

BACKGROUND PAPER E: REPORT OF STAKEHOLDER VIEWS

E1 This background paper provides a report on the views expressed by stakeholders during the programme of work. It contains an analysis of contributions made by writing or via the message board on the SNH web site, together with a summary of the views expressed at the 2 national stakeholder seminars.

Analysis of written responses

E2 A range of individuals and organisations responded to the invitation to contribute with 60 written responses received between August 2005 and February 2006. More substantial contributions were made by NTS, Royal Society of Edinburgh, the Solway Firth Partnership, SCNP, Argyll and Bute Council, the Hebridean National Park Partnership, the Ramblers Association, the Mountaineering Council for Scotland, Highland Council and two individuals.

E3 Of the responses received, nearly 150 separate comments were recorded. The main themes raised were as follows.

- 17 of the 60 respondees specifically stated their support for coastal and marine National Parks (CMNP) in principle, but did not comment on a specific area. A further 26 respondees supported a CMNP and identified one or more specific areas for it – with support for larger areas and also a Park in Argyll the most significant groupings. A full breakdown of views is as follows.

Large Parks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 mile exclusion zone from the Mull of Galloway to Peterhead • A natural extension of the North West Highland Geopark- extended to cover the Minch and as far as Strathy Point to the east • On the west coast, include parts of the Inner Hebrides, and be of a relatively large size • Minches National Park stretching from the Butt of Lewis and Cape Wrath to Barra and Ardnamurchan Point • St Abbs Head to Duncansby Head as an East Coast Park • Duncansby Head to Cape Wrath as a North Coast Park • The western seaboard north of the Clyde, the Inner and Outer Hebrides, Orkney & Shetland • From Ailsa Craig through the Inner Hebrides to Skye together with the Outer Hebrides and St Kilda • All the Western Isles / Orkney and Shetland
Argyll Coast and Islands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area around Mull • Mull and its adjacent coastlines and sea-lochs • Knapdale up to Oban, the Sound of Jura and

	<p>Corryvreckan, the Isles of Jura, Scarba, Garvellachs, Colonsay, the seas out to Tiree and Coll encompassing Mull, Iona, Staffa and Treshnish islands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An area covering some 40 islands from Islay and Gigha to Coll & Tiree and to Skye • South coast of Mull, west coasts of Kintyre and the mainland between the two • Mull and Iona • The main Argyll Islands of Mull, Coll, Tiree, Islay, Jura and Colonsay • The Inner Hebrides and Argyll • Argyll and the Isles, extending to the Small Isles, Ardnamurchan and Morar and Moidart • Mull and its satellite islands – encompass Coll, Tiree, Rhum, Eigg, Muck and Canna • Oban and Lorn
Solway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solway Coast • Solway Firth area and wider Galloway Coast • Dumfries and Galloway
Other areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of the north west coast which still contain remnants of once-substantial sea-trout populations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Banffshire Coast – Troup Head • Eyemouth/East Berwickshire • Heads of Ayr • The Moray Firth • Culbin Sands, Forest and Findhorn Bay • Shetland • Harris

- 11 respondents were sceptical or had reservations about CMNPs or were directly opposed to it in principle. The main concerns identified included increased restrictions on fishing activity, additional bureaucracy and the lack of any perceived benefits. One respondent suggested that a regional seas approach should be adopted instead.
- A range of issues concerning the selection of areas were identified by respondents – including constraints such as existing infrastructure, the lack of available information (including information on the seabed itself) and the need to better demonstrate added value and community support. Further consideration of the cultural heritage interest was also suggested, while other comments were made on the size of park and its seaward boundary.
- In terms of the aims of a CMNP, most respondents considered that it should consider conservation interests before development and recreation interests. Others argued that conservation and protection aims should sit alongside socio-economic benefits and indeed this was seen as vital if a Park was to be welcomed locally. One respondent also noted the importance of monitoring and research to ascertain if Park designation brings social, economic and environmental benefits in practice.

- Considerable comment was generated on the powers of a CMNP. Of the general comments made, most seemed to be in favour of a Park Authority having a full range of powers and functions to enable it to play an overarching role, capable of bringing all interests and activities together. On town and country planning, a spectrum of views was offered ranging from a Park with full planning powers to one which was simply a statutory consultee to the existing planning authority. Several responses highlighted the importance of marine spatial planning through the Park Plan. On fishing, responses from fishing groups and fishermen argued for a Park Authority with limited or no powers in this area. In contrast, responses from environmental groups suggested the need for a much more hands-on role given the perceived conflict between fisheries and conservation interests. Several respondents highlighted the relationship between the Park Authority and Inshore Fisheries Groups as being critical. Finally, responses from shipping and port and harbour interests highlighted the importance of the NPA taking into account the needs of commercial shipping and ports operations.
- On governance, respondents emphasised the need for representation for all users of the marine environment. To ensure all interests are covered, representation on a coastal and marine Park Authority would therefore need to be wider in scope than a land-based Park. Several respondents also argued that local interests and communities should have a direct role in the governance of the Park area.

E4 Finally, several comments were made on SNH's efforts to engage with stakeholders and on the next steps. The need for an in-depth and wide ranging consultation based on well developed proposals was generally supported and it was suggested that time and resources would need to be made available for this. The difficulties in gauging local opinion were noted, particularly where there were perceived conflicts of interest. Several respondents commented on the make-up of the stakeholder group, with those from the ports and harbours sector and also the sea anglers concerned at they lack of direct representation.

E5 A full breakdown and responses and summary of the main points made is contained in Table 1 and 2 respectively.

Analysis of contributions to the SNH message board

E6 125 postings were made on the message board by 44 different individuals – many of whom seemed to be based in the Argyll area. Of the responses received, nearly 60 separate comments were recorded. The main themes raised were as follows.

- 9 of the 44 contributors specifically stated their support for CMNP in principle, but did not comment on a specific area. A further 10 contributors supported a CMNP and identified one or more specific areas for it

including the following - Inner and Outer Hebrides; Argyll coast and islands; Mull and surrounding seas; Western Isles; Isle of Skye and surrounding seas; Scapa Flow (Orkney), all of west coast, Strathy Point to Dunnet Head, West from Strathy Point, Clyde area, Forth & Tay Estuaries and somewhere remote – e.g. St Kilda.

- 10 contributors were either opposed in principle or undecided about a CMNP. A range of concerns were expressed, including: the need for designation was not clear - the marine environment may not be in need of further protection; there were no obvious benefits for fishing/aquaculture; there would be further restrictions on fishing/aquaculture; there was nothing to gain from increasing tourism and a Park would be dominated by urban people who did not understand the area or the marine environment and would not put local people first. Others suggested that a Park limited to a recreational function would be irrelevant as it could not tackle wider issues such as pollution. Another suggested that we should be working towards the common good of all seas, and not just those within a National Park.
- A range of other issues were picked up in the debate. On the choice of area, it was suggested that the Park needed to be large enough to address the range of present and future management needs. On powers, a spectrum of views emerged. There were some suggestions made for a Park with powers and functions for marine spatial planning, access and sustainable tourism. Others saw the need for the Park Authority to have an overarching role – bringing all relevant interests together. Some cautioned against a Park resulting in another tier of government – and that the powers and functions of a Park Authority should therefore be limited. More radically, it was suggested that that revenue generated by Crown Estates for moorings within the Park could be used to pay for it. On governance, the importance of local involvement was frequently highlighted
- A significant part of the discussion was dominated by issues relating to future fisheries management, aquaculture and development within a Park. Some contributors specifically argued for no-take zones within a Park and also better regulation of bottom trawling and clam dredging. Other contributors – many of whom were fishermen – were directly opposed to this. Linked to this debate was subject of the aims and overall purpose of the Park. Some contributors suggested that the primary obligation of the Park should be conservation, with the Park Plan putting conservation interests before development and recreation interests. Others saw the need for a more balanced approach with sustainable use and development being of equal if not greater importance to conservation and protection. It was suggested that a Park would only be considered to add value locally, if it generated socio-economic benefits for local communities, with examples of branding, tourism and the development of community marine renewables suggested. The need for monitoring and keeping research data to ascertain if designation brings environmental benefits was also noted.

- Finally, a number of comments were made on future consultation. It was suggested that any consultation needed to listen to all views, not just those who shout the loudest. Several requests to revisit the composition of the stakeholder group were made, including from small creel and inshore fishing interests and also recreational sea angling.

Summary of views recorded at the 2 national stakeholder seminars

- E7 Stakeholder seminars were held to discuss SNH's work at Inverness Town House on 30 November 2005 and at Hampden, Glasgow on 8 December 2005. These two events attracted nearly 150 people representing over 90 different organisations.
- E8 Two workshops were held as part of these seminars. The first focused on issues and opportunities presented by coastal and marine National Park. The second was on potential National Park areas. An evaluation sheet was also available at the end of the day on which further contributions could be made.

Morning workshop – Issues and Opportunities

- E9 Delegates were split into groups for this workshop and asked to identify and prioritise opportunities and issues and record suggestions on how to maximise or resolve these. In Inverness, the groups were mixed according to delegates geographic area of operation and expertise but in Glasgow due to the large numbers of people present delegates were divided into groups under the following headings: Local authority/planning; research and conservation; community / economic development; ports, harbours, shipping; tourism, recreation and cultural heritage and fishing. Each group was asked to list any concerns they had about the proposed CMNP and any benefits they could identify.
- E10 The key issues identified by the stakeholders in the morning workshop were:
- Increased planning and control of the sea-bed by a CMNP will lead to restrictions on economic development.
 - A CMNP will mean excessive legislation, another layer of consultation, a reduction in local democracy and creeping bureaucracy.
 - Where will the funding come from? Areas not selected (particularly immediately outside the boundary) will suffer from reduced funding.
 - A CMNP will further erode local authority influence and resources.
 - A CMNP will be dominated by environmental interests – local communities, fishermen and other businesses will loose out.
 - A CMNP will be too weak to actually protect the environment; it may also attract too many visitors which the infrastructure cannot support
 - Will the CMNP be of any real value?; what will it do?; how will we know if it has been successful?
 - How does a CMNP fit in with other national strategies and existing designations? How much influence will it have over non-devolved responsibilities?

- A CMNP will lead to increased house prices and more second home ownership.
- A CMNP will not have the expertise to manage fisheries – this should be left to the inshore fisheries groups.

E11 The key opportunities listed included the following.

- A CMNP will help raise awareness, understanding and commitment to our marine natural heritage.
- A CMNP will help develop sustainable tourism and bring local economic benefits to an area.
- A CMNP could help to develop more sustainable ways of using our natural resources e.g. inshore fishing; shellfish and finfish aquaculture, renewable energy development.
- A CMNP will bring increased funding and lead to investment in infrastructure, improved facilities and services.
- A CMNP will help long-term co-ordination, coherence and integration of management for an area.
- A CMNP will enhance the protection of wildlife and habitats, ecosystems and the cultural heritage, and provide more opportunities to enjoy them.
- A CMNP will create opportunities for economic development, employment and community development.
- A CMNP could develop stronger community involvement in local management and help to reduce conflict in the marine environment.
- A CMNP could make regulation clearer and more straightforward, the more joined-up and strategic approach of a CMNP would increase consensus and reduce bureaucracy.
- A CMNP will increase national and local community pride in the coastal and marine environment.

E12 A more detailed summary of comments made in the morning workshops is provided in Table 4.

Afternoon Workshops – proposals for areas

E13 In the afternoon workshops, delegates were divided into geographic groups depending on where they lived or worked. Maps were provided and each group was asked to consider National Park status for their area under the following headings: national importance, collective and coherent identity (working units, local traditions, common activities / pressures, existing initiatives, transport links), key management issues, accessibility, scale, social and economic benefit, possible areas and boundary issues. These topics were discussed with varying degrees of success depending on the groups willingness to discuss the issues in relation to each specific area, and also their experience and knowledge of it. A more detailed summary of the points made during these workshops is included in Table 5.

Comments on the Evaluation sheets

- E15 The opportunity was provided for delegates at both seminars to make further comment on the organisation and content of the day on a separate evaluation sheet. 38 of these were handed in, and a summary of the comments provided is contained in Table 6. Comments concentrated on a number of specific issues, including
- the importance of local support for a future Park;
 - suggestions for approaches to consultation;
 - suggestions for consideration of areas and boundaries;
 - comments on the SNH assessment framework;
 - comments on the relationship between the CMNP and existing and proposed initiatives;
 - comments on the need to clarify Park aims and the implications for existing activities; and
 - suggestions on future information needs
- E16 The evaluation sheet also provided the opportunity for attendees to indicate support for specific Park areas. Argyll Coast and Islands, followed by Lochaber and Skye, again emerged as clear favourites, though support was also indicated for Firth of Clyde, Moray Firth, Western Isles, Shetland, Solway, and the North West Coast areas.

