



**Marine
Management
Organisation**

Marine Licensing
Lancaster House
Hampshire Court
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE4 7YH

T +44(0)300 123 1032
F +44 (0)191 376 2681
www.gov.uk/mmo

Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing Project Team
National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

E: GYTRC@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Your reference:
TR010043
Our reference:
GYRM-SP010
Our internal
reference:
DCO/2018/00010

By Email only

4 October 2019

Dear Dominic Young,

The Planning Act 2008 – Section 89 and The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – Rule 8 etc Application by Norfolk County Council for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing

Marine Management Organisation (MMO) response to Deadline 1

The MMO has reviewed the Examining Authority's (ExA) 'Rule 8 Letter', dated 1 October 2019.

The MMO is an Interested Party (IP) for the examination of Development Consent Order (DCO) applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) in the marine area. The MMO received notification on 17 June 2019 stating that the Secretary of State has accepted an application by Norfolk County Council ("the Applicant"), for a DCO for Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing ("the development").

The MMO has an interest in this project because the development includes the construction of a new double-leaf bascule bridge over the River Yare, with associated licensable activities occurring both over and within the marine environment. The DCO application includes a Deemed Marine Licence (DML) under Section 65 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (MCAA 2009) and should consent be granted for the project, the MMO will be responsible for monitoring, compliance and enforcement of DML conditions.

In accordance with the deadlines specified under the Examination Timetable for the proposed Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing, I am writing to provide the MMO's response to Deadline 1.

Deadline 1 consists of:

- Comments on any updates to Application Documents submitted by the Applicant before or at the PM (if relevant)



- Comments on Relevant Representations (RR)
- Summaries of any RRs exceeding 1500 words
- Written Representations (WRs)
- Summaries of any WRs exceeding 1500 words
- Post hearing submissions, including written submissions of oral case
- Notification by Statutory Parties of wish to be considered as an Interested Person (IP) by the Examining Authority (ExA)
- Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) requested by the ExA
- Draft itinerary to be provided by the Applicant for an ASI
- Provision of suggested locations and justifications for site inspections for consideration by the ExA
- Notification of wish to attend any Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI)
- Notification from any Affected Person of wish to speak at a Compulsory Acquisition Hearing (CAH)
- Notification of wish to speak at an Issue Specific Hearing (ISH)
- Notification of wish to speak at a subsequent Open Floor Hearing (OFH)
- Notification of wish to have future correspondence electronically
- Responses to any further information requested by the ExA

Of these items, the MMO considers the following relevant for inclusion in this response:

1. Comments on any updates to Application Documents submitted by the Applicant before or at the PM (if relevant)

- 1.1. In the MMO's relevant representation, dated 1 August 2019, the MMO included comments regarding the draft DML.
- 1.2. An updated version of the draft DML was provided by the applicant 19 August 2019. The MMO responded with comments. This has since been updated and the applicant has provided an updated version of the draft DML and draft SoCG 30 September 2019. An overview of the comments on the latest version of the draft DML are in section 4.
- 1.3. The MMO are not aware of any other updates to Application Documents submitted by the Applicant between the 1st August 2019 and the PM.

2. Comments on Relevant Representations (RR)

2.1. Historic England (HE)

- 2.1.1. The MMO note HE's remark that the development has the potential to harm archaeological deposits of interest, both directly and indirectly and that they will comment on the Applicant's proposed mitigation strategy to ensure that the significance of the impacted remains/deposits is not lost.
- 2.1.2. The MMO wish to advise that a condition could be added to the DML to ensure the Applicant follows the advice of HE and any agreed mitigation measures are implemented in full. To this end, the MMO would welcome engagement with both HE and the Applicant should they wish to discuss the inclusion of conditions within the DML, or any other matters within the remit of the MMO.

2.2. Natural England (NE)

- 2.2.1. The MMO note NE's advice to reduce impacts to interest features and protected species.
- 2.2.2. The MMO wish to advise that if this advice was received under a standard marine licence application, condition(s) would be added to ensure the agreed mitigation measures are implemented in full. To this end, the MMO would welcome engagement with NE and the Applicant should they wish to discuss the inclusion of conditions within the DML, or any other matters within the remit of the MMO.

