



1

Immingham Green Energy Terminal

9.19 Draft Statement of Common Ground between Associated British Ports and the Harbour Master, Humber (Tracked)

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 Volume 9

> <u>June</u> 2024 Version **2**.0 Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR030008 Document Reference: TR030008/EXAM/9.19

Delet	ted: March
Delet	t ed: 1



i

Immingham Green Energy Terminal 9.19 Draft Statement of Common Ground between Associated British Ports and Harbour Master Humber (Tracked)

Version History

Version	Date	Submitted	
<u>1.0</u>	13 March 2024	Deadline 1	
<u>2.0</u>	<u>4 June 2024</u>	Deadline 4	



Status of the Statement of Common Ground

Associated British Ports considers that this draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is an accurate description of the matters raised and the current status of each matter.

On Behalf of Associated British Ports

Name				
Position	Sustainable Development Manager			
Organisation	Associated British Ports			
Signature				



Table of contents

Chapter Pages	5
I Introduction1	
Overview	l
The Project	1
Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	1
Purpose and Structure of this Document2	2
2 Summary of Engagement	3
Table 2-1: Record of Engagement	3
3 Matters Agreed and Matters Not Agreed	5
Table 3-1: List of Matters Agreed, Matters Outstanding and Matters Not Agreed	3
1 Glossary 14	4

Deleted: 1 Introduction 1¶ Overview 1¶ The Project 1¶ Parties to this Statement of Common Ground 1¶ Purpose and Structure of this Document 2¶ 2 Summary of Engagement 3¶ Table 2-1 – Record of Engagement 3¶ 3 Matters Agreed and Matters Not Agreed 5¶ Table 3-1 - List of Matters Agreed, Matters Outstanding and Matters Not Agreed 6¶ 4 Glossary 15¶



for the Humber Estuary ("the SCNA"). The abbreviations SCNA and HES denote

1 Introduction

Overview

- This Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG") has been prepared to accompany 1.1 an application made to the Secretary of State for Transport (the "Application") under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ("PA 2008") for a development consent order ("DCO") to authorise the construction and operation of the proposed Immingham Green Energy Terminal ("the Project"). 1.2 The Application is submitted by Associated British Ports ("ABP"), ABP was Deleted: (established in 1981 following the privatisation of the British Transport Docks Deleted:) Board. The Funding Statement [APP-010], provides further information on ABP Deleted: [APP-010] as the Applicant. The Project as proposed by ABP falls within the definition of a Nationally 1.3 Significant Infrastructure Project ("NSIP") as set out in Sections 14(1)(j), 24(2) and 24(3)(c) of the PA 2008. The Project 1.4 ABP is seeking to construct, operate and maintain the Project, comprising a new Deleted: Immingham Green Energy Terminal multi-user liquid bulk green energy terminal located on the eastern side of the Port of Immingham (the "Port"). The Project includes the construction and operation of a green hydrogen 1.5 production facility, which would be delivered and operated by Air Products (BR) Limited ("Air Products"). Air Products will be the first customer of the new terminal, whereby green ammonia will be imported via the jetty and converted onsite into green hydrogen, making a positive contribution to the United Kingdom's ("UK's") net zero agenda by helping to decarbonise the UK's industrial activities Deleted: United Kingdom's (UK) and in particular the heavy transport sector. A detailed description of the Project is included in Environmental Statement 1.6 Deleted: Chapter 2: The Project of the ("ES") Chapter 2: The Project [REP3-022], Deleted: [APP-044] Parties to this Statement of Common Ground 1.7 The parties to this SoCG are (1) ABP (as the Applicant) and (2) the Harbour Master for the Humber ("HMH"), whose Unique Reference Number in these proceedings is 20047053. This SoCG covers the general topics listed on page F6 of the Examining Authority's Rule 6 letter [PD-005] dated 8 January 2004 Deleted: [PD-005] (insofar as relevant) together with the specific topics directed at HMH and Humber Estuary Services ("HES") set out on page F7. ABP is the promoter of the Project and the owner and operator of the Port of 1.8 Immingham. 1.9 HES is the informal name (akin to a trading name) used by ABP in its capacity, not as the promoter of the Project and the owner and operator of the Port of Immingham, but as the separate Statutory Conservancy and Navigation Authority
- Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR030008 Examination Document Ref: TR030008/EXAM/9.19

the identical entity.



