

Question No.	Responsible	Question	Response
Q3.21.1.1	Perenco	<p>Impact of existing turbines The Applicant's Waveney Helicopter Access Supplementary Analysis [REP4-039, Paragraph 31] states that the current Dudgeon wind farm is within 3nm of Waveney, with the closest turbine 2.7nm away. Do you agree that this means that the proposal of DEP would have no difference on night flights as the CAA restrictions would already be imposed?</p>	Perenco confirms that one of the Dudgeon windfarm turbines is 2.7nm from the Waveney platform. Should the CAA impose the anticipated new rules for flying in proximity to windfarms, unless a dispensation were granted by CAA, night flights would not be permitted to an installation at Waveney with a suitably rated helideck. Without such a dispensation it is correct to state that DEP would introduce no further restrictions to night flights.
Q3.21.1.2	Perenco	<p>CAA dispensation The Applicant has suggested that there may be CAA dispensation to allow for night flights from certain directions, such as with decommissioning of the platform. Provide comment on this?</p>	Perenco believes that the CAA is highly likely to provide a dispensation in respect of the one Dudgeon windfarm turbine within 3nm. With such a dispensation, night time visual approaches prior to construction of DEP may still need to be restricted to when winds are from a southerly direction (i.e. approach is from a northerly arc.)
Q3.21.1.3	Perenco Applicant	<p>IMC Access For clarity, would there be any possible day IMC access to Waveney platform if DEP was constructed with the 1nm buffer?</p>	Perenco does not consider that this is possible.
Q3.21.1.4	Perenco Applicant	<p>One Engine Inoperative Take Off Condition The Applicant states that their temperature and pressure assumptions are sufficiently conservative, whilst Perenco's are excessively conservative. Notwithstanding this difference, if the final wind turbine layout is similar to the indicative drawings provided, the One Engine Inoperative take-off distance required will not reduce helicopter access [REP4-039, Paragraph 15].</p> <p>a) Perenco, confirm whether you agree with Applicant that with the indicative layout there would be no required reduction in helicopter access?</p> <p>b) Perenco and Applicant, if based on the indicative drawings the One Engine Inoperative take-off distance required would not reduce helicopter access, what would be the consequence if there was a final change to the layout from these indicative drawings in the area of the Waveney Platform?</p>	Perenco response: a) Perenco confirm that the indicative layout would permit helicopter operations with limited (but not no) reduction in helicopter access. b) If changes were made to the 'indicative' wind farm array layouts, this could make the Waveney platform inaccessible by helicopter under the majority or all weather conditions.
Q3.21.1.5	Perenco	<p>Night flights from Norwich Airport How would Norwich Airport opening times effect future night flights to a supporting rig at Waveney?</p>	Night flights (i.e. flights when it is not daylight) could occur within Norwich airport operating hours through most of the year. See comparative table for detailed information.

Q3.21.1.6	Perenco	<p>Comparative tables of information regarding helicopter access</p> <p>To ensure a full understanding of the differences and agreements between the parties, please each provide a set of tables setting out Day VMC, IMC and No Fly Conditions, based on the agreed datasets for the last few years. This should be done with one set of tables applying the CAA Draft Limits, with and without DEP, and another based on current CAA limits and restrictions, with and without DEP. When setting out the figures based on DEP being in place, please use the 1nm buffer as proposed by the Applicant.</p>	See Table submitted as a separate document
Q3.21.1.7	Applicant	<p>Access to Waveney</p> <p>Perenco states that if there is a turbine within 1.34nm of Waveney platform then access would only be from the east or west and concludes that access flight times available to Waveney NUI as a proportion of the current status would be low [REP4-050, Figure 3]. Respond to this and explain whether this could be overcome with the final wind turbine layout?</p>	Not for Perenco
Q3.21.1.8	Applicant	<p>Robustness of Assessment</p> <p>Perenco has claimed that a simple count of all daylight times when visual flight rules apply does not represent the proportion of helicopter operations that will be unaffected. Has the Applicant undertaken a robust enough assessment taking into account all relevant factors as reasonably possible, such as those set out in Perenco's submission [REP4-050]?</p>	Not for Perenco
Q3.21.1.9	Perenco Applicant	<p>Joint Statement</p> <p>Provide a joint statement from both parties to set out what is a mutually agreeable position for helicopter access to Waveney, and how that can be secured in the dDCO.</p>	Perenco is working with the Applicant to try to establish a mutually agreeable position that could be secured in the dDCO. Meetings have taken place. The Applicant has been provided an economic impact analysis from Perenco which has been submitted to the Examiners as a separate document along with these answers to the Examiners' written questions.
Q3.21.1.10	Independent Oil & Gas	<p>Blythe and Elgood</p> <p>Is Independent Oil and Gas content that the Proposed Development at DEP would not significantly impinge on operations at its assets in this area, such as through restricting helicopter or sea vessel access?</p>	Not for Perenco