



Historic England

Dr Michael Ebert
The Planning Inspectorate
3/18 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol BS1 6PN

Our ref:
Your ref: TR030003

Telephone:

15th August 2018

Dear Sir,

Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and Rule 17 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended)

TR030003: Application by Port of Tilbury London Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for a Proposed Port Terminal at the Former Tilbury Power Station ('Tilbury2'): Request for further information for Deadline 7 (16th August 2018)

We offer the following response to the questions set by the Examining Authority as set out in Annex A of your letter dated 7th August 2018. Please note that Question 12 (directed to Historic England) addresses different matters which we have addressed as follows in Parts 1 to 4:

Question 12

Part 1: *The Panel notes Historic England's submission at deadline 6 dated 30 July 2018, in which Historic England states that Requirement 3 External appearance and heights is to be subject to further discussion after deadline 6.*

Our response: Historic England has reviewed the proposed colour palette, and the accompanying method statement which the applicant has now provided. We have also reviewed the plan submitted by the applicant which shows how the container stacks might be arranged so as to break up their visual impact in views from Tilbury Fort. We have discussed these matters with the applicant and agree, as we have previously stated, that measures which seek to ameliorate the visual prominence of the proposed development should be adopted. However, we do not believe these would materially reduce the level of harm which we advise would be caused to the significance of Tilbury Fort.



Historic England, Eastgate Court, 195-205 High Street, Guildford GU1 3EH
Telephone 01483 25 2020 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



Question 12

Part 2 Historic England states that the Marine Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) conforms to an outline document appropriate for the examination of the proposed development, but that it requires enforceable conditions in the Deemed Marine Licence (DML), Schedule 9 to the dDCO. Historic England has supplied its proposed draft conditions at deadlines 3 and 5, and repeats them with its submission at deadline 6. We also note the Applicant's submission Response to ExA Comments on DCO and Related Interested Parties' Deadline 5 Submissions at deadline 6, items 5.8.15, 5.8.17 and 5.8.25. Would Historic England please state whether it is satisfied with the draft V5 of the Marine Archaeological WSI submitted by the Applicant at deadline 6 (acknowledging that it wishes to maintain its position concerning enforceability)?

Our response: We hereby acknowledge the changes that have been introduced into the above referenced Marine Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) version 5 (Tilbury2 Document Ref: POTLL/T2/EX/198), which mostly address the important matters raised by us previously in our advice. We are therefore prepared to accept this version of the WSI, as submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 6, subject to adequate provision for delivery of Method Statements through any Deemed Marine Licence as might be secured for this proposed development project.

We are prepared to offer this advice despite the position taken by the Applicant as set out in this version of the WSI; see section 6.4 (Significance of Impacts), paragraph 6.4.2 and the statement made in Port of Tilbury London Ltd (PoTLL) Responses to Interested Parties' Deadline 5 Submissions (Tilbury 2 Document Ref: POTLL/T2/EX/194). We do not accept the position taken by the Applicant that it is unnecessary to establish a foreshore elevation monitoring programme. It therefore continues to be our advice that a baseline of foreshore elevation levels, adjacent to Tilbury Fort, should be established prior to project commencement against which any changes are to be assessed during or post-delivery of the proposed development project.

We appreciate your acknowledgment that the effective and timely implementation of an archaeological WSI depends on its enforceability and we are prepared to accept that if the Marine WSI version 5 (as referenced above) is accepted as a certified document that production of associated Method Statements, as detailed within the WSI, should be provided for through any deemed Marine Licence. We add that a Method Statement could be employed to deliver a foreshore elevation monitoring programme, as described above and therefore would be compatible with our advice to you regarding the use of conditions within any deemed Marine Licence. It is a relevant matter that we compare this situation with our advice to you regarding the terrestrial WSI in that its preparation and agreement should be enforced by conditions, although the absence of such provision within the Development Consent Order does not necessarily mean that the WSI itself is unacceptable.



Historic England, Eastgate Court, 195-205 High Street, Guildford GU1 3EH
Telephone 01483 25 2020 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



Question 12

Part 3: *Would Historic England reaffirm its final position with regard to the significance of Tilbury Fort?*

Our response: There is no change to our position regarding the significance of Tilbury Fort and the harm to that significance which the proposed development would cause. This was set out in full in Sections 3-5 of our Written Representations. While we have subsequently discussed and agreed measures with the applicant which seek to minimise the impacts of the development proposals, Historic England reaffirm our advice that the proposed development would cause severe harm to the significance of Tilbury Fort, a place of exceptional significance.

Question 12

Part 4: *Would Historic England reaffirm its final position with regard to the Terrestrial Archaeological WSI?*

Our response: Historic England reaffirms that the WSI for Terrestrial Archaeology is acceptable, as set out in full in our letter at Deadline 5.

Yours sincerely,



Christopher Pater
Head of Marine Planning

Cc Debbie Priddy (Inspector of Ancient Monuments – Historic England, East of England)



Historic England, Eastgate Court, 195-205 High Street, Guildford GU1 3EH
Telephone 01483 25 2020 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.