- 1.10 The SCNA has statutory responsibility for the safe navigation of the river for all users and, as Competent Harbour Authority for the Humber, it trains pilots and stipulates pilotage requirements. Through VTS Humber, the SCNA monitors and regulates commercial vessel traffic on the Humber to ensure their safe passage whatever their destination on the Humber.
- 1.11 HMH is the statutory appointee of the SCNA, with overall responsibility for the management of SCNA's operations on the Humber and also has his own independent statutory powers¹.
- 1.12 In this SoCG, ABP and HMH are referred to as "the Parties."

Purpose and Structure of this Document

- 1.13 The purpose of this document is to identify and summarise any agreement, disagreement or matters outstanding between the parties on matters relevant to the examination so as to assist the Examining Authority in its consideration of the Application.
- 1.14 In preparing this SoCG, the guidance provided in <u>Planning Act 2008</u>: examination of application for development <u>consent</u> (Department for Communities and Local Government (as it then was), March 2015) has been fully taken into account. In addition, this SoCG has had due regard to the Examining Authority's **Rule 6** letter [PD-005],
- 1.15 Section 1 of this SoCG is designed to act as a general introduction to the Project and to the parties concerned.
- 1.16 Section 2 of this SoCG sets out a summary of the correspondence and engagement between the parties to date.
- 1.17 Section 3 of this SoCG sets out the matters which have been agreed or which remain outstanding, together with any matters upon which it has not been possible to reach agreement.
- 1.18 The Tables in Section 3 use a colour coding system to indicate the status of the matters between the Parties as follows:

(a) Green – matter agreed	Deleted: ;
(b) Orange – matter ongoing,	Deleted: ; and
(c) Red – matter not agreed,	Deleted:

¹ The role of Harbour Master, Humber is quite separate from that of the Immingham Dock N

n Authority (

-	Deleted: '
-	Deleted: consent'
ſ	Deleted: [PD-005].



2 Summary of Engagement

- 2.1 A summary of the consultation and engagement between ABP and HMH up to the date of this SoCG in relation to the Project generally and concerning the matters raised in this SoCG specifically is presented in Table 2-1.
- 2.2 It is agreed by the Parties to this SoCG that Table 2-1 is an accurate record of the meetings and key correspondence between the Parties.

Table 2-1; Record of Engagement

		Summary with key outcomes and points of discussion
Pre-application		
30 August 2022 Email from ABP to HMH and HES Harbour Control Manager		
10 October 2022	EIA Scoping Opinion was adopted by the Secretary of State	The SCNA was consulted at the EIA Scoping stage by the Planning Inspectorate.
9 January to 20 February 2023	First Statutory Consultation	HES/SCNA was consulted by ABP as part of the First Statutory Consultation.
11, 12 & 13 April HMH attendance at HMH attendance at navigational simulations		HMH attendance at HR Wallingford.
10 May 2023 In Person Meeting Attendance by HMH at the HAZID workshop.		Attendance by HMH at the HAZID workshop.
		HES/SCNA was consulted by ABP as part of the Second Statutory Consultation.
29 August 2023	Email from ABP to HMH	Proposal for the DCO to include Protective Provisions very similar, if not identical, to those agreed for the Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal ("JERRT"), project.
Post DCO submi	ission	
22 December 2023	Email exchange	ABP shared a first draft of the SoCG with HMH, asking for comments.
1 February 2024	Email exchange	A second draft of the SoCG with HMH was shared with HMH, asking for comments.
29 February 2024	Email exchange	HMH sent comments back on the draft SoCG to ABP.