Table 1 Written Responses received (September 2005 and February 2006)

* Substantive response

	Date	From	Individual /Group
01	04/08/05	John Timmons: John.Timmons@gcal.ac.uk	I
02	05/08/05	Clyde Fishermen's Association - Patrick Stewart, Secretary	G/Fish
03	05/08/05	Kinlochbervie Community Development Partnership - Alex Dawson, Project Officer	G/Com
04	05/08/05	NFUS - John Kinnaird, President	G/Other
05	10/08/05	Dept for Transport, Shipping Policy 2 Division - Godfrey Souter	Gov
06	14/08/05	Cairngorms National Park - Andrew Thin, Convener	Gov
07	23/08/05	Peterhead Harbours - John Paterson, Chief Executive	G/Ship
08	18/08/05	Davina Thomas, 68 Findhorn , Forres, IV36 3YF	I
09	29/08/05	West Highland Anchorages and Moorings Association - Colin Davidson, Secretary & Treasurer	G/Ship
10	30/08/05	Angus Council - Colin Robertson, Head of Planning & Transport Policy	LA
11	30/08/05	Associated British Ports Ayr & Troon - Alastair MacFarlane, Port Manager	G/Ship
12	01/09/05	Advisory Committee on Historic Wreck Sites - Tom Hassall, Chairman	G/Cult
13	02/09/06	Sea Trout Group - Fiona M Cameron, Consultant	G/Fish
14	04/09/06 and others	David Woodhouse, Isle of Mull Wildlife Expeditions, Torr Buan House, Ulva Ferry, Isel of Mull	I
15	04/09/05	Mrs Pamela Crayton, Elamcray Cottage, Lamlash, Isle of Arran KA27 8JX	I
16	13/09/05	Falkirk Council - Gordon Laird, Environment Co-ordinator	LA
17	15/09/05	Arisaig & District Community Council - Ranald A M Coyne, Secretary	G/Com
18	12/09/05	Scottish Enterprise Network - Neil Ferguson, Strategy Directorate	Gov
19	16/09/05	Scottish Enterprise - Jack Perry, Chief Executive	Gov
20	23/09/05	Henry Murdo, Dunfion Bagpipes, Brodick, Isle of Arran	I
21	24/09/05	John Scott, Wyken, Findhorn, Forres IVJ6 3YZ	I
22	07/10/05	Scottish Quality Salmon - Lord Lindsay, Chairman	G/Fish
23	15/11/05	Fife Coast & Countryside Trust	LA
24 *	21/11/05	Dr Colin Martin, Arnydie, Bankhead Farm, Peat Inn, Cupar, Fife, KY15 5LF	I
25	30/11/05	Hamilton Natural History Society - Michael J Pink, Secretary	G/Cult
26	01/12/05	RICS Scotland - Liisa Muinonen	G/Other
27	08/12/05	Scottish Environment LINK - Dr Rebecca Boyd	G/Env
28	09/12/05	Sea Anglers Conservation Network - Ian Burrett, Scottish Regional Co-ordinator	G/Rec
29 *	09/12/05	National Trust Scotland - Richard Luxmoore, Head of Nature Conservation	G/Env
30	13/12/05	SEPA - Campbell Gemmell, Chief Executive	Gov
31 *	16/12/05	The Royal Society of Edinburgh - Dr Marc Rands	G/Cult
32 *	20/12/05	Solway Firth Partnership - Jeremy Roberts	Gov
33	20/12/05	Scottish Fishermen's Federation	G/Fish

	Date	From	Individual /Group
34 *	21/12/05	Scottish Council for National Parks - Robert G Maund, Chairman	G/Env
35	21/12/05	Moray Firth Partnership - Mike Comerford, Chairman	Gov
36 *	21/12/05	Highlands & Islands Enterprise - Sandy Cumming, Chief Executive	Gov
37	22/12/05	British Geological Survey - Robert Gatliff, Head, Marine, Coastal & Hydrocarbons Programme	G/Other
38	23/12/05	Scottish Canoe Association - Ron Mather	G/Rec
39	23/12/05	Mull Aquaculture and Fisheries Association - Nick Turnbull	G/Fish
40	23/12/05	Forth Estuary Forum - Helen Corbet	Gov
41	04/01/06	Alan Stobie, Achavit, Argyll	I
42	08/01/06	Scottish Association of Shellfish Growers - Douglas McLeod, Chairman	G/Fish
43 *	20/01/06	Crown Estate - Rhona Fairgrieve, Coastal Manager	Gov
44	16/01/06	Loch Etive Farmed Shellfish	G/Fish
45	19/01/06 & 21/03/06	Dumfries & Galloway Council - Chris Hopkin, Countryside and Environmental Projects	LA
46	19/01/06	Robert Kelly, Torrin, Skye	I
47	21/12/05	Keith Chesney	I
48 *	12/01/06	Jonathan Wills, Shetland	I
49	13/01/06	Mull & Iona Community Trust - James Hilder	G/Com
50 *	25/01/06	Argyll and Bute Council - Audrey Martin,	LA
51 *	26/01/06	Hebridean Marine National Park Partnership - Mark Carter, Chairman	G/env
52 *	03/02/06	The Ramblers Scotland , Ian McCall, Campaign and Policy Co-ordinator	G/Rec
53	08/02/06	Linda and Jim Battison and Colin Mossman, Little Bay Luxury Boat Charter, Lerags Glen, Oban	I
54	08/02/06	Scottish Sea Farms , Sally Davies, Environment Manager, South Shian, Connel, Argyll	G/Fish
55 *	09/12/05	Mountaineering Council of Scotland , Beryl Leatherland, Vice President, West Mill Street, Perth	G/Rec
56	15/02/06	Oban and Lorn Tourism Association , Bill Mathews, Chairman	G/Tour
57	14/02/06	Wendy Else, Norse's Cottage, Manish, Isle of Harris	I
58	24/01/06	Forth Ports PLC , Dr Derek McGlashan, Ports Security and Environment Manager – Scottish Operations.	G/Ship
59	27/01/06	The Highland Council , George Hamilton, Natural Resources Manager	LA
60	27/02/06	G. Gower, Ardintenny, Argyll	I
61	14/03/06	Mallaig Community Council - Janette McMinn, Secretary,	Com
62	24/03/06	Comhairle nan Eilean Sar , Keith Bray, Policy Officer	LA

I Individual LA Local Authority Gov Public Bodies and Government Depts

G/ Groups Fish - Fishing interest Com - Community
Ship – Shipping interest Env –Environmental
Dev - Development Cult - Cultural
Tour - Tourism Rec - Recreation
Other

Table 2 - List of organisations attending the national stakeholder seminars

	ORGANISATION	
Public body/Government Department	1. RCAHMS	Glasgow
	2. Crofters Commission	Inverness
	3. Sportscotland	Glasgow
	4. Highlands & Islands Enterprise	Inverness
	5. SE Dumfries and Galloway	Glasgow
	6. East Grampian Coastal Forum	Inverness
	7. Moray Firth Partnership	Inverness
	8. Tay Estuary Forum	Glasgow
	9. Forth Estuary Forum	Glasgow
	10. Solway Firth Partnership	Glasgow
	11. Keep Scotland Beautiful	Glasgow
	12. The Paths For All Partnership	Glasgow
	13. Scottish Water	Inverness
	14. Department For Transport	Inverness
	15. UK Hydrographic Office	Inverness
	16. Marine and Coastguard Agency	Glasgow
	17. HM Naval Base Clyde	Glasgow
Local Authority	18. Aberdeenshire Council	Inverness
	19. Argyll & Bute Council	Inverness, Glasgow
	20. Ayrshire Joint Structure Plan Team	Glasgow
	21. Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	Inverness
	22. Dumfries & Galloway Council	Glasgow
	23. Fife Council	Glasgow
	24. Fife Coast and Countryside Trust	Glasgow
	25. Glasgow and Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan Committee	Glasgow
	26. Glasgow City Council	Glasgow
	27. Highland Council	Inverness
	28. North Ayrshire Council	Glasgow
	29. NE Scotland Biodiversity Partnership	Glasgow
	30. South Ayrshire Council	Glasgow
Community body	31. Arisaig & District Community Council	Inverness
	32. Fair Isle Bird Observatory Trust	Inverness
	33. Community Of Arran Seabed Trust	Glasgow
	34. Nadair Trust	Glasgow
	35. Mull and Iona Community Trust	Glasgow
Fishing/Aquaculture interests	36. Orkney Fisheries Association	Inverness
	37. Scottish Quality Salmon	Inverness
	38. Spey Fishery Board	Inverness
	39. West Sutherland Fisheries Trust	Inverness
	40. Scottish White Fish Producers Assoc. Ltd	Inverness
	41. Highland Shellfish Management Organisation	Inverness
	42. West Sutherland Fisheries Trust	Inverness
	43. West of Scotland Fish Producers Organisation Ltd	Inverness
	44. The Fishermens Association Ltd	Inverness
	45. Clyde Fishermens Association	Glasgow
	46. Clyde and Southwest Static Gear Assoc	Glasgow
	47. Mull & Iona Fisheries & Aquaculture Assco.	Glasgow
	48. Scottish Sea Farms	Glasgow
	49. Fishermen's Mutual Association	Glasgow
	50. Pan Fish Scotland Ltd	Glasgow
	51. Mallaig and NW Fisherman's Association	Glasgow

Shipping/ports interests	52. Port Manager Ayr/Troon	Inverness
	53. Fraserburgh Harbour Master	Inverness
	54. Cromarty Firth Port Authority	Inverness
	55. Ullapool Harbour Trust	Inverness
	56. Inverness Harbour Trust	Inverness
	57. Port of Dundee Ltd	Glasgow
	58. Forth Ports plc	Glasgow
	59. West Highland Anchorage and Moorings	Glasgow
	60. Eyemouth Harbour Trust	Glasgow
	Environment, recreation and cultural heritage interests	61. Archipelago Forum
62. John Muir Trust		Inverness
63. Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland		Inverness
64. Hebridean Marine National Park Partnership		Glasgow
65. Marine Conservation Society		Inverness
66. Scottish Federation of Sea Anglers		Inverness, Glasgow
67. Sea Anglers Conservation Network		Glasgow
68. Scottish Wildlife Trust		Inverness
69. SCNP		Inverness, Glasgow
70. Strathkelvin Ramblers		Glasgow
71. Bearsden and Milgavie Ramblers		Glasgow
72. National Trust for Scotland		Glasgow
73. Scottish Canoe Association		Glasgow
74. Rambler Association		Glasgow
75. RSPB Scotland		Glasgow
76. Scape Trust		Glasgow
Tourism interests	77. Aberdeen Business School of Tourism	Inverness
	78. Outdoor Capital	Inverness
	79. Wild Scotland	Inverness
	80. Wildlife Expeditions - Isle of Mull	Glasgow
Other	81. Scottish Parliament Information Centre	Glasgow
	82. Scottish Youth Parliament	Inverness
	83. Land Use Consultants	Glasgow
	84. Dundee University	Glasgow
	85. University Marine Biological Station Millport	Glasgow
	86. Scottish Countryside Ranger Association	Glasgow
	87. Royal Town Planning Institute in Scotland	Glasgow
	88. British Geological Survey	Glasgow
	89. Scottish Green Party	Glasgow
	90. Scottish Renewables Forum	Inverness
	91. Jacobs Beattie	Glasgow
	92. University Marine Biological Station, Millport	Glasgow

TABLE 3 SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Written responses were received from a total of 59 respondees, 13 of whom were individuals, and 46 from local authorities, fisheries groups, community groups, local enterprise groups, Firths Partnerships etc. The themes emerging from responses have been categorised as listed below and have been summarised within these themes.

