

INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING
THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATIONS PROCEDURE) RULES 2010
THE THANET EXTENSION OFFSHORE WIND FARM ORDER

Comments on any additional information/ submissions received by Deadline 4, 4B and 4C and comments on SEZ Material Change Consultation submitted on behalf of the Port of London Authority and Estuary Services Limited

Unique Reference Number	EN010084
Document Ref.	PLA 18 / ESL 18
Author	Winckworth Sherwood LLP
Date	29 April 2019

Minerva House
5 Montague Close
London
SE1 9BB
DX: 156810 London Bridge 6

T 020 7593 5000
F 020 7593 5099

www.wslaw.co.uk

Winckworth
Sherwood

**Solicitors and
Parliamentary Agents**

Submission to the ExA of comments on the SEZ Material Change application and related documents submitted at D4 and D4B by IPs and OPs already within the Examination	
PLA/ESL comments	The PLA and ESL's comments on the SEZ Material Change application are set out in their Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH8. The PLA and ESL will respond to the Applicant's SEZ Material Change consultation by the Applicant's consultation deadline of 26 May. The PLA and ESL's response will be consistent with their submissions made at Deadline 4 and subsequent deadlines.
Comments on Applicant's Appendix 2 submitted at Deadline 4C: Shipping and Navigation – Statement of Evidence	
Paragraph(s)	Comment
26-28	The additional data referred to was in the form of AIS or Succorfish data. Recreational vehicles do not tend to carry AIS equipment, so the additional data does not accurately capture the increase in recreational vessels that occurs in the peak summer period of August. Therefore the data still relies on on-site summer monitoring which was done in June rather than in August; August is the busiest time for recreational traffic and therefore would be the reliable month on which to base the assessment for and risks to recreational vehicles.
33-34	The 1 mile buffer is in relation to boarding and landing operations specifically. Only having the 2 miles plus one mile buffer at the NE Spit area will not give ESL the flexibility required to undertake transfers in the full range of MetOcean and traffic conditions that they would normally expect to encounter on a regular basis.
36	The max safe sea-room has been calculated based on a standard turning circle with an allowance for the pilot transfer time, but does not make any allowance for non-standard situations which may occur as a result of traffic conflicts of emergency scenarios, which is why the additional buffer zone of 1 mile is critical.

51	<p>Concern over the CRM was not only in the results, but that it was based on one month's data for December, and that month was the lowest in a 12 month period in terms of the number of vessels using the NE Spit pilot stations. There would also have been lower than average number of recreational vessels, as it was winter data.</p>
107	<p>The four recommended additional risk control measures (para 107 of the amended NRA) include two that are also embedded risk controls (being promulgation of information and optimisation of the orientation of the TEOW). The two additional mitigation measures proposed are moving buoys and the shipping liaison plan. As for the moving buoys, 'aids to navigation management' is also an embedded control so it is not clear what benefit these would add, and the shipping liaison plan is still in the early stages of drafting by the Applicant and has yet to be agreed, so it is unclear to what extent, if any, it will reduce the risks to navigation. In any event, the controls which the Applicant proposes would still cause adverse impacts to the PLA and ESL from an operational perspective, and the Applicant further proposes that they would be implemented by the PLA, ESL and other IPs and the expense of the latter group, rather than the Applicant. For these reasons, the PLA and ESL do not consider the Applicant's proposed mitigation to be adequate.</p>
114-115	<p>These paragraphs do not seem to take account of the Tongue Deep Water Diamond and the fact it will have to be moved (see response to Action point 17).</p> <p>In the NRA the Applicant did not recommend relocating the pilot station due to the disproportionate cost/benefit of doing so, but has provided no evidence as to what the relative cost or benefits of that relocation would be.</p> <p>Paragraph 115 recommending mitigation 'further north' of the diamond is too vague as to be of any meaningful benefit.</p>
117-123	<p>The inshore route was used by the vessels listed in table 2 due to poor weather. All 7 of these voyages took place during periods of poor sea conditions at which time the Sunk Pilot Station was off-station. The use of inshore route provided sufficient shelter to enable boarding and landing operations to continue and therefore for the ports to remain open to all traffic. For 5 of the voyages ESL was operating a restricted service so these vessels would not have been able to go round the outside and use the Tongue or dip down to a position to the north of the NE Spit diamond.</p> <p>Between December 2017 and November 2018 the NE Spit (including Tongue, NE Goodwin etc) was off station on 17 separate calendar days. During the same period the Sunk was off station on 35 separate days. With the extension in</p>

	place ESL would lose the flexibility to operate outside of the identified 2 mile circle north of the NE Spit diamond, which they require to continue operations in poor weather, when other boarding and landing areas are no longer viable.
--	--

Winckworth Sherwood LLP
Solicitors and Parliamentary Agents
On behalf of the Port of London Authority and Estuary Services Limited
29 April 2019