

ABP Response to ExQ1 (NLGEP)

Question	Notes	Title	Content	Proposed Response
Q7.0.13		Protective Provisions	Please consider whether it is necessary to provide Protective provisions for ABP as port and navigation authority. If they are not regarded as necessary, please provide a brief explanation	A protected provision will not be required as the current wharf infrastructure, as in operation currently, will not be amended/alterd as part of the works authorised by this DCO. The impact is understood to be the potential for more vessel arrivals at the berth which can be managed as necessary by ABP under existing processes and procedures for vessels accessing and using the Humber Estuary and Trent waterways.
Q7.1.26		Certification of Plans Article 44	(i) Should this include the Design and Access Statement (DAS) and Navigation Risk Assessment (NRA)? (ii) If the DAS or NRA are not included, please provide an explanation how the design considerations and navigation risks considered will be secured	Navigational risks need to be reviewed as part of the examination process but as the wharf infrastructure itself is unaffected by works authorised by the DCO, and as the applicant has agreed that existing rules and processes with regard to vessel arrivals and departures (and as administered by HES) will be respected, we do not envisage a need for NRA to form part of the Article 44 process. However, please note that the applicant will not be allowed to deviate away from current maximum vessel dimensions and ship type currently in operation at the Wharf.
Q10.1.3	ABP (ii) only	Requirement 5	(ii) Do you regard the current wording would achieve an appropriate method of ensuring a balance between operational safety and protection of amenity? Please explain your response to (ii) by setting out how you have	Our understanding is that Flixborough Wharf's operation will remain unchanged save that an increase in vessel throughput is anticipated. As part of our role as statutory harbour authority encompasses maritime safety and the lighting/beaconage we would not anticipate any need to

			balanced the competing interests and what lighting/safety standards you rely upon in support of the approach taken.	alter or change our current statutory processes in managing the safe passage of vessels throughout our SHA area.
Q16.0.6	Applicant, ABP	Navigation Risk Assessment (NRA)	(i) The current NRA is identified as a draft or preliminary assessment, what secures the provision of a subsequent or final NRA? (ii) Windage is identified as a potential hazard, how is this to be resolved? (iii) Please confirm that other port operators have been consulted and advise if any concerns have been identified in respect of the relationship to or effect upon these port operations	<p>i) We would anticipate that the NRA can be termed as being finalised once we have fully agreed its contents with the applicant.</p> <p>ii) Windage impact cannot be resolved but can be mitigated against with the use of dynamic assessment and, if necessary, the potential for tug usage for manoeuvring vessels. These matters are dealt with as a matter of course as part of our ongoing SHA management procedures.</p> <p>iii) For the Applicant</p>
Q16.0.7		NRA	(i) Are there any safety concerns in respect of the handling of CO2 at the port or on the river? (ii) Do you have any comments or concerns in respect of the NRA submitted with the application or the identification of hazards?	<p>i) From a vessel handling an navigational safety perspective there would be no change to the way that the harbour is run. The vessel operator however would need to ensure that national and international procedures related to the carriage of dangerous goods are adhered to.</p> <p>ii) This remains the subject of ongoing dialogue with the applicant.</p>
Q16.0.8		DCO Requirements	(i) Are you content with the controls delivered through the DCO as drafted and that these would deliver an appropriate Navigation Risk Assessment? (ii) Are the mechanisms to control lighting considered satisfactory to ensure no conflict with aid to navigation?	<p>i) Yes</p> <p>ii) Light pollution has potential to affect vessels transiting the Trent past this proposed facility. Every effort should be made by the applicant to ensure that light pollution does not affect River Trent users. Assessments and feedback will be delivered to the Applicant as installation is progressed</p>

				with the Applicant required to complete any rectification as necessary.
--	--	--	--	---