

Response ID ANON-PUHC-43Z2-3

Submitted to Call for evidence – gear-feature interactions in marine protected areas - Stage 3

Submitted on 2023-03-28 12:09:50

1. Confidentiality

1 Would you like your response to be confidential?

No

If you answered Yes to this question, please give your reason.:

2. About you

1 What is your name?

Name:

Robert Yorke

2 What is your email address?

Email:

robert.yorke@btinternet.com

3 Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation (please detail which organisation)?

Organisation:

Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee

3. Bottom towed gear

1 Do you have any additional evidence about the interactions of bottom towed gear and MPA seabed features?

Yes

Please respond:

The Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee are very pleased to have the opportunity to respond to this consultation.

As a general principle of supporting initiatives that aim to increase the health of the seas and any resulting biodiversity, we fully support the introduction of the relevant byelaws and measures that will prevent fishing gear damaging a potentially fragile ecology. We support the introduction of the relevant bylaw for each site.

Underwater cultural heritage (UCH) in our waters is unique, irreplaceable, and at risk of damage from bottom towed gear. Much of it is undiscovered. Any wreck or drowned prehistoric landscape can provide an array of evidence for so many human behaviours, from Early Human migration to war at sea and the changes in technology that affect our current way of life.

Exposed shipwrecks, or other drowned structures, can provide shelter and safe breeding grounds for marine species, including demersal fish and colonising marine life. A single shipwreck will have more than one habitat with light, darkness, sheltered and high energy mini-environments suited to a variety of marine life.

Since much of our UCH is currently undiscovered, the protection given by these byelaws to known and unknown sites is welcome.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to draw your attention to the presence of our hidden underwater cultural heritage

2 Do you agree with the MMO analysis of the available evidence provided in the bottom towed gear impacts evidence document?

Yes

Please respond:

3 Further information

Optional:

No file uploaded

4. Anchored nets and lines

1 Do you have any additional evidence about the interactions of anchored nets and lines and MPA seabed features?

Yes

Please respond:

The Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee are very pleased to have the opportunity to respond to this consultation.

As a general principle of supporting initiatives that aim to increase the health of the seas and any resulting biodiversity, we fully support the introduction of the relevant byelaws and measures that will prevent fishing gear damaging a potentially fragile ecology. We support the introduction of the relevant bylaw for each site.

Underwater cultural heritage (UCH) in our waters is unique, irreplaceable, and at risk of damage from anchored nets and lines. Much of it is undiscovered. Any wreck or drowned prehistoric landscape can provide an array of evidence for so many human behaviours, from Early Human migration to war at sea and the changes in technology that affect our current way of life.

Exposed shipwrecks, or other drowned structures, can provide shelter and safe breeding grounds for marine species, including demersal fish and colonising marine life. A single shipwreck will have more than one habitat with light, darkness, sheltered and high energy mini-environments suited to a variety of marine life.

Since much of our UCH is currently undiscovered, the protection given by these byelaws to known and unknown sites is welcome.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to draw your attention to the presence of our hidden underwater cultural heritage

2 Do you agree with the MMO analysis of the available evidence provided in the anchored nets and lines impacts evidence document?

Yes

Please respond:

3 Further information

Optional:

No file uploaded

5. Traps

1 Do you have any additional evidence about the interactions of traps and MPA seabed features?

Yes

Please respond:

The Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee are very pleased to have the opportunity to respond to this consultation.

As a general principle of supporting initiatives that aim to increase the health of the seas and any resulting biodiversity, we fully support the introduction of the relevant byelaws and measures that will prevent fishing gear damaging a potentially fragile ecology. We support the introduction of the relevant bylaw for each site.

Underwater cultural heritage (UCH) in our waters is unique, irreplaceable, and at risk of damage from traps. Members of the Sussex Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority have experience of a small cannon from an historic wreck being caught in the lines of a string of lobster pots and being hauled to the surface, thereby damaging the wreck.

Much of our UCH is undiscovered. Any wreck or drowned prehistoric landscape can provide an array of evidence for so many human behaviours, from Early Human migration to war at sea and the changes in technology that affect our current way of life.

Exposed shipwrecks, or other drowned structures, can provide shelter and safe breeding grounds for marine species, including demersal fish and colonising marine life. A single shipwreck will have more than one habitat with light, darkness, sheltered and high energy mini-environments suited to a variety of marine life.

Since much of our UCH is currently undiscovered, the protection given by these byelaws to known and unknown sites is welcome.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to draw your attention to the presence of our hidden underwater cultural heritage

2 Do you agree with the MMO analysis of the available evidence provided in the traps impacts evidence document?

Yes

Please respond:

3 Further information

Optional:
No file uploaded

6. All Gears

1 Do you have any additional evidence about the interactions of fishing gear and MPA seabed features?

Not Answered

Please respond:

2 Do you agree with the MMO analysis of the available evidence provided in each gear document?

Please respond:

Not Answered

3 Further Information

Optional:
No file uploaded

17. Feedback on the online survey

1 Overall, how satisfied are you with our online consultation tool?

Satisfied

2 Please give us any comments you have on the tool, including suggestions on how we could improve it.

Please give us any comments you have on the tool, including suggestions on how we could improve it:

3 How did you hear about this consultation?

Word of mouth

If other, please provide details: