

IMMINGHAM EASTERN RO-RO TERMINAL



Response to IOT Operators' Deadline 4 Submissions

Document Reference: 10.2.49

APFP Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5(2)(q)

PINS Reference – TR030007

October 2023

Document Information

Document Information		
Project	Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal	
Document Title	Response to IOT Operators' Deadline 4 Submissions	
Commissioned by	Associated British Ports	
Document ref	10.2.49	
APFP Reg 2009	Regulation 5(2)(q)	
Prepared by	IERRT Project Team	
Date	Version	Revision Details
23/10/2023	01 Deadline 5	Submitted at Deadline 5

Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Relevant Policy	4
3 Response to [REP3-012] 1.3 Stakeholder Consultation consensus, [REP3-16 NS.1.1 Response to Stakeholder consensus in NRA, and Cover [REP3-001] and MSMS Manual [REP3-017]	5

1. Introduction

1.1. This document provides the Applicant's response to the information submitted by IOT Operators ("IOT") at Deadline 4 which in turn draws upon information submitted by IOT at previous deadlines, and during Issue Specific Hearings 1-4. The IOT submissions responded to in this document are:

- (i) IOT's written summary of oral submissions made at ISH3 and ISH4 **[REP4-034]**;
- (ii) IOT's comments on ABP's Interim Response to the IOT Operators' NRA **[REP3-012]**;
- (iii) Response to ExQ1 Submissions by the IOT Operators **[REP3-016]**;
- (iv) Cover Letter **[REP3-001]**;
- (v) MSMS Manual **[REP3-017]**; and
- (vi) ExA ISH 3 Agenda Questions **[EV6-001]**.

2. Relevant Policy

2.1. Within its written summary of oral submissions made at ISH3 and ISH4 **[REP4-034]** the IOT Operators provide a list of parts of the UK Marine Policy Statement and the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan which they indicate the IERRT facility does not comply with. It is noted that these are, in effect, the same parts of those policy documents which DfDS also refer to in its Deadline 4 submissions.

2.2. The IOT operators concerns in respect of these policy considerations again relates to the different position it takes to the Applicant on the implications of the IERRT project on safety and operational matters. The Applicant's evidence is that the IERRT project does not generate significant adverse effects in respect of these matters and there is, therefore, no conflict with those parts of the plans which the IOT operators highlight.

2.3. The Applicant would point out, however, that if regard is had to the full wording of Marine Plan policy PS2 it is clear that it does not apply to the IERRT development.

2.4. The first part of East Marine Plan Policy PS2 states:

"Proposal that require static sea surface infrastructure that encroaches upon important navigation routes (see figure 18) should not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances. Proposals should"

2.5. An examination of figure 18 of the plan reveals that no 'important shipping routes' occur in close proximity to the site of the proposed IERRT development.

Furthermore, on a full reading of paragraphs 358 and 359 of the supporting text of the plan it is clear that the purpose of this policy is to protect the important navigation routes identified in the plan from any encroachment by static sea surface infrastructure. This is not what is being proposed through the IERRT development.

2.6. The IOT Operators also provide a general list of policies, draft legislation and decisions “to be aware of in the context of national energy security considerations and the importance of the IOT and refineries to the UK’s oil supplies.”

2.7. From the general list provided it is not clear to the Applicant what specific elements are being relied upon by the IOT operators, or for what particular purpose. The Applicant’s position is that the IERRT development will not have significant implications in respect of national energy security matters in terms of impacts on the operation of the IOT.

3. Response to [REP3-012] 1.3 Stakeholder Consultation consensus, [REP3-16 NS.1.1 Response to Stakeholder consensus in NRA, and Cover [REP3-001] and MSMS Manual [REP3-017]

3.1. In light of the Applicant’s Proposed Changes Notification [AS-027] and the consequential ongoing public consultation, rather than enter into a lengthy exchange at this stage on Navigation and Shipping matters, the Applicant is reserving its position in the context of comments and responses so as to give it the opportunity to engage further with the Interested Parties during the current consultation process. A comprehensive response will be provided at Deadline 6 – possibly earlier subject to the progress made.