

This consultation questionnaire sets out the consultation questions from within the relevant sections of the Planning Issues and Options Paper. Your views are sought on the proposed policies, and where appropriate, alternative policy approaches, as set out in section 11 and section 12 of the paper. Please insert your response to the questions and proposed policy options in the text boxes provided.

WHEN MAKING COMMENTS IN RELATION TO SPECIFIC SECTIONS OF THE PLANNING ISSUES AND OPTIONS PAPER, IT WOULD HELP IF YOU COULD QUOTE THE RELEVANT PARAGRAPH NUMBER(S), IF APPROPRIATE, SO WE CAN CLEARLY UNDERSTAND YOUR COMMENTS.

Section 4 - Legal and policy context

Question 1: Are there other legislation, policies or plans not identified in Table 4.1 and Annex 3 that should be considered in the development of the Pilot Pentland Firth and Orkney Waters Marine Spatial Plan?

Comments

Section 5 - Knowledge and evidence to underpin the plan

Question 2: Is there other information that you think should be used to inform the development of the marine spatial plan for Pentland Firth and Orkney Waters?

Comments RISK TO DIVING SEA ARMS & SPECIAL IMPORTANCE OF NESTING PEREGRINES ON DUNNET HEAD.

Section 6 - The purpose, users, status and spatial extent of the pilot plan

Question 3: Considering paragraph 6.5, are there other stakeholder engagement and governance related issues that should be investigated through the pilot marine planning process?

Comments RSPB, CAITHNESS BIODIVERSITY GROUP, WHALE + DOLPHIN CONSERVATION

Question 4: Do you agree with the identified purposes and users of the marine spatial plan set out in Section 6? Are there additional or alternative purposes or users of the plan that should be considered?

Comments RSPB, CAITHNESS BIODIVERSITY, WHALE + DOLPHIN CONSERVATION

Question 5: Should the existing Pilot Pentland Firth and Orkney Waters Marine Spatial Plan boundary be realigned with the boundaries of the proposed Scottish Marine Regions or do you think the existing 'strategic area' boundary is appropriate? (Refer to Figures 5 and 6)

INAPPROPRIATE

Question 6: How should the pilot plan and/or marine planning process facilitate and support integration between the terrestrial and marine planning systems? (See paragraphs 6.16 – 6.17).

Comments

Question 7: How should the adjoining terrestrial areas be mapped in the pilot marine spatial plan? Do you agree with the proposed key principles set out at paragraph 6.18?

Comments

Section 7 The guiding principles and themes that will inform the development of the marine spatial plan

Question 8: Are the guiding principles and themes identified in Section 7 appropriate? Are there other guiding principles and themes that should inform the development of the pilot marine spatial plan?

Comments IT WILL DESTROY THE NATURAL HABITAT AND THE VIEWS OF THE NORTH EAST COAST

Section 8 Strategic Vision, Aims and Objectives

Question 9: What is your vision for the future of the Pentland Firth and Orkney waters area? What would you like the area to be like in 20 years time?

Comments WINDFARMS ESPECIALLY WILL DESTROY THE NORTH EAST FOR VERY LITTLE BENEFIT & TO THE DETRIMENT OF HEALTH & WELLBEING FOR MANY NATURE

Question 10: Are there existing marine activities that you think should be safeguarded now and into the future? For example, commercial fisheries, ferry services and recreational activities.

Comments YES ALL OF THESE

Question 11a: How should the protection and/or enhancement of the natural environment be considered in the marine spatial plan?

Comments PRESERVE & DO NOT INTERFERE WITH THE WILDNESS WHICH HAS RECOVERED AFTER 2 WORLD WARS

Please indicate on a scale of 1-5 (1 = Not important at all, 5 = The highest importance)

1 2 3 4 5

Question 12a: How should the protection and/or enhancement of historic and culture resources (e.g. Scapa Flow wrecks) be considered in the marine spatial plan?

Comments STROMA SHOULD BE PRESERVED - AS ICONIC AS SE. KILDA

Question 12b: Is the protection of the historic and culture environment important? How important is it?

Please indicate on a scale of 1-5 (1 = Not important at all, 5 = The highest importance)

1 2 3 4 5

Question 13a: How should the promotion and support of economic growth be considered in the marine spatial plan? If any, which economic activities would you like to see grow and develop?

Comments TIDAL & WAVE POWER PERHAPS - DEPENDS ON DAMAGE TO ENVIRONMENT.

Question 13b: Is promoting and supporting economic growth important?