2.3. Royal Yachting Association (RYA), Great Yarmouth Port Authority (GYPA) and Great Yarmouth Port Company (GYPC)

- 2.3.1. The MMO notes requests for inclusion of layby berths for vessels and waiting pontoons for smaller vessels.
- 2.3.2. The MMO wish to advise that any changes to the scope of the development would need to be included in the DML and may require the inclusion of additional conditions within the DML. Once these requests have been addressed, the MMO would welcome engagement with the Applicant and, if necessary, the relevant IPs, to discuss the inclusion of conditions within the DML, or any other matters within the remit of the MMO.

2.4. RYA, GYPA, GYPC, Great Yarmouth Port Users Association, Ashtons Legal on behalf of Perenco UK Ltd, Mills & Reeve LLP on behalf of ASCO UK LIMITED, Alicat Workboats Ltd and Richards Dry Dock and Eng Ltd, Goodchild Marine Services Limited

- 2.4.1. The MMO notes concerns regarding river access north of the proposed development, as well as impacts on existing commercial entities, both during the construction and operation phases and that some IPs have requested Protective Provisions to safeguard their business. The MMO also note suggestions that the control tower for the new bridge should also operate existing bridges across the River Yare to enable them to open in succession and allow vessels to travel along the river efficiently.
- 2.4.2. The MMO encourage the applicant to work with these IPs to resolve these concerns. The operation and maintenance regime would not be conditioned on the DML as it is not within the remit on the MMO. The MMO also wish to highlight that the proposed development is within the East Inshore Marine Plan area. Relevant policies should be considered by both the applicant and ExA, particularly Ports and Shipping Policy PS3.

2.5. Environment Agency (EA) and RYA

- 2.5.1. The MMO note the EA's and RYA's concerns regarding flood risk as a result of the proposed development. The EA also noted concerns regarding sediment transport. In the MMO's relevant representation, dated 1 August 2019, paragraph 8.3.7 it states '*...the ES should at least discuss whether the process impacts (i.e. flow and sedimentation) would increase in scale under climate change and, potentially, should also identify and include a transition case where the estuary type is neither ebb nor flood dominated. This is to ensure that the impacts can be expected to remain within the engineered channel and do not begin to affect (particularly) Breydon Water...*' The MMO encourage the applicant to undertake further assessment of the environmental impacts resulting from the proposed development to address these concerns.

- 2.5.2. The EA also noted other areas requiring further consideration, including code of construction practice and ecology and biodiversity enhancements.
- 2.5.3. The MMO wish to advise that if this advice was received under a standard marine licence application, condition(s) would be added to ensure the agreed measures are implemented in full. To this end, the MMO would welcome engagement with the EA and the Applicant should they wish to discuss the inclusion of conditions within the DML, or any other matters within the remit of the MMO.

3. Summaries of MMO's Relevant Representation

- 3.1. Following receipt of a Section 56 notification, the MMO submitted our Relevant Representation to PINS on 1 August 2019. Due to the length of the Relevant Representation, the MMO was unable to submit its comments in full via the PINS website. Instead, a copy of the MMO's full representation has been submitted to PINS via email (GYTRC@planninginspectorate.gov.uk).
- 3.2. A summary of the main points raised in the MMO's Relevant Representation to PINS is provided below:
- 3.2.1. There are several changes required in the Deemed Marine Licence (DML) including clearer definitions and rewording/amendment of conditions, particularly those concerned with timescales.
- 3.2.2. The results of the dredging chemical analysis including coordinates are required to be able to inform a full review. Depending on these results, further mitigation measures may be required.
- 3.2.3. Due to the basic information provided on the duration and nature of the pile driving and local migratory fish, the MMO do not believe there is enough information to grant a licence for the works.
- 3.2.4. The Environmental Statement should include a discussion of a detailed scour assessment and should discuss whether the coastal process impacts (i.e. flow and sedimentation) would increase in scale under climate change.
- 3.2.5. It is the opinion of the MMO that the evidence base to support ES conclusions in terms of underwater noise is insufficient.

4. Written Representations (WRs)

- 4.1. The MMO confirms ongoing engagement with the Applicant since the submission of its Relevant Representation to the ExA on 1 August 2019.
- 4.2. Whilst a number of points have been agreed between the MMO and the Applicant regarding the draft DML, there still remains a number of issues outstanding that were detailed within the MMO's Relevant Representation (dated 1 August 2019) and above in section 3. These outstanding issues are presented below and constitute the MMO's Written Representation.