- [For the establishment of Coastal & Marine National Parks in principle](#)
- [For the establishment of CMNPs in principle and suggestion for possible Park area](#)
- [Undecided or against the establishment of Coastal and Marine National Parks](#)
- [Selection criteria](#)
- [Scope of powers for CMNP Authority](#)
- [Scope of planning powers for CMNP Authority](#)
- [Scope of powers for CMNP Authority – fishing/shipping interests](#)
- [Role of CMNP – Conservation and protection](#)
- [Role of CMNP – Recreation / tourism interests](#)
- [Role of CMNP – Socio-economic benefits](#)
- [Governance of CMNP](#)
- [Comments on present/future consultations](#)

FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COASTAL & MARINE NATIONAL PARKS IN PRINCIPLE	
"I am so glad to hear that the Scottish Executive are to consider a Marine Reserve."	08 I
".. would generally support the intention firstly to provide the necessary legislative framework for such parks and secondly, to identify potential areas for designation."	10 LA
"Scottish Enterprise (SE) welcomed the commitment in the National Parks (Scotland) Act to economic and social development of communities in National Parks and to the promotion of enjoyment of the special qualities of designated areas. We consider that it would be appropriate given the geography of the country to have coastal and marine National Parks..."	19 Gov
"If the national park was to follow the excellent example of the New Zealand government and the work done by their marine biologists then I would be absolutely delighted."	20 I
"...felt we would like to formally declare our support for the concept of setting up such a park."	23 LA
"We are very much in favour of the establishment of Coastal and Marine Parks, and it seems reasonable to use the existing National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000, if the feeling is that it is fit for the purpose."	25 G/Cult

(Scotland) Act 2000, if the feeling is that it is fit for the purpose.”	
“RICS Scotland recognises the potential benefits of Marine and Coastal National Parks as a means of promoting sustainable development, and welcomes the Scottish Executive’s study into its feasibility.”	26 G/Other
“LINK members welcome the establishment of a CMNP in Scotland because our coastal and marine environment is of national and global importance.”	27 G/Env
“The National Trust for Scotland warmly welcomes the commitment to establish a National Park in the coastal zone.”	29 G/Env
“SEPA supports, in principle, the consultation over the proposed designation of coastal and marine national parks in Scotland.”	30 Gov
“The development of proposals for coastal and marine National Parks in Scotland is to be welcomed and it would be the first such action in the UK (and possibly in Europe). Insufficient attention has been paid in the past to the integrated management of marine areas which provide a wide range of goods and services for the benefit of both local and non-local populations.”	31 G/Cult
“HIE supports the principle of a coastal and marine National park for Scotland.”	36 Gov
“The proposal to designate an area of offshore Scotland as a Marine National Park is attractive. It will help to raise the issues associated with sustainable development of our marine resources further up the political and public agenda.”	37 G/Other
“The SCA enthusiastically support the formation of a Coastal & Marine National Park. ... We support the development of a CMNP so that it will make a practical difference to problems such as pollution and litter, as well as control the inshore movement of tankers and other large ships, and place stricter controls on developments of hotels, renewable energy projects, marinas etc where they are inappropriate to the environment.”	38 G/Rec
“There is widespread support that a Coastal and Marine National Park would where appropriate be an extremely effective mechanism for integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) and would raise the profile of ICZM in Scotland and of all those who deliver it.”	40 Gov
“I was positively overjoyed when Ross Finnie made his announcement because at that very time I was doing a pitch to my Community Trust Board members on the value of a National Park.”	14 I
“The Mountaineering Council of Scotland (McofS) is broadly supportive of the establishment of Coastal and Marine National Parks (CMNPs) that provide genuine protection to the natural and cultural heritage of Scotland. We represent many outdoor enthusiasts who have valued the unique character of the seascape and islands of Scotland for decades and therefore we believe that these special places should be conserved and enhanced both within and outside the spatial boundaries of any proposed CMNP.”	55 G/Rec

FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COASTAL & MARINE NATIONAL PARKS IN PRINCIPLE AND SUGGESTION FOR POSSIBLE PARK AREA	
“.. it would seem to be a natural extension of the North West Highland Geopark, but maybe logically (?) extended to cover the Minch, or at least the northern part of it, and possibly extended in an Easterly direction as far as Strathy Point.”	03 G/Com
“... the entire coastline from St Abbs Head right up the east coast along the Moray Firth up to Duncansby Head could possibly be by itself East Coast Park. The North Coast itself from Duncansby Head to Cape Wrath..... Could all the Western Isles form a park, and Orkney and Shetland form another?”	07 G/Ship
“.. protect the Scottish Coastal waters by a 50 mile exclusion zone from the Mull of Galloway to Peterhead – excluding oil tankers and trawlers but not small inshore fishing or passenger ferries.”	08 I
“... the area around Mull, incorporating Iona, Staffa, the Treshnish and the Garvellachs along with the Sunart, Firth of Lorn and Loch Creran SACs is a possibility.”	09 G/Ship
“.. it is important that areas of the north west coast which still contain the remnants of once-substantial sea trout populations (such as Loch Maree, Loch Ewe and the River Ewe) are considered as sites for a Scottish Coastal/Marine National Park.”	13 G/Fish
“Some examples of potential candidate areas within the Scottish Enterprise catchment include: The Banffshire Coast – Troup Head; Heads of Ayr; Eyemouth/East Berwickshire; Solway Coast”.	18 Gov
“I suggest the Park should focus on Mull and its adjacent coastlines and sea-lochs. Depending on the required size, the zone might incorporate Mull together with Iona, Staffa, Ulva, and the Treshnish Isles; Morvern and the south of Ardnamurchan (Loch Sunart); Loch Linnhe up to the Corran Narrows; Lismore; the southern offshore islands including Kerrera, Seil, Luing, Scarba (with the Corrievreckan); and the Garvellachs. The southern mainland limit should certainly reach Crinan, and might perhaps extend to the point of Knap, south of Kilmory”. (Full case submitted)	24 I
“Choice of the location for the first coastal and marine park will be difficult but it should be on the west coast, include parts of the Inner Hebrides, and be of a relatively large size. In order to avoid problems with representation in the National Park Authority, it should span the border of Argyll and Highlands Regions.”	29 G/Env
“There are several locations along the west coast of Scotland that offer great potential for the establishment of marine National Parks If size were no obstacle, the essence of a Scottish marine National Park would be captured in the creation of a Minches National Park stretching from the Butt of Lewis and Cape Wrath in the north to Barra and Ardnamurchan Point in the south – a geographically coherent area of inshore waters fringed by some of the most spectacular coastal landscapes in Scotland. If a smaller and administratively less complex area were preferred, then several candidate marine National Parks, exhibiting broadly the same qualities, would readily identify themselves: (a) Northern Minch, incorporating the coastal parts of the North West Sutherland and Assynt NSAs and the adjacent seas; (b)	31 G/Cult

Central Minch, including the coastal parts of the Wester Ross and Trotternish NSAs and adjacent seas; (c) an area to the south west of Skye, including the coastal parts of the Ardnamurchan and Knoydart NSAs, the Small Isles NSA and adjacent seas; (d) Firth of Lorn and the waters around the islands of Mull, Coll and Tiree; and (e) the waters surrounding Colonsay, Islay and Jura, including the coastal parts of the Knapdale NSA.”	
“The purpose of this response is to briefly highlight further the eligibility of the Solway Firth area and wider Galloway Coast as a candidate area for a MCNP, that warrants further consideration post the end of the current consultation period in March.” (Full case submitted)	32 Gov
“SCNP believes that the following options are relevant: a) A large CMNP encompassing Knapdale up to Oban, the Sound of Jura and Corryvreckan, the Isles of Jura, Scarba, Garvallachs, Colonsay, the seas out to Tiree and Coll and encompassing Mull, Iona, Staffa and the Treshnish Islands over to Ardnamurchan, Moidart and Morar and up to Knoydart and Kintail, across to the bottom half of Skye, including the Cuillin and Sleat, out to the Small Isles and all the seas landward of them. b) A smaller area taking in the north coast of Ardnamurchan, the whole of Moidart and Morar up to Kintail, across to Skye and the Small Isles as above. c) Wester Ross & Sutherland, illustrated by the old National Park Direction Area extended up to Coigach and Assynt NSA and its adjoining coastline, and out to encompass the coastal islands. The preferred option would be option a), with the preferred core of any CMNP being option b).”	34 G/Env
“The MFP is supportive of the inclusion of the Moray Firth on any short list of prospective sites put to the Scottish Executive, as an area worthy of consideration for National Park status. However, any final decision to make the Moray Firth a park should be subject to a properly informed consultation being undertaken and a broad consensus being achieved across stakeholder interests within the Firth.”	35 Gov
“Basically the SCA would promote the inclusion of as large an area of the west coast as possible. Our main concern would be that too small an area is chosen and it becomes overloaded with visitors, so we would advocate an island and sea area covering some 40 islands from Islay & Gigha in the south to Coll & Tiree in the west and to Skye and its associated islands in the north and including all the islands in between.”	38 G/Rec
“Lastly we believe that our particular area [Mull] is not suitable candidate for a CMNP and does not require the protection that is a necessary requisite for a park designation.”	39 G/Fish
“.. my suggestion is that the Argyll Coast & Island search area be expanded southwards to include not only Islay as discussed in the recent paper, but also more of the mainland.” “The recent reports from SNH points out that two of the natural breaks in the West Coast are Kintyre and Mull. Together the South Coast of Mull, West Coast of Kintyre and the mainland between the two form a natural bowl with a common history, land and seascapes that would make a very well defined Coastal and Marine National Park.” (More detailed case submitted)	41 I
“The Planning and Environment Committee, on behalf of Dumfries and Galloway Council, wishes to submit this expression of interest in the designation of a coastal and marine national park in Dumfries and Galloway.	45 LA

<p>The Planning and Environment Committee has requested a further paper detailing initial thoughts on the statutory and policy framework for a coastal and marine national park and the suitability of Dumfries and Galloway for such a designation. Following consideration of this paper by the Committee in March 2006, it is intended that it will be presented to Scottish Natural Heritage.”</p>	
<p>“Shetland is the ideal place to set up Scotland’s first National Park, according to the Shetland Tourism Association, whose executive committee has decided to back the proposal.”</p> <p>“Shetland meets every single one of the criteria suggested by the Scottish Executive for deciding where the new park should be. It would be an outstanding choice, with spectacular geology and scenery, magnificent seabird colonies, large populations of seals and otters and a greater variety of habitats for marine life than anywhere in the country.” (Detailed case submitted.)</p>	48 I
<p>“Regarding Mull and Iona for possible inclusion in an Argyll CMNP, you will be aware that this is an area currently attracting considerable discussion. The Community Trust has responded by trying to promulgate relevant information and encourage reasoned debate on the subject – however sketchy current plans are. Therefore, our approach has been to proactively engage in the process, and to try to help the community get access to information...”</p> <p>“As previously stated we are unable to offer a firm view either way however you may be interested in issues which have been raised with us. There was one suggestion that an Argyll Islands Park might have a boundary across Mull. This is clearly a crazy suggestion, as visitors once on an island, will impact the whole island, not just the area that has been zoned, we would therefore argue that park boundaries that subdivide an island are not workable.”</p> <p>(More detailed pros and cons of area inclusion submitted)</p>	49 G/Com
<p>“Given the diversity of our area and the socio-economic issues facing many of the communities within Argyll and Bute the designation of a coastal and marine National Park could assist in sustaining some of our more remote and fragile communities many of which are located within our coastal strip and on our 25 inhabited islands.”</p> <p>“The boundary proposed includes the main Argyll Islands of Mull, Coll, Tiree, Islay, Jura and Colonsay. The boundary extends out to the 12 mile limit to the west which ties in with the extension of planning control in relation to marine fin-fish developments. To the north the boundary follows the Councils boundary with Highland Council and it then cuts across back to the main land following the northern boundary of the Firth of Lorne SAC. This means that Oban would lie outwith the Park boundary. There was consideration given to including Oban however it was felt that Oban would act as a natural gateway and that there was no specific justification for including it based on the criteria drawn up. Kilmartin Glen has been included within the proposed coastal boundary of the Park as an important cultural link to the sea. The most southerly area of mainland coastline included in the boundary is the Knapdale National Scenic area.”(Full case for, and conditions of, inclusion submitted)</p>	50 LA
<p>“Members of the Hebridean Partnership have identified an area, which excels in all of the identification criteria laid down by SNH: Argyll and the Isles, extending to the Small Isles, Ardnamurchan and Morar and Moidart. This area includes many special natural features,</p>	51 G/Env

