

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Michael Wilks SCC](#); [Alison O'Connor ABP](#)
Cc: [PINS](#)
Subject: Lake Lothing - last minute submissions from SCC & ABP
Date: 20 May 2019 21:48:03
Attachments: [LCC final submission Templated.docx](#)

Hi Alison and Michael,

Thank you for keeping Lowestoft Cruising Club (LCC) in the loop at this late stage.

The changes proposed by the Applicant and counter changes suggested by ABP are complex. I am currently away on holiday and I had made what I hoped would be our final submission to PINS. This is not yet on the PINS website but attached here for your benefit.

Our sole objective in relation to the DCO Article 40 is to ensure that LCC is fully represented in discussions determining the Scheme of Operation, the Navigation Risk Assessment, and matters arising during the bridge construction phase, including the proposed closure to navigation. This applies to the immediate and longer-term future.

We are happy to participate in any procedures the Applicant and the Harbour Authority can agree. Clearly the Applicant wants to have a Navigation Working Group (NWG), while the Harbour Authority considers the NWG to be unnecessary as they consider the PMSC Shareholders Group would carry out the required consultations.

We leave the Applicant and the Harbour Authority to hopefully resolve their differences as long as our objective of full and meaningful representation is provided to us with regard to the Scheme of Operation, the Navigation Risk Assessment, and matters arising during the bridge construction phase, including the proposed closure to navigation.

With regard to the latest version of the Scheme of Operation provided by SCC, following discussions with ABP, I could not see any changes that materially affect LCC members. I was at a disadvantage in not being able to see what I presume were annotated notes explaining changes with my Polaris Office app on my tablet.

The other matters being exchanged between SCC and ABP in relation to the DCO are not (hopefully if I fully understand!) directly relevant to LCC.

I have to express concern that such complicated significant changes are being made at this late date in the examination procedure. If there are changes made that we have not been provided with adequate opportunity for comment then I will expect we to be given an early opportunity to raise any such issues at the first meeting of the NWG or the PMSC Shareholders Group, which ever is appropriate and available.

I am copying this email to PINS as I may not be able to meet the 24th May Deadline 10 date if I wait for further communications from SCC and ABP, and bearing in mind I am on holiday! I am happy for PINS to place this email on their website, in fact I request that it is published. I apologise to PINS that this is my "final submission + 1".

Regards, David

Dr David B Bennett (On behalf of Lowestoft Cruising Club)

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>



Lowestoft Cruising Club

Commodore: Colin Coe

Vice Commodore: Greg Tripp

Rear Commodore: James Hutcheson

Dear PINS Team,

Please find below our Closing Submission, Document Tracker and Summary Position as a Deadline 10 submission.

Many thanks, Dr David B Bennett

Lowestoft Cruising Club (LCC): Closing Submission, Document Tracker and Summary Position.

1. RR-016. Agree with the setting up of the Navigation Working Group (NWG) by the Applicant (SCC), provision of a waiting pontoon between the old and new bridges, and the establishment of a Navigation Risk Assessment (NRA), particularly for the bridge construction phase. Disagree with the lack of a bridge opening schedule, and the worst case scenario of a three week summer closure to navigation.
2. REP3-001. Draft Scheme of Operation (dSO) and dNRA presented at NWG3. NWG should be formalised in the draft Development Control Order (dDCO). Remain opposed to a three week summer closure.
3. REP3-002. dSO closely mirrored that at the A47 bridge and was acceptable. Remain opposed to a three week closure. BAM Nuttall (contractor) unable to confirm season or duration of closure.
4. REP4-025. Membership of the NWG should be unbiased. Unease expressed that Article 20 of dDCO has very wide ranging powers of obstruction and closure to the right of navigation. Requested addition of a paragraph providing compensation for loss of right of navigation. Concern expressed regarding consultation and disagreement with future changes to the SO made by the undertaker (SCC).
5. Google Earth view of western Lake Lothing presented to the Examiners at the Accompanied Site Inspection 12 February 2019, with annotations showing the many maritime interests comprising a total of 400 berths that would be impacted by a closure of navigation.
6. REP5-034. Oral presentation at dDCO Hearing 2. Reiterated objection to navigation closure. We welcome the commitment in Article 20 to give at least three months notice of a closure. Requested compensation for loss of navigation [denied by SCC]. Continue to support the role of the NWG in SO and NRA discussions with SCC, as well as the Harbour Authority's (HA) stakeholder meetings arranged by Associated British Ports (ABP).
7. REP7-009. Suggestion for SCC and ABP to meet with LCC to discuss SO issues and the future role of the NWG.
8. REP7-010. Welcomed the addition in dDCO Part 1 Preliminary Interpretation of "...in consultation with the members of the group [NWG]" in response to REP4-025 above. Welcomed the addition of a new paragraph in dDCO Part 4 Operational Provisions re representation prior to any submission to the Secretary of State (see REP4-025 above). Requested change of "...or..." to "...and..." to ensure both NWG and HA are consulted [included

by SCC in DCO presented 14 May 2019 Issue Specific Hearing 3]. Accepted that the final NRA can only be produced when the final design and construction methodology are known.

9. REP8-027. Agree with SCC that the provision of a waiting pontoon is an essential part of the NRA. An alternative site for the waiting pontoon will need to be found if Nexen's objection is sustained. Agree with SCC that the role of the NWG should remain in the DCO Article 40.
10. REP8-028. Following a video of a ship entering Lowestoft a short explanation of a recreational vessel entering Lowestoft was presented for the benefit of the Inspectors. Should there be a delay in opening the bridges sequentially the need for a waiting pontoon was emphasised. While few of the many maritime interests west of the new bridge were able to attend hearings and make written representations the Inspectors should not assume that it is only LCC who are concerned about any closure to navigation during bridge construction.
11. REP8-029. No response by SCC or ABP to REP7-009. LCC have no concerns about the SO as detailed with the DCO.
12. **Summary Position.** We remain concerned about a possible summer closure of up to three weeks. We welcome the commitment to give at least three months notice of a closure. The SO is acceptable, but will need to be monitored in the light of ABP's operational experience once the new bridge is functioning. The provision of a waiting pontoon is an essential feature of the NRA. We welcome participation in the NWG allowing direct discussions about the SO and the NRA in consultation with SCC, ABP and BAM Nuttall. There are a number of other unresolved issues raised at NWG3 which need to be addressed at the next NWG meeting.