4.3. Policy and planning

- 4.3.1. In examining the DCO Application, PINS is required to have regard to the Marine Policy Statement and any relevant marine plan.
- 4.3.2. The MMO is the marine plan authority for the English inshore and offshore regions. In this regard, the MMO confirm that, as proposed, the Project will be undertaken within the East Inshore Marine Plan Area.

4.4. Licensing requirements of the 2009 Act

4.4.1. The marine licensing provisions of the 2009 Act set out which activities in the UK marine area require a marine licence. In broad terms, this includes any activity which involves the deposit or removal of articles or substances below the level of mean high water springs, unless a relevant exemption applies.

4.4.2. For Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (“NSIPs”), a DCO may include provisions deeming a marine licence for licensable activities taking place in the marine area. Alternatively, applicants may seek a marine licence directly from the MMO.

4.4.3. In the present case, the MMO understands that the Applicant is seeking consent for all licensable activities via deemed consent within the draft DCO, the Deemed Marine Licence.

4.4.4. The MMO has reviewed the DCO Application documents and sets out in the following table all works related to the Project which have so far been identified as to be carried out in the UK marine area:

Works No and description	Details of works in the marine area
Work No. 6A - Bollard Quay and west bank of the river Yare	(i) the provision of public realm facilities; (ii) the provision of vessel waiting facilities adjacent to the west bank of the river Yare; (iii) the construction of part of a flood defence wall, to be incorporated within a flood defence scheme proposed to be undertaken by the Environment Agency; (iv) the construction of vessel impact protection systems within the watercourse; and (v) works within the watercourse to support the vessel impact protection systems, including— (aa) the construction of piles and pile caps; and (bb) the provision and capping of backfill material
Work No. 6B — East bank of the river Yare	(i) the construction of vessel impact protection systems within the watercourse; and works within the watercourse to support the vessel impact protection systems, including— (aa) the construction of piles and pile caps; and (bb) the provision and capping of backfill material
Work No. 7A – West bank of the river Yare	(i) the construction of a control tower, including all necessary access, apparatus and connecting services.
Work No. 7B – East bank of the river Yare	(i) the construction of a plant room, including all necessary access, apparatus and connecting services
Work No. 8B – river Yare bridge	(i) the construction over the watercourse and adjacent land, of a bridge deck carrying the new carriageway, footways and

	<p>cycle track;</p> <p>(ii) the construction of an opening section of bridge deck and associated barriers and signage;</p> <p>(iii) the construction, within and adjacent to the watercourse, of bascule abutments and other structures and facilities to support the bridge deck and enable the operation of the opening section described in ii) above;</p> <p>(iv) the construction of vessel impact protection systems within the watercourse;</p> <p>(v) works within and adjacent to the watercourse to support the works described at subparagraphs (iii) and (iv) including—</p> <p>(aa) the construction of piles and pile caps; and</p> <p>(bb) the provision and capping of backfill material;</p> <p>(vi) apparatus for the mechanical, electrical, instrumentation, control and automation systems of the bridge; and</p> <p>(vii) the construction of access stairs</p>

4.4.5. In order for any of the above activities to be included in the Deemed Marine Licence, the Applicant needs to clearly demonstrate through the environmental impact assessment (“EIA”) process that the environmental impact of all licensable activities has been assessed and, where required, mitigated.

4.5. Draft DCO and draft Deemed Marine Licence

Deemed Marine Licence (DML)

4.5.1. As detailed in section 1, the draft DML has been reviewed and updated by the applicant several times. The most recent draft was provided to the MMO 30 September 2019. All changes noted on the current draft DML have been agreed and made. As detailed in section 2, it may be necessary to amend the scope of the proposed development, amend existing conditions and/or include additional conditions. Comments of note regarding the draft DML, which currently do not require further information and/or action, are detailed below.

4.5.2. Regarding Part 3 16 (2), our preference would be that this clause is removed from the DML completely. Restricting and/or preventing the flow of information after 6 weeks will slow the process and/or prevent the MMO making a determination. If the MMO cannot make a determination due to lack of information the return will be rejected. This clause has not been included in recent DMLs for similar schemes. The applicant has responded that they understand the risk associated with the inclusion of this clause but would prefer it remain. The MMO accept inclusion of this clause.

4.5.3. Regarding Part 3 19, we approve inclusion of article 19. The applicant is aware and accepts that the MMO will charge for their time to review/comment on any submitted documents whether or not the DCO is approved.

4.6. Environmental Statement

Dredge and Disposal

4.6.1. Whilst samples have been taken and analysed for physical and chemical properties, the details have not been provided. Given that dredging may occur during operation (albeit in line with the current licence) it cannot be assessed whether the sampling regime, analysis methods or results are appropriate to inform the Planning Inspectorate's decision. The results of the chemical analysis including coordinates should be provided to allow a full review to be undertaken.

4.6.2. It has been stated that any dredging during operation will be incorporated into the current dredging regime along the River Yare, however details of this existing licence have not been provided and we cannot find a valid licence for this area on the MMO public register. We cannot comment on whether this approach is reasonable without being able to assess the dredging extents of both this application and the existing licence. We also cannot comment on whether the existing licence can accommodate the operational dredging activities given no estimate of dredging requirements have been provided.

4.6.3. Mitigation measures are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice and these appear appropriate. Although following a review of the additional requested information (see comments 8.1.1), additional mitigation may be recommended.

4.6.4. The applicant has identified (para 11.8.8) that "Any contaminants released will be quickly dispersed and diluted through the natural tidal flow regime. The effects will be similar to the dredging operations that already take place and have been assessed as slightly adverse". Whilst we agree with this conclusion for the operational works (dewatering of the cofferdam) due to the scale and short longevity, we cannot advise on the impacts during operation.

Fisheries

4.6.5. With respect to fisheries, the evidence used to reach the ES conclusions (the assessment of the likelihood of and significance of potential impacts) is insufficient with no references provided to support the conclusions stated.

4.6.6. In Table 8.2 of the ES, the scoping opinion is given (ID7) which recommended that the ES should include an assessment of effects on benthic ecology and fish, including migratory fish, in particular, those that migrate through the River Yare. The ES must assess any likely significant effects on protected fish species and species of conservation concern, including European eel, smelt and river lamprey, and present an assessment of potential impacts of noise and vibration on sensitive aquatic receptors, including benthic ecology and fish receptors. The applicant has not provided an assessment of the impact on migratory species present or the potential impacts on these species.

4.6.7. The applicant has referenced the scoping opinion in paragraph 8.9.1 that a limitation of the 2m beam trawl is that it would underrepresent bigger fish and migratory species as this type of gear does not adequately target these fish.

However, in paragraph 8.8.49 this is not taken into consideration as the applicant states that “no protected or noted species (such as migratory fish) were recorded in the (benthic ecology) and fish surveys” so no further assessment was made to assess the impact on these species. The applicant must utilise other sources of previous surveys and background information to provide a desk-based assessment of fish species present in the area in addition to the snapshot provided by the four trawl surveys.

- 4.6.8. The applicant has stated that underwater noise from the project has the potential to impact fish species. However, the applicant does not provide a clear methodology of the piling works but has provided the following basic information: Piling works (driven piles) will be required as part of the scheme. During construction, sheet piles will be used in the river channel to create a cofferdam on either side (east and west) of the channel, which will form the footprint of the bridge supporting knuckles (12.7.1). The cofferdams will facilitate in-channel works within the River Yare. The cofferdams will become integrated into the permanent works bridge foundation. They will be dewatered as necessary and backfilled to create the knuckles. Fish will be translocated where necessary. No additional temporary works are proposed outside of the cofferdams. The cofferdams will reduce the width of the River Yare channel by approximately 50% to no less than 50 m (12.7.2). Furthermore, it is understood that no dredging of the riverbed is required to facilitate construction (para 16.7.30). No details were provided specifying the timing, nature and duration of the piling works or set against known local fish migrations. This is essential information required to assess the impact on migratory species as percussive noise can cause an acoustic barrier to their migration.
- 4.6.9. In paragraph 8.8.35 of the ES in the assessment of the disturbance effects of noise and vibration, a reference for the following statement should be provided “it would be expected that smaller fish might show behavioural responses at slightly lower levels (to underwater noise)”. As detailed in section 2, condition(s) can be added to the DML to ensure agreed mitigation measures, such as piling timing or methodology restrictions, are implemented in full.