outstanding examples of habitat, fauna and flora, some unique and best examples in the UK, Europe and the World.” (Full case for inclusion submitted)	
<p>“Mull and its satellite islands simply have to be the prime area for such a park and I would in fact take it wider if possible. Let take the park boundary further and encompass Coll, Tiree, Rhum, Eigg, Muck and Canna. All would fit like a glove into the Marine National Park situation bringing benefit to man and beast here.”</p> <p>“My suggestion is to tope of Lewis, bottom of Islay, east to the eastern edge of Mull and west to the most western tip of the Outer Hebrides.”</p>	14 I
<p>“In considering this we need to remember that most of Scotland’s coast is of high quality. In previously responses on national parks our steer on this has included Harris, the western seaboard north of the Clyde, the Inner and Outer Hebrides, Orkney & Shetland and Culbin Sands, Forest and Findhorn Bay. An almost inescapable conclusion from the process so far is that the first park is likely to be on the west coast. We would find it hard to disagree with the merits of the areas that have emerged. The three that have been highlighted – Argyll Coast and the Islands, Lochaber and Skye and the Western Isles – are clearly of very high quality and deserve to be high on the list.”</p> <p>“We have argued for some time that Harris in particular would benefit from such a designation.”</p>	52 G/Rec
<p>“We have been following the debate on Scotland’s proposed Coastal and Marine National Park with interest and would like to add our voices in support for the Inner Hebrides and Argyll as the natural candidate for designation/”</p> <p>“We worry that support from Argyll for the park has been somewhat reserved and we believe that this is the result of the current confusion surrounding these proposals. Many local people believe that the Argyll coastline and Inner Hebridean islands <i>already</i> have special status..... We trust that this will not detract from Park status indeed the fact that several marine areas in Argyll have already been singled out should surely strengthen the case for park status for our area.”</p>	53 I
<p>“At present, we have not consulted our membership sufficiently to define key areas that we believe should be included within any proposed CMNP and we recognise that this process of identification may prove to be an emotive issue for our members. However some areas have iconic significance to mountaineers at home and abroad. From this perspective we consider that the introduction of extensive CMNPs along the West Coast (from Ailsa Craig through the Inner Hebrides to Skye together with the Outer Hebrides and Saint Kilda) would be supported by the wider mountaineering community. To which we must add that some East coast locations also merit consideration as potential CMNPs.”</p>	55 G/Rec
<p>“I am writing on behalf of the Oban and Lorn Tourism Association.... Our association would like you to choose this area for Scotland’s first Marine and Coastal National Park. We believe that this area is perfect for this park for the following reasons: - Tourism is the most important and largest industry in the areas. The infrastructure to this area compared to other areas being considered is already mainly in place with good road and rail links to all main centres of population. The marine natural heritage of the area contains many of the most important sites in Scotland. The area is remarkably rich in puffins (Treshnish SSSI), seals (Lismore SAC), otters, Golden and Sea Eagles ... Some of the highlights of the area.. are Corryvreckan Whirlpool, Staffa and Fingals Cave and of course Iona.... The cultural history of the</p>	56 G/Tour

area is incredible.”	
“We would suggest that a sensible boundary would to the North East follow the local authority boundary at Appin, would include the North Eastern coastal areas of the Sound of Mull and then run West from Ardnamurchan to the twelve-mile fishery limit. It is also important that the Argyll mainland sea lochs area should be included with the southern limit around Crinan with a line running West to meet the twelve-mile fishery limit.”	
[Ardnamurchan/Lochaber]	60 I

UNDECIDED OR AGAINST THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COASTAL AND MARINE NATIONAL PARKS	
“.. best practice in relation to the management of the marine environment predicted a regional seas approach. That the Scottish Executive is not following the strong logic of the ISP recommendation is a grave disappointment.”	02 G/Fish
“... before being enthusiastic about marine parks we would need to know what benefits there might be from such a designation and what restrictions might be imposed.”	09 G/Ship
“In general our Council was interested in your proposals but certainly until we have a lot more information we would have reservations particularly with regard to the effect on our local fishermen.”	17 G/Com
“If the national park turns out to be another toothless dog and the commercial fishermen are going to be allowed to finish off what little is left, then I will certainly be against it.”	20 I
“It is necessary to demonstrate the benefit of a Coastal and Marine National Park in Scottish waters. This benefit must be tangible, and ‘added value’ must equate to measurable improvement of existing arrangements.”	33 G/Fish
“We believe that the conception of an CMNP is urban conceived and driven and that those coastal communities who it may effect have not been properly consulted and that to pursue and CMNP may cause unnecessary conflict within these communities;”	39 G/Fish
“We fail to see any ‘value added’ benefits for our industries and no real example has been given to show otherwise;”	
“However, ASSG members are concerned that, despite this acknowledged benign status, our current activities and potential future expansion of operations are likely to be severely constrained within the boundaries of any CMNP.”	42 G/Fish
“Whilst I appreciate that the management regime for any CMNP has yet to be established, there would need to be a cast iron guarantee that	

our operations were to be safeguarded before we could consider supporting the concept.”	
“The idea of CMNP is born out of the best intentions and there would no doubt be many benefits from it. However, it would increase the regulatory burden on shellfish farmers and others trying to scratch a living from the sea. Over the last 27 years I have been in aquaculture I have seen the regulatory burden increase annually with more and more requirements which have to be fulfilled to comply with legislation. I am therefore, on balance, against the idea.”	46 I
“As a working creel fisherman on Mull I would like to register my extreme concern at the possibility of a MNP being created in my area. Generally I cannot see what benefits Mull would acquire from MNP status. Mull would be turned into some kind of nature theme park with it's native heart ripped out, please don't let this happen.”	47 I
“We welcomed the inclusion of a provision for marine parks in the Act but we do have some reservations over whether the provisions of that Act alone will be adequate to deliver an effective park in the marine environment.”	52 G/Rec
“The [Highland] Council’s Land and Environment Select Committee discussed the issue of a coastal and marine National Park when it met on 12 th January. Members are very unsure about the need for or the benefits of a coastal and marine National Park within the Highlands. As focus shifts from the whole of Scotland to areas in Argyll and Bute, Lochaber and the Western Isles, west coast members have begun to express grave concerns held within the communities they represent.”	59 LA

SELECTION CRITERIA	
“Easily accessible to big populations; Established tourism activity and a latent potential for increasing tourism; A comprehensive developmental framework already in place...; An established integrated/holistic approach to development...; A track record of successful partnership working ...; Landward and seaward activities already happening/established; Recent/current regeneration investment to build on.”	18 Gov
“The delineation of individual marine national parks requires very careful consideration in relation to factors such as the high degree of biological and hydrological flux, which is characteristic of the marine environment.”	22 G/Ship
“.. we have one minor concern with the reference made to the presence of existing partnership structures in the socio-economic factors. In our view, the existing presence of a partnership approach or a high level of co-ordination should not drive the selection process. We believe the focus should rest on the special natural and cultural qualities of the area and its management needs.”	26 G/other
“Alternatively, marine national parks could be established in more challenging circumstances where they may achieve greatest value if they include regions in which there is a clear need for coordinated management from the coastal zone to the open sea and where some of the most difficult conflicts arise between industrial use, recreation and nature conservation value. This would suggest that the Firth of Clyde and	31 G/Cult

the Firths of Forth and Tay could be appropriate candidates.”	
“Because we have not completed a detailed marine seabed survey of most of the waters around Scotland, it is premature to define Marine National Parks in detail. A National Seabed Survey is required before there is sufficient evidence available to define detailed Marine National Parks.”	37 G/Other
“At the seminar we did not think that pollution and water quality issues, both for marine wildlife and recreational users, was given adequate consideration as a relevant criteria in the selection of an area. We would suggest this is added.”	38 G/Rec
“I feel it is extremely important that a balance be kept between the eco systems which exist at present and that any meddling by humans whether well intentioned or exploitative must be very carefully monitored. If an area proposed for a Marine National Park has been well documented over the past few years and the data recorded it will be far easier to see the effect such designations may make in all their aspects and without this criteria there can be no comparisons; the introduction or reintroduction of new activities or species should always be envisaged in the over all picture and a clear criteria of the purpose of the marine park should be tabled at the outset for everyone to see. The track records of designated areas in other parts of the world should be referred to and learnt from and if a marine park is established in Scotland an adjacent area should also be monitored for comparison.”	43 G/Fish
“... any potential CMNP should be large enough to be able to cope with the probable increase in tourism and sustainable expansion of the tourist support industries. ... Experience from around the world has shown that Marine Protected Areas are one of the most successful methods of achieving a balanced final product. A CMNP large enough to incorporate MPA’s or “no take zones” would benefit both the environment and local economies.” “With this in mind and to avoid undue impact to the inshore fishermen the outer extent of any proposed CMNP must extend out to the 12-mile limit.”	51 G/Env
“The main question seems to be whether offshore we should look to 6 or 12 nautical miles. This probably depends on location and which management issues are relevant. Clearly 6nm is more straightforward administratively as beyond this fisheries management is reserved to Westminster.”	52 G/Rec
“It would be sensible to designate an area where it is believed it would be strongly welcomed by a majority of the local community... There must be demonstrable value to local communities. .. There must be infrastructure and services available to service the expected influx of visitors.”	54 G/Fish
“There is some evidence that this type of economic activity (as generated by the mountaineering community) is retained locally and therefore we believe that there is a genuine economic argument for the conservation of ‘wild’ terrestrial landscapes within the proposed CMNP boundaries.” “In terms of spatial boundaries, we believe that CMNPs should consist of extensive and contiguous tracts of coastline and islands. The	55 G/Rec

selection and expanse of these protected areas should be based on consensual scientific indicators of whole ecosystem viability, biodiversity value, qualitative appraisals of landscape characteristics and cultural attributes.”	
<p>“In defining areas of outstanding natural heritage importance, consideration should be given to the biodiversity, landscape value, cultural and natural heritage, nature conservation importance and the value of these in supporting the areas’ enjoyment and understanding via tourism and recreation. The special “identity” of the areas should also be drawn on. Consideration of identity should draw on the social, cultural and environmental character and should identify a commonality of management issues which a park authority could suitably address. The existing “value” of the natural and cultural heritage should be assessed and the potential benefits of national park status identified.”</p> <p>“Any proposal for a coastal and marine national park should be on such a geographic scale that it delivers the objectives noted in the Council’s response to question 1 and adequately incorporates the criteria set out in response to question two.”</p>	59 LA

SCOPE OF POWERS FOR CMNP AUTHORITY	
“.. I have always been particularly concerned about (a) the inability to bring all interests – and there are many – together so that inshore and pelagic fishermen have a future: you may have an overarching role here.”	21 I
<p>“Coastal and Marine National Parks will undoubtedly be more complex than their inland counterparts due to the mix of statutory authorities and legislation involved. In our view it would be beneficial if the National Park designation could be used to co-ordinate the work of these varied bodies.”</p> <p>“We suggest that it may be of benefit to give careful consideration to how a National Park Authority can have meaningful involvement and influence in the many marine matters that are reserved to Westminster or the European Union.”</p>	26 G/other
“In order to achieve the aims of a CMNP we believe that the National Park Authority (NPA) must be given adequate powers through the National Parks (Scotland) Act to: 1. Develop the National Park Plan into a working spatial planning system, based on sound information, for the whole Park. 2. Take overall control of all devolved activities appropriate to the NPP in the CMNP. ...3. Reach agreement with UK departments on reserved issues4. Take a strategic overview of the workings of the Park. 5. Encourage active involvement of stakeholders, from UK and Scottish departments and non-departmental public bodies down to the grass roots ...”	27 G/Env
“One of the chief functions of the National Park Authority is the management of change within the park and balancing this with the need for sustainable economic development of the local communities. The National Trust for Scotland believes in most instances that this can only be achieved if the Authority has full planning powers Similarly, there should be a presumption that the Authority should also be the access authority.	29 G/Env

<p>“... SCNP still advocates a fundamental requirement for an independent park authority with its own vision and its own <i>modus operandi</i>.”</p> <p>“Turning to the terrestrial component of a CMNP..... SCNP would argue for the full range of powers for this aspect of a CMNP as exists already for Loch Lomond and the Trossachs.”</p> <p>“Land management issues also need to be considered, both in terms of their effects on the marine environment and the sustainable development of landward areas.”</p>	34 G/Env
<p>“The National Park Authority must have full powers or the potential benefits may not be achievable. Inclusion of “no take zones” within the CMNP would allow for regeneration of natural resources, enable commercial sectors to gain from these restrictions, allow scientific and educational programs to benefit and flourish from relatively untouched areas. Effective spatial planning may provide for specific fishing activities and locating of aquaculture sites thereby reducing some of the present pressures and conflicts.”</p>	51 G/Env
<p>“In his letter to SNH the Minister has made it very clear that added value offered by the designation of a park is a key issue. It is clear that a park authority has to have certain powers if it is to be able to add value to the management of the area concerned.”</p>	52 G/Rec

