CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Do you agree with the proposals set out in the draft Scottish Marine Regions Order 2013?

Yes ☐ No ☒

If no, please explain why not and your suggested alternative(s).

The Tay Estuary Forum Steering Group members wish to highlight the individuality of the Tay region, and are concerned that inclusion into a wider SE Region, may lead to TEF regional issues becoming secondary to those in the Forth, as the larger, more industrialised and urbanised Firth, nearer to Parliament and civil servants based in Edinburgh.

The creation of the TEF in 1997 also reflects the individuality of the Tay Estuary Forum and its members, as the Partnership itself was initially set up by its own Steering Group members in response to a perceived "gap" between other existing Partnerships, and not at the request of SNH. The University of Dundee offered to host the Partnership, which is unique amongst the Local Coastal Partnership network, but which has provided the TEF with an identity of "honest-broker", which we have continued to retain.

We believe that there is a strong case to be made for a boundary/ distinction at Fife Ness. Whilst we have no objections to the proposed northern boundary coordinates of the "SE Region", we would opt for a southern boundary which maps more closely onto that of TAYplan, the Strategic Planning Authority for Dundee, Perth & Kinross, Angus and North Fife; and the River Basins under the Water Framework Directive, where there are separate AAGs and sub-basin plans for the Forth and the Tay.

Furthermore, the Coastal Cells of Scotland report, (H.R. Wallingford, Ltd. 1997) clearly illustrates that Fife Ness is a key physical processes boundary and as such is a sediment cell division.

We also note that with the revision of the Inshore Fisheries Groups, the SE Region no longer aligns with that boundary either.

2. Do you have any further comments? In particular we are seeking views on

- the drafting of the Order;
- the co-ordinates establishing the marine region boundaries;
- the boundaries outlined at paragraph 8 above;
- the names of the regions suggested; and
- the illustrative map.

As an alternative to “South East” Region, we propose calling the area “Tay-Forth” which more clearly aligns the region with its major Firths. The generic term “South East” does not promote a sense of identity, unlike most of the other planned Scottish Marine Regions, such as “Moray”, “Clyde”, “Argyll” and so on.

Incorporation of the current TEF region into a wider SE Region would not best serve to preserve the quality of the Tay Estuary and adjacent coast, which hosts uniquely important habitats, physical environments and recreational assets. We wish to make it clear that the Tay is an important region, in its own right, in terms of ecology, physical processes and geology, catchment size and character, socio-economics and culture.

3. Do you believe that the creation of Scottish Marine Regions discriminates disproportionately between persons defined by age, disability, sexual orientation, gender, race and religion and belief?

Yes ☐ No ☐

4. If you answered yes to question 3 in what way do you believe that the creation of Scottish Marine Regions is discriminatory?

n/a