Coastal Processes

- 4.6.10. The ES (and hence the modelling) assumes that the hydrodynamic profile of the finished bridge represents the maximum impact on the bed and hence that no separate model of the construction phase is required. While details of the cofferdam alignment were not part of this review, the need to construct the piers inside of the cofferdams suggests that the construction phase footprint would be slightly larger than that assessed. MMO consider this to be a minor point since the river flow modelling upon which the effects assessments are based has captured the essential scale and tenor of the impacts and therefore do not believe that additional modelling for any small additional footprint would alter any part of the assessed outcome.
- 4.6.11. MMO’s understanding of the TUFLOW modelling detailed in the STA is that the model does not update the bed levels in response to the calculated changes in flow. The model reports a doubling of flow velocity in response to a halving of channel width; from this, a bed stress is calculated, and from bed stress a sediment transport rate is calculated, allowing, finally, areas of erosion and deposition to be represented. However, paragraph 6.2.27 appears to indicate that the flow model does not update the bed elevation according to the sediment transport, which means that the flow results are indicative only –

changes in bed elevation would modify the flows; feedback between changes in flow and changes in sediment transport would lead to a different distribution of outcomes to those represented in the ES. Reported changes in water surface elevation would not apply as these are a consequence of the flow acceleration and this would reduce as the bed is lowered.

- 4.6.12. Paragraph 5.2.13 of the STA states that the model has been set up to simulate the distribution of sediment within the Yare, but it is inferred from the description that this is not spatially-variable (i.e., the subsequent paragraphs describe a vertical distribution but no horizontal/spatial variability). This would be of significance if the model were to be re-run to allow for bed level updating and to derive a more accurate spatial description of impacts.
- 4.6.13. Paragraph 5.2.17 states a two-layer approach to sediment distribution but Plate 5-5 and paragraph 5.2.18 present a 3-layered model. Again, this would only need clarification if a more accurate modelling of impacts were to be required (for assessments other than simply coastal process impacts).
- 4.6.14. The STA indicates that a 50% reduction in channel width under the bridge is likely to cause scour sufficient to double the average water depth. The report also suggests that a more detailed scour assessment will be carried out as part of final scheme. This is something that the MMO thinks should be carried out as part of the Environmental Statement, in the interests of more complete assessment.
- 4.6.15. The ES should include a discussion of a detailed scour assessment and any likely mitigation measures that this would entail.
- 4.6.16. The MMO believe that the ES should at least discuss whether the process impacts (i.e. flow and sedimentation) would increase in scale under climate change and, potentially, should also identify and include a transition case where the estuary type is neither ebb nor flood dominated. This is to ensure that the impacts can be expected to remain within the engineered channel and do not begin to affect (particularly) Breydon Water, since the role of this area as a storage volume may be even more important under higher sea levels.

Underwater Noise

- 4.6.17. It is the opinion of the MMO that the evidence base to support ES conclusions (i.e. assessment of the likelihood and significance of the potential impacts of the proposed works) in terms of underwater noise is insufficient. In Table 8.2, there is a scoping opinion (ID7) which recommends that the ES should include an assessment of effects on benthic ecology and fish, including migratory fish, in particular, those that migrate through the River Yare. The ES should assess any likely significant effects on protected fish species and species of conservation concern, including European eel, smelt and river lamprey. The ES should also present in the Nature Conservation aspect chapter an assessment of potential impacts of noise and vibration on sensitive aquatic receptors, including benthic ecology and fish receptors.
- 4.6.18. In terms of the environmental baseline, it is noted from section 8.3.33 of the ES that benthic ecology and fish receptors are considered to be of low importance. The report states that the main conservation interest is commercially important fish, which appear to use the area in low numbers. No protected or notable species (such as migratory fish) were recorded in the benthic ecology and fish surveys (please see comments on fisheries above).