SCOPE OF PLANNING POWERS FOR CMNP AUTHORITY	
<p>“An informal and incomplete system of spatial planning already exists and the rational use of a coastal national park demands that this system be formalised. As a very minimum, the national park plan should include a system of marine zonation that balances the different uses and, most importantly, should be enforceable. The National Park Authority should also retain the power to act as the planning authority should a full system of marine spatial planning be established in the future.”</p>	29 G/Env
<p>“The National Parks should be contained within, and not be an alternative to, a broad planning strategy and need to be seen as a tool that will achieve better management of Scotland’s marine assets as a whole.”</p>	31 G/Cult
<p>“.. in the same way that local authorities are to receive planning powers from the Crown Estate to regulate aquaculture, should the CMNPA have planning powers transferred from local authorities. SCNP will always argue that these powers should include Development Control in addition to statutory Local Plan powers for efficient operation and good communication with the public.”</p>	34 G/Env
<p>“To summarise: our main argument as regards spatial planning is the need to set up a network of Marine Protected Areas of which CMNPs should be part.”</p>	34 G/Env
<p>“The Park should not impose any additional layers of bureaucracy onto the resident population;”</p>	36 Gov

<p>“It should not adversely impact upon other Executive priorities such as the potential for marine renewables through tidal and wave power,”</p>	
<p>“We favour the CMNP being its own Planning Authority along the lines of the Loch Lomond & Trossachs model.”</p>	38 G/Rec
<p>“We are concerned that it will add another level of bureaucracy making planning both on the sea and land even harder to achieve;”</p>	39 G/Fish
<p>“However, we believe that the main debate relates to the potential planning powers that a CMNP Authority may hold. Consideration of the nature and extent of planning powers is fundamental to any National Park, especially if marine spatial planning and sustainable development are held as key tenets.”</p> <p>“For the moment, it seems unlikely that there will be an opportunity to extend planning powers for matters other than aquaculture out to 12nm. However, offshore renewable energy is one sector caught up in the debate over extension of planning powers beyond the MLWS mark. If a system of marine spatial planning were to be introduced within a National Park’s area of jurisdiction, we would wish to be reassured that all sectors of marine development, and their relationship to our own interests, were properly provided for.”</p>	43 Gov
<p>“At this point in time it is envisaged that one possibility would be the setting up of a separate Park Team within Planning Services. The team would include some existing officers and would have the responsibility for the development control, policy, implementation and access function within the Park supported by specialists in biodiversity and marine issues and by a ranger service.”</p>	50 LA
<p>“We have argued that terrestrial national parks should have full planning powers In line with this we would expect that the park board should have equivalent powers in the marine part of its jurisdiction.... We understand that fish farm development control is due to come under the control of planning authorities..... We consider that this should also apply to the park authority. .. We believe that the park authority should have control over other marine development but recognise that this may require primary legislation. ... Other examples of management issues that may need to be addressed and where the park authority should have at least a call in power include moorings, shipping lanes, energy developments and water quality.”</p>	52 G/Rec
<p>“... we believe it is necessary for the planning authority to have a right of veto over damaging or intrusive large scale extractive, industrial and recreational developments.”</p> <p>“Intrusive large scale developments and ‘honey pot’ sites that are detrimental to the long term interests of CMNPs can, in our opinion be avoided if a planning framework is devised which supports geographically diffuse small business and community projects as a response to any projected increase in visitor numbers.”</p>	55 G/Rec
<p>“A park should ideally combine the management of coastal and marine areas, within inshore waters. Such an area would help retain community involvement and ownership and would bring within a statutory framework the planning and management of coastal and marine environments. This should help to deliver better integration between activities like fishing and marine nature conservation.”</p>	59 LA

<p>“.. The Park Plan would have to contain an element of marine spatial planning and embrace the principles of integrated coastal zone management. Planning powers over aquaculture are due to be transferred from the Crown Estate Commissioners to local authorities in the summer of 2006. Given that the park authority is unlikely to be granted fisheries management powers or responsibility for maritime shipping, a statutory planning role, exercised via the Park Plan is more likely. A coastal and marine park authority would require powers to prepare and implement statutory coastal zone plans with a marine spatial planning element.”</p>	
---	--

SCOPE OF POWERS FOR CMNP AUTHORITY – FISHING INTERESTS	
<p>“...We would also be concerned that a National Park authority would constitute an additional regulatory body.....”</p>	<p>22 G/Fish</p>
<p>“In the purely marine field, there are opportunities for exercising control over activities that should be explored. For instance, it would be possible to establish a Regulating Order within the borders of the park and to ensure that the NPA fulfilled the role of the Management Authority. This would allow rational management of the shellfish resource, so important to many coastal communities, to be integrated with other park aims.”</p>	<p>29 G/Env</p>
<p>“It is vital that the CMNP Authority continues existing marine use rights in the designated area as exercised prior to the Authority coming into force. We suggest that the Authority should, thereafter, be subject to a statutory procedure if it proposes that the right is revoked or modified.”</p>	<p>33 G/Fish</p>
<p>“In respect of the responsibilities of the Crown Estate Commissioners, the CMNPA should be the moorings authority for the park area and consideration should be given to delegating CEC responsibilities to the CMNPA.”</p> <p>“SCNP recognises that one of the main contentions in establishing the marine component of a CMNP will be the governance of fisheries. This should be seen as an opportunity to localise fishing effort and to inject long term thinking into the planning of this activity.it would seem best that conservation mechanisms should be wholly owned by the fishermen, backed by good quality scientific data.”</p> <p>“A further consideration is the question of shipping movements and the work of the Marine and Coastguard Agency (MCA). Discussions should be held with the MCA with a view to improving the operational effectiveness of protective measures in the vicinity of a CMNP, whether through partnership arrangements with the MCA or granting concurrent powers...”</p>	<p>34 G/Env</p>
<p>“HIE expects that the new structure of Inshore Fisheries Groups will be the principal means of delivering sustainable fisheries management, and that these groups will actively work with any proposed Park. We also consider that proposed changes within the planning control of aquaculture will be adequate to meet the needs of a future Park;”</p>	<p>36 Gov</p>
<p>“We are concerned with Park statutory powers to control our industries and the possible makeup of any management board;”</p>	<p>39 G/Fish</p>

“We are concerned that the aims of the CMNP will always back the conservation argument, particularly when there is a conflict;”	
“It is, however, worth noting that the enterprises likely to be most affected by the creation of a National Marine Park – fishing and fish farming – are already heavily regulated and will continue to be so, whether or not a park exists. A park authority could well be a more efficient and effective way of ensuring local influence over decisions by national and European authorities.”	48 I
“[Fisheries] This is likely to be a key management issue in the marine part of any park. We need to explore the proposed role of Inshore Fishery Groups with more rigour. The principle of local management of the resource is a good one but we need to be clear how issues are resolved if their Local Management Plans are incompatible with the National Park Plan.” “The park should be able to pilot novel management approaches such as no take zones.”	52 G/Rec
“Our Norwegian owners already view the level of regulation and bureaucracy in Scotland as excessive, and this once again brings into question the level of continued investment and the potential for future investment. The aquaculture industry in Scotland is simply not in a position to readily absorb any increase in bureaucracy and cost.”	54 G/Fish

SCOPE OF POWERS FOR CMNP AUTHORITY – SHIPPING INTERESTS	
“... care must be taken to safeguard ships’ right of innocent passage in the UK’s territorial sea, and freedom of navigation in the UK’s Pollution Control Zone, consistent with the United Nations Convention on “the Law of the Sea.”	05 Gov
“While we are supportive of many environmental initiatives..... Marine National Parks should take into account the needs of commercial ports operations and the needs of industry. This is especially important in the ports and shipping industries where it is increasingly understood that shipping is the most environmentally sensitive form of transport.....”	11 G/Ship

ROLE OF CMNP – CONSERVATION AND PROTECTION	
Re Loch Sween Argyll – “.. there is an increase in jet skis, water skiers and fast boats what steps can we take to encourage the protection of this area”.	01 I
“I appreciate that the driving force for this proposal is marine nature conservation; however I believe that the linkage between the conservation and enhancement of the natural and cultural underwater heritage is essential.”	12 G/Cult
“While Scottish Ministers have adopted a presumption against the development of sea cage fish farms on the north and east coasts, the north west coast lacks and area defined as ‘fish-farm-free’. We believe that such an areas, as part of a National Park or MPA, would provide a	13 G/Fish

safeguard for at least a few valuable sea trout stocks.”	
“I well remember doing fieldwork in my early days here, and how impressed I was by the richness of the marine lifeSo it does seem particularly important to give it the same protection as the English marine life..”	15 I
“There is limited ability under existing legislation to identify and protect nationally and internationally important marine species, habitats, landscape and cultural features from damaging activities. While we look to a Marine Act to fully address this, a CMNP could promote conservation and enhancement of important features and ensure that users of the area did not cause irreversible or long-term damage.”	27 G/Env
“On the Marine park issue I was disappointed that more emphasis wasn’t placed on conservation.Do you envisage that a Scottish marine park management will be allowed to impose their own restrictions on conservation issues? If not then this could be a missed opportunity to help restore fish stocks.”	28 G/Rec
“While we welcome the steps to establish a national park in the sea, it is important that this is not seen as a substitute for more comprehensive conservation measures.” “It is (therefore) particularly important, both from the point of view of conserving the natural heritage, promoting the sustainable use of natural resources and promoting sustainable economic and social development that the natural resources are maintained in a healthy condition. Management of a marine national park must therefore be directed towards this end.” “As with natural heritage features, the coastal historic environment and its tangible associations are part of cultural <i>systems</i> which need to be managed holistically, alongside the natural assets of the area.”	29 G/Env
“Our fundamental view is that the development of national parks in Scotland should be strategic in approach to ensure that our finest areas of cultural and natural heritage are given protection against existing and future inappropriate development and this includes our marine heritage.” “SEPA, under the Water Framework Directive, currently has responsibilities for surface water and drainage status (including the health of coastal waters) out to the 12 mile limit. This will be such a crucial area for the effective credibility of the CMNPA that consideration should be given to the need for concurrent powers for the park authority.”	34 G/Env
“The SCA also see the CMNP as the most appropriate top tier designation for a protected coastal area.”	38 G/Rec
A CMNP should incorporate elements of marine spatial planning and habitat/species protection measures within its long-term vision or Plan. ... It is entirely possible that a future CMNP may involve an area where an existing coastal partnership organisation is trying to implement the principles of integrated coastal management, albeit on a voluntary basis. Since the National Park’s management mechanisms will have a statutory presence that is independent of whatever backing the constituent elements may have in their own right, we anticipate seeing the	43 Gov

introduction of legally-binding integrated coastal planning and management for the National Park area.”	
“I feel it is extremely important that a balance be kept between the eco systems which exist at present and that any meddling by humans whether well intentioned or exploitative must be very carefully monitored. If an area proposed for a Marine National Park has been well documented over the past few years and the data recorded it will be far easier to see the effect such designations may make in all their aspects and without this criteria there can be not comparisons; the introduction or reintroduction of new activities or species should always be envisaged in the overall picture and a clear criteria of the purpose of the marine park should be tabled at the outset for everyone to see. “	44 G/Fish
“Some of the most vociferous supporters of the establishment of a CMNP appear to believe there is little or no regulation or control at present of potentially damaging activities such as aquaculture and fishing, and that new powers will be given to the Park Authority. We believe this is undesirable and unnecessary and that protection of the marine environment can be ensured by proper & fair use of existing legislation/regulation. We see no advantage in the establishment of a CMNP which could not be achieved by efficient and targeted use of existing legislation. It is preferable for Scotland to have specific protection for habitats/species where needed and clear spatial planning for the whole country.”	54 G/Fish
“I was horrified to read the following statement from you in the Stornoway Gazette:- ‘There is no reason why wave power couldn’t be within a National Park’.....what is the sense in picking out an area, undoubtedly one of the most beautiful and unspoilt in Britain, as a National Park, only to desecrate it later with an industrial complex?”	57 I

ROLE OF CMNP – RECREATION / TOURISM INTERESTS	
<p>“We expect the CMNP to be a model of sustainable management of a world class coastal and marine environment that makes a practical improvement on the ground and on the water, and includes and innovative and inclusive approach to managing recreation and access in line with Scotland’s new Access Legislation.”</p> <p>“We would like to see the CMNP promote awareness and understanding of the CMNP through high quality Interpretive Centres at gateways to the park.”</p> <p>“The development of a CMNP will encourage additional visitors to the area and we believe that the local infrastructure needs to be developed to minimise the impact of increased numbers on the local population.”</p>	38 G/Rec
“Our presumption is that the park authority should also be the access authority. There needs to be a consideration of how the park authority might fulfil its role on recreation within the marine part of the park.”	52 G/Rec

