

## **Draft Marine Bill 2008**

### **Response from North Yorkshire and Cleveland Coastal Forum**

**19<sup>th</sup> June 2008**

The North Yorkshire & Cleveland Coastal Forum has 160 members from various coastal interest groups covering the geographical area between Saltburn in the north and Speeton in the south [North Yorkshire county boundary]. It's executive group met on the 11<sup>th</sup> June to discuss the draft Marine Bill and wish to forward the following comments below for inclusion in the consultation on the draft legislation.

The executive group consist of members from Scarborough Borough Council, North York Moors National Park Authority, Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council, North Yorkshire County Council, Cleveland Potash Ltd. and Natural England.

Generally, the Forum executive group were positive about the draft Bill, but wish the following comments to be taken into consideration.

#### **1. Creation of an MMO**

- It is unclear about who the board members of the MMO would be
- How will the MMO interact with national ICZM strategy ?
- The MMO will need assistance in producing the Marine Policy Statement and subsequent local Marine Plans.
- Our coastal forum can assist in these tasks. Collectively, our forum has access to a huge amount of data about the North Yorkshire and Cleveland coast.
- Essential that the MMO communicates effectively
- Invite the MMO local representative to be a member of our coastal forum
- Ensure the MMO is adequately financed

#### **2. Marine Planning**

- Local Marine plans need to be all encompassing using relevant recent data and involve all interested parties & stakeholders
- Our coastal forum can assist in the process as an information point and engagement structure
- Need to be sure of exact area/ coverage of the plans

- We have ‘Seascapes’ information which is very relevant [Marine and Intertidal Historic Landscape Characterisation project]
- Delivery plan needs to be clear /concise and well resourced

### 3. **Marine Licensing**

- Currently, some dredging is not licensed so the draft Bill is positive in this aspect
- Need to ensure that when granting a licence regard must be given to protecting the environment and human health

### 4. **Marine Nature Conservation**

- There is a large gap in the proposed ‘ecologically coherent’ network down the North East coast. Our area has no MCZs identified even though we have No Trawl Zones and a Sensitive Marine Area at Robin Hood’s Bay. This has been noted for many years as an area of national significance for the marine environment. We would like to see these areas included in plans for designating MCZs.
- Local authorities should also be involved in identifying MCZs

### 5. **Marine Fisheries [including Migratory and Freshwater fishery]**

- Our coastal forum supports the modernisation of marine fisheries protection and sustainable management of all fisheries.
- Must ensure IFCAs have local representatives
- Will IFCA committees be given more funding given the increased workload ? Ensure adequate funding is given to IFCAs.
- Suggest European Eel is added to Smelt and Lamprey for EA regulatory powers
- Enforcement of licences is an issue – where would funding come from for licensing and enforcement ?

### 6. **Coastal Access**

- Welcome the proposal particularly the idea of automatic’ roll back’
- Focus should be given on establishment of a new route in the southern area of the Forum [ Filey to Flamborough] and improvements to the existing route [ Cleveland Way]
- Proposed route will link the 2 Heritage Coasts and 2 National Trails in the area

- Spreading room on the undercliffs [gradual sloping sea cliffs] will be self managing dependant on slope/ aspect etc. However, there may be some management requirements if scrub encroachment affects sea views.
- Measures should be taken to ensure landowners/ occupiers do not lose out as a result of increased coastal access.
- Access authorities must have adequate resources for establishment and maintenance of the route in perpetuity
- Some parts of the coastline suffer from more severe erosion than others [ Forum area badly affected] the funding that's provided should reflect that
- A suitability test regarding the crossing of estuaries should be included; currently the proposal is the first crossing point.
- Rolling forward of the coastline should be considered as well as back, to take into account seaward structures [ piers/ breakwaters etc]