



Maritime &  
Coastguard  
Agency

The Planning Inspectorate  
National Infrastructure Planning  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

Bay 2/25  
Spring Place  
105 Commercial Road  
Southampton  
SO15 1EG  
UK

Tel: +44 (0)20 3817 2426  
[REDACTED]

E-mail: Helen.Croxson@mcga.gov.uk

Your ref: EN010077  
Our ref: 20024013 EA1N/EA2

2<sup>nd</sup> November 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

**Application by East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two Offshore Windfarms**

**The Examining Authority's first Written Questions and requests for information (ExQ1) at Deadline 1.**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Examining Authority's first written questions and requests for information(ExA Q1) at Deadline 1.

The Maritime and Coastguard Agency's (MCA) remit for offshore renewable energy development is to ensure that safety of navigation is preserved, and our search and rescue capability is maintained, whilst progress is made towards government targets for renewable energy.

Responses to MCA's questions can be found in the attached table.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Helen Croxson  
OREI Advisor  
Maritime and Coastguard Agency



HM Coastguard

Examining Authority's First Written Questions and Request for Information (ExQs1)

In response to the Examination Authority's first written questions and request for information issued on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020, the MCA would like to comment as follows

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Response from MCA
1.12 Marine Effects			
Q1.12.2	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	<p><b>Effects on shipping and navigation, search and rescue</b></p> <p>The Maritime and Coastguard Agency RRs [RR-053] identify the potential for further comments and correspondence in response to the ExA's Rule 9 Letter of 21 May 2020 [AS-058] does not set out or rule out further comments. Please ensure that any substantive observations on shipping, navigational risk or search and rescue are made in your WRs at Deadline 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide best progress on and justifications for any amended dDCO drafting sought (see draft SoCG [AS-051] (ID MMO-005)).</li> </ul>	<p>Based on the agreements reached through the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) to date, the MCA has no further substantive observations on shipping, navigational risk or search and rescue since our Relevant Representation (RR).</p> <p>This is on the understanding that our requirements are suitably addressed through the Development Consent Order (DCO) and its Deemed Marine Licence (DML). To date, there are a number of items to be addressed in the draft DCO/DML and we have not yet seen the revised version to be satisfied that the impact on shipping and navigation has been addressed through suitably worded conditions of consent.</p> <p>We understand the revised draft DCO/DML will be submitted at deadline 3.</p> <p>The MCA would like to add that it supports the MMO's position with regards to Arbitration.</p>

<p>Q1.12.3.</p>	<p>Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA)</p>	<p><b>Application of Marine Guidance Notes and related documents</b></p> <p>What (if any) are the as yet undocumented implications of the proposed development arising from:</p> <p>a) Marine Guidance Note (MGN) [543] Safety of Navigation: Offshore Renewable Energy Installations (OREIs) – Guidance on UK Navigational Practice, Safety and Emergency Response and its annexes;</p> <p>b) Marine Guidance Note (MGN) [372] Safety of Navigation; Guidance to Mariners operating in the vicinity of UK OREIs; and</p> <p>c) Methodology for Assessing the Marine Navigational Safety and Emergency Response Risks of Offshore Renewable Energy Installations?</p> <p>d) Please document any substantive amendments to the proposed development that you seek to respond to these documents, identify why are they required and how these should be secured?</p>	<p>The MCA expects all OREIs to be assessed in accordance with MGN 543 and its annexes. There is currently one outstanding aspect on MGN 543 regarding the submission of Hydrographic Survey data to the MCA. However, this is being addressed between MCA and the applicant as per SoCG and we expect to close this by deadline 3.</p> <p>The other outstanding aspect is ensuring the MCA's requirements for shipping and navigation are adequately secured through condition of consent in the DCO/DML.</p>
-----------------	---	---	--

1.12.4.	Maritime and Coastguard Agency, Trinity House	<p><b>Ro-ro operations</b></p> <p>Do you have any observations on the position of the CLdN Group on navigational safety effects for ro-ro operations [RR-026] or the Applicants' responses to those [AS-036]?</p>	<p>The MCA has considered RR-026 and the Applicants' responses to those comments [AS-036]. The MCA agrees with the comments made by CLdN and we are content with the risk mitigation measures the applicant is putting in place. However, we are yet to see the revised DCO/DML incorporating all of our requirements, and to see how the risk mitigation measures have been secured through the wording in the DCO/DML.</p> <p>The MCA would like to ensure that any route deviation or impact on Ro-Ro ferries is adequately addressed through consultation with those affected and considered in the NRA. We understand from the RR from CLdN Group that they have been consulted about the project by the applicant and they consider that there should be no impact on its operations. We believe they are seeking reassurance that the mitigation measures identified, to bring the risk to ALARP, are suitably secured through the DCO/DML – which we fully agree and support.</p>
1.12.5	Maritime and Coastguard Agency, Trinity House	<p><b>Individual project effects: shipping and navigation</b></p> <p>Please identify whether there are any outstanding shipping and navigation effects that bear only on the proposed development for East Anglia ONE North?</p>	<p>There are no issues from MCA's perspective that we wish to raise. Stakeholder agreement in the hazard log and risk controls measures, as part of the formal safety assessment outlined in MGN 543, is a key requirement for the MCA. We are not aware of any significant issues raised that bear only on the proposed development for East Anglia ONE North, which MCA needs to highlight here.</p>

1.12.6.	Maritime and Coastguard Agency, Trinity House	<b>Individual project effects: shipping and navigation</b>  Please identify whether there are any outstanding shipping and navigation effects that bear only on the proposed development for East Anglia TWO?	There are no issues from MCA's perspective that we wish to raise. Stakeholder agreement in the hazard log and risk controls measures is a key requirement for the MCA and we are not aware of any significant issues raised that bear only on the proposed development for East Anglia TWO, which MCA needs to highlight here.
---------	--	---	--