ROLE OF CMNP – SOCIO-ECONOMIC BENEFITS	
<p>“.. SEN’s starting position in relation to the to-be-developed policy framework is that it should be designed in such a way that enables the furtherance of Smart Successful Scotland in the chosen area and beyond, to an extent that couldn’t be obtained without the new National Park being in place. We also see, however, the opportunity to ‘design-in’ deep-rooted principles of sustainable development through the proposal development process and would encourage SNH and the stakeholder group to ensure that any policy framework provides the basis for economic, social and environmental advancement in the round.”</p>	18 Gov
<p>“.. the importance of the relationship of any designated area to the communities within the Park and also in the area of influence of the Park. National Park boundaries are at the end of the day administrative designations and need to take cognisance of the continual evolution of social and economic development patterns.”</p> <p>“... designation of an area as a National Park gives the said area an immediate international standing. given this international position, seek to incorporate (in a sensitive way) the national development agenda in terms of economic and tourism development.”</p>	19 Gov
<p>“We believe that a marine park should take account of people and socio-economics as well as the natural environment. We are pleased to see that the promotion of the sustainable economic and social development of local communities is included as one of the main aims of Scotland’s existing National Parks, and we hope that this principle will be given equal significance for a marine park.”</p> <p>“Our industry must be confident of the support of the Scottish Executive and its agencies. It is absolutely vital that the development of a marine park does not have the counter-productive effect of undermining the very investment that would further enhance the sustainability of our industry.”</p>	22 G/Fish
<p>“... in our view, the over-riding purpose of a National Park designation must be to add value to the existing management and policy context. It should also deliver a more co-ordinated approach to management and regulation to the benefit of the public, private and community sectors.”</p>	26 G/Other
<p>“We see such a Park as an accolade recognising outstanding heritage qualities, and that this can bring tourism and other benefits to coastal communities;”</p> <p>“We consider the delivery of the 4-key aims for the Park, as outlined within the Act, as key to the success of such a designation, noting the vital importance of promoting sustainable economic and social development of local communities.”</p> <p>“We would still expect the Park to contribute to HIE’s stated objective of growing the population of the Highlands and Islands. This will be particularly relevant to the remoter peripheral coastal populations that may be impacted by this designation.”</p>	36 Gov
<p>“We believe that if a National Park is to be designated, it must bring demonstrable and definable benefits to the area it covers. We are encouraged by the importance placed by the Minister on the social and economic benefits to be gained by the local communities within the</p>	43 Gov

encouraged by the importance placed by the Minister on the social and economic benefits to be gained by the local communities within the CMNP and would support paper CMNPASG1-3 in highlighting the importance of promoting the sustainable use of resources and emphasising that an integrated approach to planning issues is fundamental.”	
“The key question that needs to be addressed when looking at the principle of a coastal and marine National Park for Argyll and Bute is whether such a designation could help the Council to address the key challenges facing the area and in so doing assist in securing sustainable communities. Provided that the aims and objectives were the correct ones and the delivery mechanism well thought through a National Park could bring additional resources which could help to address the socio-economic issues facing many of our more remote and fragile islands such as depopulation.”	50 LA
“... we believe that there is a greater potential for CMNPs to provide sustainable employment for rural communities within a planning framework that gives primacy to the long term stewardship of natural resources.”	55 G/Rec

GOVERNANCE OF CMNP	
“Representation on the National Park Authority poses difficulties in marine areas because of the need to include a percentage of individuals resident in the park. It is likely that coastal parks with a high percentage of marine areas will require some modification to the system of representation.”	29 G/Env
“It is essential that the CMNP Authority executes any interest in fisheries management through its local Inshore Fisheries Group(s). “We suggest that a nominee of each relevant Inshore Fisheries Group becomes a statutory nominee to the Park Authority, and that a nominee of the Park Authority joins the Advisory Group of each relevant Inshore Fisheries Group.”	33 G/Fish
“The Park should clearly bring benefits to the local coastal and island communities from the marine assets contained within the Park area – local input and participation to the governance of the Park are essential to this;”	36 Gov
“Allied to the above, the quality of the Board members on the CMNP will determine how effectively it manages the issues it will have to address. We believe there is a need for informed discussion at Board level to ensure all the aims of the CMNP are considered in order to arrive at a balanced decision. ... We feel there should be a specific requirement to include recreational water based as well as land based representatives on the Park Board.”	38 G/Rec
““The group of organisations collectively known as Local Coastal Partnerships (LCPs) have a proven track record of successful partnership building, local support and delivery of projects. It is hoped that whichever area is selected that one of the LCPs will form the basis of the deliver and management mechanism.”	40 Gov

<p>“Similarly we see the structure of the Park Authority as being pivotal, and suggest maximum participation from community representatives with government and local authority officials acting as advisors to a NPA Board rather than voting members of the Authority.”</p>	<p>49 G/Com</p>
<p>“The Council would strongly oppose the setting up of a separate Park Authority staffing structure to oversee any coastal and marine National Park that was proposed for Argyll and Bute. There is no evidence to the contrary as to why the Council itself could not provide the delivery mechanism/framework for any coastal and marine National Park in Argyll and Bute.”</p> <p>“Following on from the issue of governance is the issue of resources. It is imperative that the level of resources that are made available to the coastal and marine National Park are correctly calculated to ensure that the aims and objectives of the Park can be delivered.”</p>	<p>50 LA</p>
<p>“To be effective, any National Park Authority must have full powers throughout its area of remit. We also believe that, because of the complexity of marine issues and concerns by local communities, more local involvement on the NPA would be beneficial and show “openness”. We cannot emphasise too strongly that whether the CMNP is seen as a success is dependent on the acceptance and support of those living and working within the area, and the extent to which they feel they have significant involvement in decision making. ... We would therefore suggest that the NPA be made up of equal sectors: government, local officials and members of the general public: eight, eight and eight with an independent chair.”</p>	<p>51 G/Env</p>
<p>“To reflect the balance between locally based and national interests, given that this is a national park and will receive central government funding, we recommend that the board be made up of 50% local stakeholders and 50% national interests.”</p>	<p>52 G/Rec</p>
<p>“Highland Council is generally committed to the principle that the management of local resources should be the responsibility of local communities and their representatives. Appropriate governance is key to the success of any proposed national park. The Council makes the following recommendations, based on existing legislative arrangements on governance for a coastal and marine national park: The maximum size of the Park Board should remain set at 25; A minimum 20% of the Park Board should be elected by those living in the park areas; Ministers should appoint the remaining members,...;. A minimum of 20% of the Board's members must be appointed as “local members” ...; No person should be appointed to the Board unless he or she has knowledge or experience relevant to the functions of the Park Authority or the Park. .. Implementing the above arrangements should ensure that at least 10 members of the Board live and work in the park area and that 15 members live or work within the area or represent the people within the local authority areas covered by the Park. The Highland Council recognises that a coastal and marine national park authority would depend heavily on the involvement of stakeholder groups, particularly if it is to ensure adequate treatment of issues like fishing, renewable energy, shipping and marine science.”</p>	<p>59 LA</p>

<p>COMMENTS ON PRESENT SNH WORK AND FUTURE CONSULTATIONS</p>	
<p>“... responsibility of dealing with the matter will be assigned to the Scottish Fishermen's Federation..”</p>	<p>02 G/Fish</p>

“... a near coast designation could impact on members’ activities and we would want to be involved.”	04 G/Other
“... as a relatively new National Park we do have direct experience of a range of issues that you are likely to be considering, and we would gladly share these with you ...”	06 Gov
“The Council is an active partner in the Forth Estuary Forum It would seem appropriate to consider any proposals for the estuary through this forum..”	16 LA
“.. any proposals which might impact on the Forth and Tay Estuaries should be dealt with through the relevant coastal forums.”	23 LA
“I enjoyed yesterday’s seminar ... I was disappointed that recreational sea angling (RSA) was so poorly represented.” “I thought it very typical that there are 6 or 7 commercial fishing organisations on the Marine park stakeholder group and not one from RSA....”	28 G/Rec
“The National Trust for Scotland therefore welcomes the consultative approach to establishing a National Park and seeks mechanisms to ensure that this is carried on into the process of developing a National Park Plan... One problem lies in determining who the stakeholders are. Clearly those living in the park are of primary concern but there will be many people living outwith the park who earn their living practically within the park or who visit it for recreation. A <u>National</u> Park also implies national interests, and its management is the legitimate business of all those living in Scotland. All of these can claim to be stakeholders and a means must be found of balancing views where conflicts emerge.”	29 G/Env
“SEPA is, therefore, well-placed to contribute to the development of proposed marine and coastal national parks, and will welcome the opportunity to be closely involved with the development proposals.”	30 Gov
“Because the decision to establish a National Park and the subsequent actions arising from the National Park plan are likely to have important consequences for those who live and work within the National Park boundary, it is vital that local interests are full informed and involved in the decision making process at all stages from the initial choice of location through to the preparation and implementation of the plan, and eventually to the monitoring and review of local policies.” “The nature and form of the public engagement will vary with the different stages of the project. Prior to the designation of the Park it must seek both to inform and solicit the opinions of local interests through public meetings and focus groups and regular contacts with local stakeholder organisations.” “There are, however, some particular problems concerning the representation of local interests both formally and informally in relation to marine National Parks. The most obvious of these is how does one define what is meant by ‘local community’,”	31 G/Cult

<p>“While it may be comparatively easy to list the different sectoral interests which will need to be actively informed and consulted throughout the decision making process, it may prove more difficult to identify which organisations truly and fully represent those interests.”</p>	
<p>“The MFP’s neutral status puts us in a unique position to bring together many diverse interest groups and identity issues and opportunities. We are already engaged with many of the stakeholders who will wish to have an input into any consultation on National Park status. We would be happy to assist in any way we can.”</p>	35 Gov
<p>“We are disappointed that the SCA is not directly involved in the current Stakeholder Group. If Scottish Ministers proceed with the CMNP, the SCA are keen to make a direct input to the further development of the project.”</p>	38 G/Rec
<p>“We are concerned that the original 25 stakeholders may not be a balanced group and we know of at least one stakeholder who has expressed this view.”</p>	39 G/Fish
<p>“I would be grateful if you would continue to keep the Forth Estuary Forum informed and involved in these proposalsand would like to offer you the support of the Forth Estuary Forum in any way that we can.”</p>	40 Gov
<p>“The ASSG does not reject entirely the concept of a CMNP, but we have a legitimate interest in ensuring it is beneficial for all stakeholders, especially for an environmentally benign activity such as molluscan shellfish cultivation. Therefore, in order to investigate an improved ‘road map’ for the creation of a CMNP, we strongly urge that the period of consultation be extended, that the linkages to the over-arching context of Integrated Coastal Zone Management be more thoroughly explored, and that the process of seeking stakeholder views be continued and widened to include additional representatives from local community interests.”</p>	42 G/Fish
<p>“We are extremely interested to learn of the development of a paper that will address aquaculture issues as they relate to a CMNP, as noted for action at the December Stakeholders’ meeting. We would welcome an opportunity to work closely with SNH in drafting this paper.”</p>	43 Gov
<p>“As an organisation who’s primary aim revolves around community empowerment and community capacity building we cannot stress enough our desire to see the voice of the communities included in any CMNP given a true hearing.”</p> <p>“We understand that once outline decisions on geographical location have been made by the Minister, some 18 months of community consultations would take place. We urge that these consultations/appraisals be given adequate funding to ensure they are meaningful and effective...”</p>	49 G/Com
<p>“I have accessed the stakeholder group and staggered that yet again no one from the eco tourism industry is represented on the group and more staggered that when I have been at the very heart of bringing National Parks to Scotland and the prime reason why the Marine National Park is on the table I have not been included in this group.”</p> <p>“In short you will only get half truths concerning the possible new marine park and this must be taken on board when decisions are made</p>	14 I

