see that a number of other sites in South West Waters have not been included in Tranche 2 as previously expected, and most notably Studland Bay. We would urge you to ensure that Studland Bay is included in Tranche 3 for the following reasons:**

**Despite the concerns of wealthy interests, such as the boating community, we believe that designating Studland Bay as a Marine Conservation Zone could provide a win-win result for wildlife, boaters, fishermen and local communities.**

**As well as benefiting its marine life, including protected seahorses, endangered undulate rays, native oysters, breeding cuttlefish and commercially fished species, we would seek to highlight the additional benefits to recreational users of the bay, the local fishing industry and local communities.**

**Studland Bay is a rich and diverse wildlife habitat, and is both nationally important and unique, not least of all because it is home to two species of sea horse which are protected by law (since 2008). Pairs of sea horses tend to**

inhabit very small territories within the sea grass beds, so any damage in these areas, even small patches of damage, can be really disruptive to the seahorse breeding habits within these grounds.

We recognise that this is also a busy recreational area, with over 300 boats mooring in the bay on a busy summer day. But we believe it is possible to address the concerns of boaters and other leisure users of the bay, by catering for their activities whilst preventing disturbance to marine life. There is no reason why Studland Bay could not continue to be a multi-use site which allows for low impact water-based activities to continue alongside thriving wildlife. Therefore we believe the concerns outlined about impact on shore-based businesses are unwarranted.

Seagrass habitats have already suffered decline worldwide, and at Studland Bay there is evidence of damage to the sea grass habitat caused by leisure boats anchoring (see evidence collected by Dorset Wildlife Trust). The most sensitive part of the seagrass meadow DOES need to be protected and restrictions put in place in this relatively small area of the bay. However, provision of eco-friendly moorings, provision of anchoring zones, and guidance on best anchoring zones and practices, could allow boating to continue in the Bay.

Furthermore, establishment of safe swimming zones and a snorkel trail could allow swimmers to enjoy the bay without the threat of injury from boats and jet skis which exists today at busy times. This would allow for both local community and visitor involvement in research, education and awareness of this unique habitat.

The seagrass habitat offers a very important nursery area for many fish and shellfish species, including commercially fished species. By protecting this habitat, there would be a considerable benefit to commercial fishing outside of the Bay as this would allow a number of species to thrive, including key commercial species. Commercial fishing does not currently happen within the Bay, so there should be no negative impact on commercial fishing. The introduction of an angler's code would also facilitate the continuation of leisure fishing in the Bay.

Finally the sea grass habitat in Studland Bay also offers a vital 'blue carbon sink' absorbing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, making a natural contribution to reducing the impacts of climate change on the South Coast, at the same time as acting as a natural coastal defence.

Q.2 Are there any additional features not currently proposed for designation located within this site that should be protected? Please explain and provide evidence to support your views as necessary.

Site Name: **Studland Bay**

**As the site has not been identified as a rMCZ in Tranche 2, all of the features within the site remain unlikely to be protected. The seagrass meadows must be protected and we would urge you to include them in Tranche 3.**

Q.3 Should any changes be made to the boundary of the site? If so what changes would you propose? Please provide evidence to support your views and proposal.

Site Name:

**N/A**

Q.4 Is there any additional evidence to improve scientific data certainty for features within this site? Please explain and provide evidence to support your views as necessary.

Site Name: **Studland Bay**

**It is essential that DEFRA makes clear what additional data is required to ensure that Studland Bay is included in Tranche 3. Where data does not exist this should be commissioned.**

Q.5 Are there any additional activities (that may have an impact on the recommended features) occurring within this site that have not been captured within the Impact Assessment and site summary documents? If yes please provide evidence.

Site Name: **Studland Bay**

**The importance of this site as a nursery site for many commercially fished species, and the benefits that designation would result in for populations of commercial species, have not been sufficiently acknowledged.**

Q.7 Do you have any new information on costs to industry not covered in the Impact Assessment that would be directly attributable to these MCZs as opposed to costs stemming from existing regulatory requirements? If yes, please provide evidence.

Site Name:

**N/A**

Q.8 Do you have any new information on the quantified benefits of designation? If yes, please provide evidence.

Site Name: **Studland Bay**

**Dorset Wildlife Trust and Natural England should be asked to carry out work to calculate the cost benefits of including Studland Bay as a rMCZ, e.g. benefits to commercial fishing in protecting the seagrass breeding nursery, benefits to**

local businesses of promoting this site as a nature conservation paradise, and research & educational benefits.

## Questions applicable to all additional features proposed for first tranche sites

Q.9 Do you agree that the additional feature or features should be added to the existing MCZs? Please explain and provide evidence to support your views as necessary.

Site Name: **All sites**

**We are broadly in support of additional features outlined being added to first tranche sites.**

Q.10 Do you have any new information on costs to industry of these additional features not covered in the Impact Assessment? Please note that relevant costs are only those directly attributable to adding these features to the MCZs as opposed to costs stemming from existing regulatory requirements or stemming from the existence of the MCZs with their current features. If yes, please provide evidence.

Site Name:

**N/A**

## General Comments

Q.11 You may wish to provide comments on any other aspects the MCZs proposed. Where you disagree with the proposed approach, please provide evidence where possible to support your views.

**Our main concern is that Studland Bay has not been included in the rMCZs proposed. Please see above. We would urge you to reconsider this issue, and ensure that Studland Bay is included in Tranche 3.**

**Please keep us informed on this issue via:**

**Amanda Williams**

**Regional Liaison Officer to Molly Scott Cato MEP**

**(Dorset & Wiltshire)**

**Email: [dorwilts@mollymep.org.uk](mailto:dorwilts@mollymep.org.uk)**

## Data Submission Form

Contact name:  Email:  Telephone:
MCZ feature, site or regional area data relates to <sup>2</sup> :
Has this information been previously submitted as part of the MCZ process <sup>3</sup> ?  Please note there is no requirement to submit reports or data that have already been submitted unless you wish to submit a more recent version of any report. For data that has already been submitted please provide details including the reference number used by NE and JNCC <sup>4</sup> .  For data that has already been submitted via Mapping European Seabed Habitats (MESH) or Marine Recorder please provide the MESH Globally Unique Identified (GUI) reference or Marine Recorder Survey ID and Survey Name.
Please specify any copyright restrictions or restrictions on use of data provided:

<sup>2</sup> If national then please specify this.

<sup>3</sup> Either to the Regional MCZ Projects or separately to Natural England or JNCC

<sup>4</sup> For offshore sites, this is listed as part of the JNCC advice at <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-6658>.

Evidence used for inshore sites is listed in annex 9 of the NE advice at

<http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5803843768025088?category=6742552893980672>

## Section 1: Environmental data/evidence

Data owner:

Type of survey (e.g. geophysical/bathymetric/geotechnical/environmental/socioeconomic/cost information):

Date of survey:

Name of survey:

Survey co-ordinates OR for full coverage maps, perimeter coordinates or GIS of area:

Survey contractor:

Purpose of survey:

Type(s) of data obtained (e.g. geophysical/bathymetric/geotechnical/environmental/aspects of socio-economic data):

Method(s) of acquisition (e.g. 0.1m <sup>2</sup> hamon grab samples/survey format):
Processing method(s):
Output(s) (please include file names if possible):
Quality assurance/control method(s), include reference to standards where possible and / or detail of peer review where relevant:

## **Section 2: Socio-economic data**

Data owner:
Type of survey (e.g. socio-economic/cost information):
Date of survey:
Type(s) of data obtained (e.g. aspects of socio economic data):

Method(s) of acquisition (survey format):

Quality assurance/control method(s), include reference to standards where possible and / or detail of peer review where relevant:

Non-survey socio-economic data (please use this space for description of data, how data was derived, any quality assurance process)