Please indicate on a scale of 1-5 (1 = Not important at all, 5 = The highest importance)

1 2 3 4 5

Section 9 Identifying strategic issues and interactions

Question 14: Having considered Table 9.1, do you have any views on the identified aspirations for growth, strategic issues and opportunities to address the strategic issues in the pilot marine spatial plan?

Comments at Dunnet Head will DESTROY ITS UNIQUE CULTURAL HERITAGE & NATURE

Question 15: Having considered Table 9.2, do you have any views on the identified potential for interaction between the various sectors, what these interactions might be and how these interactions should be addressed in the pilot marine spatial plan?

Comments PROMOTION OF ARCHAEOLOGY & OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH BEFORE INFRASTRUCTURE IS URGENTLY NEEDED. DEVELOPMENT TOO FAST.

Section 10 Spatial strategy and information

Question 16: Do you think it is important to have an overarching spatial strategy? If so, what should the strategy include and why?

Comments YES. THE SKY, THE LAND, THE SPACE, THE PEACE
DUNNET HEAD & DUNLAWBY HEAD SHOULD BE PRESERVED

Section 11 Crosscutting or overarching marine planning policies

This section of the Consultation Questionnaire seeks your views on the proposed policy options set out in Section 11 of the Planning Issues and Options Paper. Please indicate in the proposed policy option response boxes below which proposed policy you are commenting on and provide any comments on the preferred option and/or alternative approach, as appropriate. The proposed policies are:

- Proposed Policy 1a: Sustainable Development
- Proposed Policy 2a: Integrating marine and coastal development
- Proposed Policy 3a: Nature conservation designations
- Proposed Policy 3b: Protected species
- Proposed Policy 3c: Wider biodiversity and geodiversity interests
- Proposed Policy 3d: Non-native species
- Proposed Policy 3e: Landscape and seascape
- Proposed Policy 4a: Cultural and Historic Environment
- Proposed Policy 5a: Water environment
- Proposed Policy 6a: Coastal erosion and flooding
- Proposed Policy 7a: Waste management and marine litter
- Proposed Policy 8a: Safeguarding existing pipelines, electricity and telecommunications cables
- Proposed Policy 9a: Hazardous development and Health and Safety Executive consultation zones
- Proposed Policy 10a: Defence

Proposed Policy Options - Response Box 1

Please indicate which proposed policy you are commenting on:

Comments 3a, 3b, 3c, 3e, 4a 1a. 1a

Would you suggest an alternative approach?

Comments LIMITED DEVELOPMENT + MORE RESEARCH
PREFERRED OPTION.

Proposed Policy Options - Response Box 2

Please indicate which proposed policy you are commenting on:

Comments DUNNET HEAD FROM BRUGH SHOULD BE
3A + B DESIGNATED SSSI TO PROTECT IT.

Please provide your comments on the proposed preferred option and/or alternative approach:

Comments

Would you suggest an alternative approach?

Comments

Proposed Policy Options - Response Box 3

Please indicate which proposed policy you are commenting on:

Comments 3A + 3B DUNNET HEAD + DUNCANSBY HEAD +
ROAD FROM BRUGH - SHOULD BE DESIGNATED SSSI

Please provide your comments on the proposed preferred option and/or alternative approach:

Comments SEA SCAPE + LANDSCAPE N.E COAST IS
VITAL + SHOULD NOT BE CHANGED.

Would you suggest an alternative approach?

Comments DUNNET HEAD + DUNCANSBY HEAD PRESERVED
FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. NO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Proposed Policy Options - Response Box 4

Please indicate which proposed policy you are commenting on:

Comments *PREFERRED + PROPOSED*

Please provide your comments on the proposed preferred option and/or alternative approach:

Comments *MORE ATTENTION TO NEOLITHIC SITES IN CAITHNESS*

Would you suggest an alternative approach?

Comments *CAITHNESS TO BE CONSIDERED EQUALLY IMPORTANT AS ORKNEY + EQUAL ATTENTION TO ARCHAEOLOGY*

Proposed Policy Options - Response Box 5

Please indicate which proposed policy you are commenting on:

Comments

Please provide your comments on the proposed preferred option and/or alternative approach:

Comments

Would you suggest an alternative approach?

Comments

Should you wish to respond to further proposed policy options please provide your response on an addition page(s) and submit with your completed Consultation Questionnaire.

Further crosscutting / overarching policy areas

Question 17: Are there other crosscutting / overarching policy areas that should be addressed in the marine spatial plan?