<p>because there is not the sympathy vote anymore for fishing when we are all short of fish and the mood here regarding fishing and fish farming is currently misread by government.”</p>	
<p>“We understand that once the area for designation has been decided there will be full local consultation on the scope of the park authorities powers and the detail of the park operation. In our view this local consultation should be taking place before the area is chosen to ensure that the park has the necessary local support and involvement. We are very concerned that a designation with such major implications for our business could be put in place without any formal local consultation taking place.”</p> <p>“We suggest that before any Coastal and Marine National Park designation is put into place the effects and outcomes of some of the recent legislative changes and initiatives be thoroughly examined and assessed. In our view the level of local buy in and support for the SSMEI projects would be particularly valuable input to the process.”</p>	54 G/Fish
<p>“We also support an open and responsive consultation by the Executive regarding the development of CMNPs and we shall inform our members of this process and the opportunities to contribute to this debate.”</p>	55 G/Rec
<p>“We in Forth Ports PLC do not believe that the interests of the major ports of Scotland are being addressed. Given the representative on the Stakeholder Group is from BPA, we believe that, whilst the smaller ports are covered, the larger, commercial ports have been excluded from the process. On that basis I request that the UKMPG are approached in future to supply an appropriate representative to attend important meetings such as the Coastal and National Parks stakeholder group.”</p>	58 G/Ship
<p>“In order to help address the above concerns Members have asked that full economic assessments be carried out, which detail the economic base within each of the potential National Park areas.”</p>	59 LA

TABLE 4 - NATIONAL STAKEHOLDER SEMINARS – SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE AT ‘ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES’ WORKSHOPS

	Issues/Concerns	Opportunities/Benefits
Role/added value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will areas not selected (particularly immediately outside the boundary) suffer because of reduced funding (8) • Will the NP be of real value? (4) • Will the NP deliver value for money, or would the funds be better spent across the whole of Scotland, is a CMNP the right option cost / benefit? (3) • Duplication of existing initiatives is wasteful and will cause confusion (2) • Problems NP will try to fix will still exist elsewhere nationally • Need national consistency in ICZM – where do NPs fit in with national approach? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to develop more sustainable ways of using the natural resources e.g. shellfish, aquaculture and renewable energy and promote area on these methods, need to balance conservation and uses of the environment and link protection and the economy (9) • Opportunity for better strategic planning and holistic thinking in the long-term (4) • Opportunity of delivering sustainable management through consensus agreements • Coherent knowledge of who has jurisdiction and responsibility • Opportunity to trial novel solutions to management and facilitate best practice • Will provide opportunity for ecosystem approach to management not based on LA boundaries
Powers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on LAs loss of influence and resource, viability of remaining area (4) • How will the NP designation fit in with non devolved activities. e.g. defence? (2) • How do you run a NP on the basis of just a plan, no real powers for NPA (like local area run on basis of a local plan with no local authority, just departments?) • NP designation will not have enough teeth • How do you integrate all the maritime legislation complete with different boundaries? • How will the NP designation fit in with international law of the sea? • How will NP interact with existing designation e.g. marine SACs • Will designation of the NP lead to further designation e.g. World heritage sites • Changes in planning system a concern 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to link existing designations • Statutory power rather than voluntary agreement
Impact on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NP will be just another layer of control / reduction in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity for community involvement in local management

Communities	<p>local elected power (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased house prices, second home ownership (3) • Potential for loss of true local identity 	<p>e.g. Argyll ICZM projects provides better understanding of others interests and reduces conflict in the marine environment (6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizen ownership, personal enrichment, community participation (3) • Will provide more employment in the area (3) • Increased property values in the area • Will provide more affordable housing in the area (2) • Opportunity to protect local fishing communities
Funding and Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional taxation funding a CMNP will be very expensive, where will the funding come from? (2) • Who is the MNP regulator SNH, SEPA, LA, Executive? • How fully will the individual be represented on the MNP Authority? • Overlap of power with local authority which has its own agenda • Threat of NP being taken over by ‘political’ discussions – dominated by one sector • How will the NP be enforced / managed or monitored? • Lack of ownership from external user groups • True local representation? Need to be right people on the Board for local / national balance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity for increased funding (8) • Will provide a forum for everyone to have their say, may provide a voice for community (2) • Potential for community involvement in monitoring and record collection • Will provide extra resources to deal with hot topics (2)
Planning and Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased planning and control of the sea-bed will lead to restrictions to economic development (9) • Excessive legislation, another layer of consultation, creeping bureaucracy (7) • Environmental interests will drive the proposals without taking into account the social and economic affects on coastal and fishing communities (2) • Over zealous conservation, protectionist approach • What criteria will be used to select areas which have potential for growth in various sectors given the difficulty in assessing the marine environment? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity for coordination, coherence and integration in management possibly across LA borders and this will be long-term (7) • Will make regulation clearer and more straightforward, joined up thinking will reduce bureaucracy (5) • Opportunity to streamline consultations • Opportunity for integration of management and budgets • Opportunity for coordination of activities across islands • Provision of detailed information for users

Fisheries management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to agree the relationships between resources and fishing if not, unlikely hope of movement / progress? • Will not enhance the Inshore Fisheries Management Groups • The knowledge held by the fishing industry will not be taken into account • LAs don't have the expertise to manage fisheries • Powers to control fishing boats from outside the area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CMNP will prevent fishing damage to fragile habitats (2) • All activities should be considered equally with no bias to fishing (2) • Enhanced fisheries management • Management could include no take zones • Interaction with IFG
Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could interfere with off-shore renewable energy capture, wind/wave/tidal (2) • Interfere with proposals for nuclear power • How will drivers integrate with Scottish Water funding cycles (currently environmental objectives are set to 2014)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity for economic development (7) • More control of aquaculture • Opportunity to learn from others e.g. Pembrokeshire Coast NP is promoting alternative technologies, not just stuck in status quo • May provide mechanism to address inappropriate development
Care, enjoyment and understanding of the natural and cultural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation of a NP will cause further degradation of natural environment, destroys the assets of an area (2) • The NP will try to please everyone – losing sight of aims and long term view and giving way to short-term interest and exploitation, the environment will lose out • Protection of natural heritage / conservation is viewed as a threat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise awareness of marine natural heritage and it's value, issues effecting it education opportunities (ecological and cultural packs), capacity building (13) • Opportunity to learn and increase understanding of biodiversity and impacts (8) • Protection of habitats, ecosystems and cultural heritage improve the quality of the environment (7) • Will create national and community pride in something special, status, recognition, cultural representation (4) • Improved access to all (3) • Will make conservation central to management of the area chosen (3) • Opportunity to develop sea angling (2) • Better protection and management of coastal land (2)
Tourism and infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine tourism can't be developed any further than it already is in Scotland given the climate, developing tourism further could be damaging (3) • There is huge potential for marketing but people need to be realistic, some developments will not be appropriate, need to manage expectation (3) • Local communities role will be reduced to servicing tourism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to develop tourism (off season trade), produce a recognisable national and international brand and raise the profile of the area, sustainable growth of coastal and marine tourism would increase the number of visitors to the area and lead to economic benefits (16) • Potential investment in infrastructure, improved facilities and services (5)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can existing infrastructure cope, increased traffic, infrastructure will need to be improved (2) • We don't want to be flooded with more visitors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity for coherent delivery with reduced competitiveness in marine wildlife tourism • Opportunity to provide a welcome to visitors through interpretative centres • Opportunity for tourism to move more upmarket
Areas boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the split of land to sea to be, danger of poor marine management if emphasis is on land • What is your definition of "coastal"? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need a large area to realise benefits

TABLE 5 - NATIONAL STAKEHOLDER SEMINARS – SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE AT ‘AREA’ WORKSHOPS

	Solway	Firth of Clyde	Argyll islands and coast	Lochaber and Skye
Workshops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Glasgow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 Glasgow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inverness, 2 Glasgow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inverness
National importance of area		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In many respects the Clyde is a microcosm of the west of Scotland – with a diversity of habitats and species due to transition in topography and physical conditions ranging from sea lochs in the north to open sea in the south 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important marine features - deep water and enclosed waters close to shore, seascape e.g. Corryvreckan Important biodiversity e.g. Golden Eagles Mull Important cultural heritage e.g. Lord of the Isles, Kingdom of Dalriada Argyll would provide a wide diversity of experience for visitors 	
Collective and coherent identity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of the Inner Solway Firth marine SAC and cross-border river basin management under the Water Framework Directive would facilitate management of area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area already has Firth of Clyde Forum and SSMEI pilot Strong view from group that CMNP was different it has the potential to provide stable long-term funding (extra resources for economic development & regeneration potential), increased profile and statutory powers for integrated management Clyde was home of ship building, but maritime heritage also reflects the importance of sea for communication etc (from network of coastal fortifications to the history of the Clyde puffers – even the possibility of marketing/branding as ‘Para Handy’s Park!’) Importance of recreational resource - the ‘doon the watter’ migration of city population to coastal resorts (now greatly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the populated nature and lack of outstanding scenery and natural heritage the area inland of the Mull of Kintyre should be rejected Some discussion on whether Loch Fyne should be included. Even though sea lochs are important on the west coast all agreed that Loch Fyne is homogeneous and provides a much more terrestrial experience, outside the Mull of Kintyre will provide a more diverse and maritime experience. Loch Linnhe was discussed but rejected, as this provided more of a mountain experience. Crinan should be included as a “gateway”, a lot of yachts from the Clyde come through there to sail. Lochgilphead is a good gateway but has no ferry link to the sea 	

	Solway	Firth of Clyde	Argyll islands and coast	Lochaber and Skye
		faded and with huge potential to gain from park)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to split Argyll and Lochaber – but there is less of a link from Skye to Mull than there is from Mull to Islay and Jura. Skye is more linked to the Western Isles 	
Key management issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NP could ensure that natural heritage resources are managed consistently across the whole area e.g. Geese 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to absorb additional visitor pressures without damage to environment or communities Great potential for benefits arising from better management of (already heavy) recreational use Great potential for currently deprived areas to benefit from park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was some discussion on administration, and the boundary at the current interface of Argyll and Bute and Highland Council rejected. The National Park should cross a local authority boundary because this will provide a more balanced administration and spread added value. Its a very large area, crossing a LA boundary will be problematic but could add value to the area by this designation and provide more balanced management Conflicts - economic activity tourism, aquaculture, renewables, shipping Other issues litter, invasive species Infrastructure will have to be improved, toilets, car parks etc will be required and this will change the nature of the area We had the same concerns about increased numbers of visitors to the SAC but it didn't materialise A lot of Argyll is designated already, what added value will the CMNP provide? 	General advantage in crossing LA boundary (not too dominated by one authority view and more added value).
Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A75 and associated coastal roads facilitates access without the need for a major new road- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accessible particularly by sustainable public transport system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relatively good road access (not generally single track) and good ferry links to all the islands 	

	Solway	Firth of Clyde	Argyll islands and coast	Lochaber and Skye
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> building programme Side roads off this corridor would enable access to coastal communities and areas of natural or cultural heritage interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ease of access to Scottish population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mull already has good infrastructure for boat trips to visit wildlife Meets accessibility criteria but does it have the capacity to deal with increased numbers of visitors and will this have an effect on the area Access / transport needs improving roads Some of the coast and marine areas are exposed and remote 	
Social and economic benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scope for development of ecotourism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to develop ferry transport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area would be an incredible marketing opportunity for tourism from whisky on Islay to cultural heritage on Iona to geology on Staffa and wildlife on Mull Fragile islands depopulating How will the community be involved? Will private funding be attracted? Are these real benefits?; How will the results be calculated? 	
Possible areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smaller area would be nonsense from a natural heritage or management point of view Galloway coastline out to the median line with Ireland and England, but excluding Loch Ryan. The boundary here would extend due west from Milleur Point to the median line with Ireland. Loch Ryan should be excluded due to the intensity of shipping, ferry transport, and industrial regeneration going on NP should be named "Galloway" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whole Firth of Clyde (i.e. Mull of Kintyre to Loch Ryan, same as FCF boundary) No clear HQ base, possibly Arran Divisive to split Kintyre from rest of area, or to include Arran without Ayrshire coast (transport links), although Arran representatives would prefer this to being left out of any CMNP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The whole of Argyll is too large Scale of the Park should reflect management need – for example you will want to restrict visitors to some areas and encourage them in others Islay, Jura and Colonsay down to the bottom of the Mull of Kintyre and up to Mull, Coll and Tiree and North to the Small Isles ("Inner Hebrides" or "The Inner hebrides archipelago") Mull, Coll and Tiree, "obvious area for Park" Mull of Kintyre to the Small 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core area seen as SW Skye, Small Isles, Ardnamurchan and Mallaig / Morar coast. Larger area possibilities extend down into Argyll (Mull, Coll & Tiree), larger area including Islay and Jura ('Sea of the Hebrides') or up to include all of Skye and as far north as Cape Wrath and across Minch to include Western Isles & surrounding waters out to 6nm NP should be large enough and include enough people that local residents can counter-