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR030008 Examination Document Ref: TR030008/EXAM/9.19 Deleted: -



Date	Form of Contact	Summary with key outcomes and points of discussion	
11 <u>– 12 March</u> 2024	Email exchange	ABP shared an updated draft of the SoCG with HMH which addressed their comments.	Deleted: -
13 March 2024	Email exchange	HMH confirmed they agreed with the content and wording of the draft SoCG.	
<u>5 – 8 April 2024</u>	Email exchange	Review of Article 3 (2) of the dDCO and the concept of disapplication. Text in ID 2 below amended accordingly.	
<u>13 – 14 May</u> 2024	Email exchange	Correspondence regarding correction required to title of paragraph 17 of the draft protective provisions for the SCNA and need for separate paragraph covering removal of wrecks and obstructions, etc.	
20 May 2024	Email exchange	Further correspondence on detail of SoCG	
<u>21 May 2024</u>	MS Teams meeting	Discussion regarding ongoing review of potential risks to river users, in particular those associated with the handling of ammonia or carbon dioxide at the jetty. This is pursuant to item ID4 below.	

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR030008 Examination Document Ref: TR030008/EXAM/9.19

4



3 Matters Agreed and Matters Not Agreed

- 3.1 It is agreed that the record of engagement included in the **Consultation Report** [APP-022] submitted with the Application, accurately sets out the consultation and engagement undertaken between the Parties in relation to the Application. In particular, the following chapters:
- 3.1.1 Chapter 4 First Statutory Consultation <u>- HMH was consulted by ABP as part of their statutory obligations.</u>
- 3.1.2 Chapter 5 Second Statutory Consultation <u>____HMH was consulted by ABP as part</u> of their statutory obligations.
- 3.1.3 <u>The Examining Authority, in its **Rule 6 letter [PD-005]** of 8 January 2024, provided lists of general and party specific matters which should be covered as part of the SoCG process. The matters covered in this SoCG are shown below and addressed in <u>Table 3-1</u>.</u>
 - <u>"The need for and the wording of any Protective Provisions to be included in the draft DCO (dDCO).</u>
 - The adequacy of the Applicant's Navigational Risk Assessment (NRA), with particular regard to the assessment methodology employed, including the application of standards and guidance and the suitability of mitigation measures proposed.
 - The adequacy of the Applicant's Navigational Simulation Survey (NSS), including the methodology for undertaking the NSS, its conclusions and the suitability of the mitigation measures proposed.
 - Any cumulative or in-combination effects concerning the construction and operational phases for the proposed IGET.
 - Suitability of wording for securing mitigation within the dDCO...
- 3.2 Table 3-1 contains a list of 'matters agreed' (shaded green); a list of matters in respect of which discussion is ongoing (shaded orange) and a list of matters not agreed (shaded red) at the date of the Examination along with a concise commentary of what the item refers to and how it came to be agreed between the Parties (as applicable).

1	Deleted: [APP-022]
-(Deleted: -
-(Deleted: -
-{	Deleted: The ExA, in its Rule 6 letter [PD-005]
-{	Deleted: Part
-	Deleted:

Deleted:



Table 3-1: List of Matters Agreed, Matters Outstanding and Matters Not Agreed

ID	Matter	Reference	Harbour Master Humber Position	ABP Position	Status	Date	
1	capacity as the	Representation [RR-003]		e provided by HMH.	Agreed	1 December 2023	Deleted: [RR-003]
2	Draft Development Consent Order – Schedule 14 Protective Provisions, Part 1	Development Consent Order [REP3-004]	protective provisions for the SCNA in Part 1 of Schedule 14 to the dDCO. He notes that ABP has accepted his proposed amendments, and therefore considers the wording of those protective provisions in the current draft to be satisfactory.	Schedule 14, Part 1 of the draft Development Consent Order sets out the proposed protective provisions for the protection of the SCNA, as the usual statutory <u>licensing</u> , procedure for tidal works has been disapplied by the dDCO. HMH has provided <u>iterative</u> comments on those proposed protective provisions, all of which have been accepted by ABP. The next version of the draft Development Consent Order submitted to the Examining Authority will reflect <u>the</u> <u>most recent comments provided</u> following Deadline 3 and ABP will).	31 January 2024	Deleted: additional Deleted: in Deleted: 2.1 Draft Development Consent Order [APP-006] Deleted: licencing Deleted: this

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR030008 Examination Document Ref: TR030008/EXAM/9.19