- 4.6.19. With regards to potential impacts, disturbance through construction and operational noise and vibration has been identified as a likely significant effect. It is therefore essential that the ES clearly describes the marine element of works. Currently the relevant information is distributed throughout the ES, which makes trying to assess the potential impacts on marine ecology difficult.
- 4.6.20. There does not appear to be sufficient information on the in-river piling works. The MMO would expect there to be information on the anticipated duration of the piling activities and months when piling will be taking place, as well as the installation method. Information on the likely noise levels from piling operations in the river also need to be presented.
- 4.6.21. Having reviewed Section 8.8, the assessment of effects on benthic and fish ecology is very minimal. Disturbance effects of noise and vibration during construction on benthic and fish ecology are considered in sections 8.8.33 to 8.8.37. The ES simply concludes the following:
- I. Construction related noise will represent a temporary, short to medium term duration and will affect a very small proportion of habitats present in the wider River Yare environment.
 - II. Vibration effects are mostly associated with piling activities during construction and the worst-case vibration levels with respect to the Outer Thames Estuary SPA (i.e. the river Yare) is also presented in Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration. Note that this chapter however addresses noise levels (and vibration) in air and is therefore not applicable to noise underwater.
 - III. Benthic ecology and fish are considered to be of local value. It is predicted that the impacts will be negligible (not significant) prior to the implementation of additional mitigation measures.
- 4.6.22. Underwater noise can have a range of effects on fish (in addition to disturbance), including mortality and physical injury, physiological stress, hearing impairment (i.e. Temporary Threshold Shift), and masking of biologically important sounds. Piling works may cause an acoustic barrier in the river, temporarily delaying or hindering fish movement past the site - something which hasn't been considered in the assessment.
- 4.6.23. No specific receptors have been identified. The ES simply concludes that the predicted impacts on benthic and fish ecology will be negligible prior to the implementation of additional mitigation measures. The evidence to support this conclusion is lacking.
- 4.6.24. Cumulative effects have been considered in Chapter 19 of the ES, although no cumulative effects have been identified with regard to underwater noise. Underwater noise must be considered in the cumulative impacts.
- 4.6.25. In summary, the assessment of the potential effects of underwater noise and vibration on fish and benthic receptors is insufficient. The ES simply concludes that "construction related noise will represent a temporary, short to medium term duration and will affect a very small proportion of habitats present in the wider River Yare environment. Benthic ecology and fish are considered to be of local value. It is predicted that the impacts will be negligible (not significant) prior to the implementation of additional mitigation measures", without providing any thorough details of the in-river piling works. The MMO would expect to see information on the anticipated duration of the piling activities and months when piling will be taking place, as well as the installation method. Information on the likely noise levels from piling operations in the river must also be presented.

5. Summaries of any WRs exceeding 1500 words

- 5.1. The majority of the points raised in the MMO's Relevant Representation to PINS, submitted 1 August 2019, remain the same. The only change since is the agreement of changes to the draft DML. A summary of the above WR is below:
- 5.1.1. All changes to the current version of the draft DML have been agreed with the applicant. As detailed in section 2, it may be necessary to amend the scope of the proposed development, amend existing conditions and/or include additional conditions.
- 5.1.2. The results of the dredging chemical analysis including coordinates are required to be able to inform a full review. Depending on these results, further mitigation measures may be required.
- 5.1.3. Due to the basic information provided on the duration and nature of the pile driving and local migratory fish, the MMO do not believe there is enough information to grant a licence for the works.
- 5.1.4. The Environmental Statement should include a discussion of a detailed scour assessment and should discuss whether the coastal process impacts (i.e. flow and sedimentation) would increase in scale under climate change.
- 5.1.5. It is the opinion of the MMO that the evidence base to support ES conclusions in terms of underwater noise is insufficient.

6. Notification by Statutory Parties of wish to be considered as an Interested Person (IP) by the ExA

- 6.1. We wish to be considered as an Interested Party by the ExA.

7. Statements of Common Ground

- 7.1. The MMO has been working with the Applicant on the establishment of a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG). The MMO understands that the agreed SoCG will be updated to the ExA by the Applicant.

8. Notification of wish to attend any Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI)

- 8.1. If deemed necessary, and in agreement with the Applicant, we may wish to attend any Accompanied Site Inspection.

9. Notification of wish to speak at an Issue Specific Hearing (ISH)

- 9.1. If deemed necessary, we may wish to speak at an Issue Specific Hearing.

10. Notification of wish to have future correspondence electronically

- 10.1. We wish to have future correspondence electronically.

11. Responses to any further information requested by the ExA

- 11.1. No further information has been requested from the MMO by the ExA.

The MMO reserves the right to modify its present advice or opinion in view of any additional matters or information that may come to our attention.

The MMO look forward to working with all parties in the examination of this application.

If you would like to discuss any specific matter further or require additional clarity, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Yours sincerely,



Adam Tillotson

Marine Licensing Case Officer

D +44 (0)20802 65138

E Adam.Tillotson@marinemanagement.org.uk

Copies to:

Fern Skeldon (MMO): Fern.Skeldon@marinemanagement.org.uk

Chris Turner (MMO): Chris.Turner@marinemanagement.org.uk

Paul Kirk (MMO): Paul.Kirk@marinemanagement.org.uk