	Solway	Firth of Clyde	Argyll islands and coast	Lochaber and Skye
	coast"		Isles including Mull, Coll and Tiree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mull of Kintyre to Loch Torridon. 	balance special interest views but smaller area would be easier to manage and gain consensus
Boundary considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inland limit could be based on where features could contribute added value to the National Park Inland limit should follow, approximately, the A75 from Stranraer to Kirkcudbright or Dalbeattie and then more minor coastal roads eastwards to Gretna 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inland boundaries – should vary according to circumstances, e.g. could be valid to incorporate the whole of an island (Arran), or on mainland coast it may only be valid to go inland by short distance (along parts of Ayrshire coast). Inland boundary would be influenced by: Density of population, Cultural artefacts/infrastructure, Density of development, Natural heritage features (coastal habitat such as dune etc) Islands – a general consensus that where there are islands should be wholly included in park, rather than just their coastal margin Peninsulas – a similar issue to islands. Where a park might include a peninsular area, preference was voiced for seas on both sides to be included rather than have a boundary that splits peninsula up the middle (e.g. Kintyre) Upper boundary – where to draw line in estuary. Clyde is tidal all the way up beyond city centre in Glasgow, so should it be there or Erskine bridge? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whole islands should be included and there should be buffer inland on the mainland - is there a geological feature or contour the inland mainland boundary could follow naturally? How about the A816? Is freshwater management relevant, should we include whole watersheds? These will be far too large and will include the top of mountains We could link the NSAs at Jura, Mull, and Lismore Whole islands should be included Mainland boundary should be a landscape / land use, or area "influenced by the sea" Seaward boundary to 12nm? No this is far to large, 3nm from the islands included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion that watershed works well for this west coast section (not too far inland). Coastal cells could be used for marine divisions Differing views on whether islands should be split or not; some felt including all Skye made NP too land focused whilst others felt split made no sense from socio-economic or environmental view Should Minch be included? Many felt yes, and W Isles out to 6nm limit beyond

TABLE 5 - NATIONAL STAKEHOLDER SEMINARS – SUMMARY OF COMMENTS MADE AT ‘AREA’ WORKSHOPS

	Western Isles-NW Coast	Orkney	Moray Firth	East Grampian Coast	South East Scotland
Workshops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inverness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inverness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inverness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inverness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Glasgow
National importance of area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group recognised that this has are has lots to recommend it in term of marine and coastal natural heritage 				
Collective and coherent identity				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character of the coastline is effectively split by Aberdeen, northwards the coastline is soft, southwards the coastline is a mixture of cliffs/deep water and sandy bays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Much more data needed to inform development of any specific proposals for this area (particular on shipping movements, port and harbour activities and associated industrial developments)
Key management issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CMNP may be able to protect those marine species or habitats that are under threat Communities which have been separated by local Authority boundaries may benefit from being brought back together within the new CMNP boundary Communities outwith the park boundary may need to have a different relationship with the CMNP than exists for those out with the terrestrial parks e.g. fishermen living outside the park will need to have a say in management The CMNP may be able to address coastal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tourism on Orkney mainland is already very highly developed, is there capacity to absorb more visitors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A NP could build on the existing Moray Firth Partnership (MFP) approach (statutory footing, resources and better buy-in from stakeholders particularly LAs) Community consultation a vital part of any boundary deliberations, MFP could be a vehicle to undertake this Implications of harbour and industrial interests restriction on further development etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to think about future environmental change A NP could build on the new ICZM initiative. This is concerned with marine spatial planning, but is also trying to increase the profile of coast locally and nationally through a ‘making the most of the coast’ initiative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there any added value here, surely the management pressures are being managed through the existing Firth initiatives? The area may need ICZM management but a National Park is not needed to deliver this Shipping movements and port development in area would effectively restrict any Park area, as these activities are not appropriate for inclusion with in a National Park No desire to split the individual Firths up or to supersede existing Forum arrangements

	Western Isles-NW Coast	Orkney	Moray Firth	East Grampian Coast	South East Scotland
	erosion, fragile socio-economics due to depopulation and transport issues				
Social and economic benefit		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some opportunity and benefit from the North Isles of Orkney. • The area is economically and socially fragile. Tourism and anything which provides additional support to maintain and improve transport infrastructure for residents is a benefit 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A NP could add value in terms of economic diversification into tourism, particular North of Aberdeen where the traditional fishing industry is in decline 	
Possible areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group did not specifically put forward proposals, although areas were discussed which would make sense in terms of coherence from Loch Maddy, Wester Ross, Western Isles and North Minch to the whole of the west coast 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scapa Flow ruled out due to possible impacts on future development of a container hub and the future of Flotta oil terminal • North Isles of Orkney suggested 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moray Firth Partnership area 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a general feeling of nervousness from the group about a Park in this area they feel that it would effectively freeze future options for major strategic development
Boundary considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas in which the geology, vegetation and human settlement are influenced by the sea should be included • Inland boundary is likely to be different in different places to take account of the character of the site chosen e.g. the whole of the Uists is influenced by the sea, this is not the case for Lewis and Harris 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inland boundary could look at contour lines and / or catchments • Is Inverness in or out, if the former where should the boundary be? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important marine features suggest a 12nm seaward boundary but requires much more detailed examination 	

Table 6 - National Stakeholder Seminars – summary of written comments made on evaluation forms

<p>Importance of local support for a future Park</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consent of the inhabitants of communities directly affected by the proposed Park • Should not be seen as a top down process. Ideally in this time of community empowerment ideas for areas must come from these on the ground. Build also on existing groups etc, that are in place • Traditionally calls for designation of National Parks is bottom up, so why is this top-down? Is it political pressure. Usually a National Park is designated as its characteristics as a special place are apparent and therefore require some designation to protect them. In this case, the exercise seems to be tackling this from the other way round – if no area is readily apparent as being worthy of designation then why seek to designate? Will the resulting National Park be truly worthy of designation? • Consultation with the area before it is designated • Also very little representation of the views of communities and general public. I would have liked to explore the criteria of a “coherent identity” more • Can we switch off the designation if it doesn’t work
<p>Approaches to Consultation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest clear ‘buy in’ from local community should be tested by local information (consultation before final decision on area is taken) • Close consultation at very local level before final criteria for operation of CMNP is confirmed • Early use of organisations such as the Nadair Trust to interact, network and communicate with local people, organisations and community groups. Any NP Authority will need significant local representation and it will never be too early to make a start on this highly important aspect • Despite full consultation not being planned at this stage, please try to engage a full range of views as far as possible • Details of communicating with Recreational interests i.e., yachting/sub aqua on stakeholder group • Our organisation is in support of a Park. Please keep informed
<p>Consideration of Areas/Boundaries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why does the Scottish Executive feel the need to designate another national park when it does not have any opinion as to where that designation might be? • Unable to identify areas until milestones/objectives etc are detailed • None of us were qualified to discuss the “scientific basis” or reasons to designate a Marine area • Possibly the preparation of a 2TI (zone of theoretical mobility) from Marine areas could be used at an additional constraint • Need clearer idea of extent coastal areas and how to determine what that extent should be • Definition of boundaries, definition of “coastal”. (how far inland etc) • The coastal element should not deflect the primary objective of better marine management. Also, in deciding on a landward boundary don’t contact this simply to take communities within the NP. The situation should be different from land based NPs of provision made for some NP benefits to be gained by settlements outside the park boundary but clearly influencing and being influenced by, the Marine and Coastal area within the Park • Very important to define the inner/inland boundary of any Marine National Park as there could easily be conflict with local authority boundaries • SNH should consider designating a larger area than just a single region. To spread the visit and look to cater for a diversity of

	<p>different interests, which might best be satisfied by zoning areas for different activities. Accessibility than a number of different entry hosts would be an advantage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To me, designating any section of the West Coast as “better” than other areas is iniquitous. The development of a balanced approach to development, lesson, sustainability and conservation should be applied to the whole area and not reserved for one section
Better information base essential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important that the underlying “mapping” is available to underpin the decision making process This is not to be a playground for the central belt, so do not exclude areas on distance criteria (distance from Central Belt). These days much of Scotland is accessible Give Ministers factual evidence – if there is more than one area suggested to Ministers You need more time to fully research this, especially the cultural/recreational aspect Development of methodologies for (all) subject areas is required to ensure a fair mapping exercise can be carried out Phase 1 Methodology for landscape and c. heritage ???? – perhaps a more in-depth study required for short listed areas. Look at folklore, ethnology, ‘expert witness’ archaeology patterns etc Please don’t forget the landscape and cultural heritage aspect The significance of cultural heritage for the decision process was hardly mentioned How was recreation and enjoyment was assessed in Phase 1. 5 blue flag award beaches & coastal golfing, St Andrews etc still Forth & Tay score so low (Estuary assessment minimises this as ignores Fife Coastline) Most of the workshop discussion was not centred around accessibility and what was going on in the marine environment . Access, 12 months per year is crucial, - do we want a park that is shut for six months per year?
Clarify relationship to existing and proposed initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to be one organisation in charge of Marine spatial management from top to bottom Please offer advice in the respect of UK. Initiatives on Marine Spatial Planning. Any messages must take account of sustainable long term outcomes for measuring the productivity of the sea Parks should be considered as part of an integrated approach to coastal and inshore activities. There seem to be many closely-related initiatives and there may be scope for stream timing Not clear how National Marine Park authority would interact with other marine management, particularly inshore fisheries management groups, fishing being one of the main authorities that could impinge on the aims of the park Consider using experience of voluntary marine SAC Groups and existing ICZM Groups
Clarify Park aims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over the pristine areas in the West which currently have very little built development. So greater clarity about the rationale for the park needs to be given I think SNH should put more emphasis on biodiversity restoration and sustainable management. I appreciate that this is only one of the form aims stipulated, as it is the one which provides the basic natural resource which underpins all the others, it is important to stress its predominance when considering competing pressures The many comments implying that environmental issues were not the top priority left me wondering whether a more built-up, developed area should be chosen e.g. Grampian or Invergordon area A degree of marine conservation , but not full policy Remain very concerned about interpretation of principles of a Marine National Park vis-à-vis the fragile communities requiring development to achieve security/prospects

<p>Clarify Park implications for existing activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wind farms must be controlled to save wildlife • No backtrack on sustainable fisheries, i.e., big boats out! • Lack of (as usual) on how unsustainable fishing methods & environmentally damaging methods would be curbed • Without M.P.As and networks of H.P.M.P.A CNTZs) a marine national park would be a waste of yours and my time • attitude to zoning fish stock protection reg. Are protected nursery areas to help build fish stocks likely to be a considered desirable feature of a National Marine Park • How would it help to attain a sustainable fishing industry. HARD Questions, nobody -SNH or SEERAD are getting to grips with • For SNH to take full recognition of the possible effects on Ports/Harbours, which fall within the proposed areas, and to clearly define any possible restraints to already heavily regulated port activities. I would welcome feedback on this and any benefits to Ports that could be defined • Rules & Regulations in retention to a Marine National Park re: development, oil, renewables – interconnector, wave and tidal power? • If you apply conservation on the basis of providing diversity and maintaining species then you will attract wildlife tourists, anglers and kayakers • The aspect of a NP being non prescriptive can not be highlighted enough. Business still seem to believe this is the case and the workshop format allows these businesses to dominate opinion. Existing infrastructure is something to build on, not to weaken the argument for a N Park • Expect National Park to be a “model” for the new Access legislation which could be copied by other areas
<p>More information required on</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding - If the area includes a number of Islands then these will be a need to set aside resources to improve ferry services to allow increased visitor numbers. Also if a fragile Island, reserves will be required to support Island • Marine influence on coastal habitats and vegetation • Powers & responsibilities for NPA, potential constraints, impact on existing designations/activities party where considered contrary to CMNP aims (e.g. MOD activities?) Where would CMNP leave ICZM? CNES has a range of questions which it may yet wish an opportunity to discuss with SNH • Structure and governance of a Park • What the actual powers of the Park Authority will be, and of any possible conflict with powers already held by Port authorities • Licences Ports apply for, for dredging and disposal of dredged ????, harbour expansion/developments • marine interest and one hot spot of biodiversity might relate to another • A write up of today’s discussions and further updates on process • Info about any research opportunities arising for investigating issues of location or management of marine parks. • SNH to contrive to provide full information on reasoning, conclusions on assessment. Web-site most effective • Experiences and views of (non tourist related) business community in existing National Parks • More about the benefits it could bring to the area (as well as drawbacks) and what it actually involves
<p>Support Indicated for specific areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argyll Coast and Islands (12); Lochaber and Skye (7), Firth of Clyde (4), Moray Firth (4). Western Isles (3), Shetland, Solway, North West Coast (1)