6

Deleted: -



ID	Matter	Reference	Harbour Master Humber Position	ABP Position	Status	Date
			licensing regime for tidal works justifies the inclusion of the protective provisions for the SCNA in Part 1 of Schedule 14 of the dDCO and the stream-lined approvals process for the protection of the SCNA which that Part contains. In light of the agreed protective provisions, HMH does not, so far as relevant to his functions, have any comments on article 3 (disapplication of legislative provisions) of the dDCO and is content with the provisions which refer to the "harbour master" and "the Statutory Conservancy and Navigation Authority", as defined in the dDCO. In particular, he has no comments on Articles 49 (Provision against danger to navigation), 50 (Lights on tidal works during construction), 51 (Permanent light on tidal works), 62 (Arbitration) and 63 (Procedure regarding certain approvals, etc.),			
3	Adequacy of NRA	6.4 Environmental Statement Appendices - Appendix 12.A: Navigational Risk	The HMH participated in the HAZID workshop and he considers the NRA to be fit for purpose, noting that further work will be required in due course to establish safe operating procedures for all vessels, including any new vessel types proposed to be introduced at the jetty. The HMH observes that the risk assessment	ABP acknowledges this position and recognises the legal separation between the SCNA and the Statutory Harbour Authority (SHA) of the Port of Immingham.	Agreed	31 January 2024



Matter	Reference	Harbour Master Humber Position	ABP Position	Status	Date	
	Assessment [APP-191],	methodology is broadly in line with the principles of the Port Marine Safety Code. The conclusions are consistent with what HMH would expect and the proposed mitigation measures appear to be reasonable, although the HMH reserves the right to change his position as the examination				Deleted: [APP-191]
		MarNIS risk assessment will be carried out in accordance with usual practice prior to the coming into operation of the new marine infrastructure and any additional requirements found to be necessary at that time must be met before operation is agreed.				
		At paragraph 1.2, HMH believes the reference to the Harbour Master is, in fact, to the Immingham Dockmaster and, at paragraph 3.7.2, the Harbour Master and VTS are referred to as "port personnel" which is incorrect.				
		Paragraph 4.2 suggests that there is no physical overlap between the Humber and Immingham SHAs whereas there are some areas over which each has jurisdiction. Paragraph 4.2 could be read to suggest that there is a single MSMS				
	Matter	Assessment	Assessment [APP-191]methodology is broadly in line with the principles of the Port Marine Safety Code. The conclusions are consistent with what HMH would expect and the proposed mitigation measures appear to be reasonable, although the HMH reserves the right to change his position as the examination progresses. HMH notes that his own MarNIS risk assessment will be carried out in accordance with usual practice prior to the coming into operation of the new marine infrastructure and any additional requirements found to be necessary at that time must be met before operation is agreed. HMH has the following points of detail: At paragraph 1.2, HMH believes the reference to the Harbour Master is, in fact, to the Immingham Dockmaster and, at paragraph 3.7.2, the Harbour Master and VTS are referred to as "port personnel" which is incorrect. Paragraph 4.2 suggests that there is no physical overlap between the Humber and Immingham SHAs whereas there are some areas over which each has jurisdiction.	Assessment [APP-191] methodology is broadly in line with the principles of the Port Marine Safety Code. The conclusions are consistent with what HMH would expect and the proposed mitigation measures appear to be reasonable, although the HMH reserves the right to change his position as the examination progresses. HMH notes that his own MarNIS risk assessment will be carried out in accordance with usual practice prior to the coming into operation of the new marine infrastructure and any additional requirements found to be necessary at that time must be met before operation is agreed. HMH has the following points of detail: At paragraph 1.2, HMH believes the reference to the Harbour Master is, in fact, to the Immingham Dockmaster and, at paragraph 3.7.2, the Harbour Master and VTS are referred to as "port personnel" which is incorrect. Paragraph 4.2 suggests that there is no physical overlap between the Humber and Immingham SHAs whereas there are some areas over which each has jurisdiction. Paragraph 4.2 could be read to suggest that there is a single MSMS	Assessment IAPP-1911 Principles of the Port Marine Safety Code. The conclusions are consistent with what HMH would expect and the proposed mitigation measures appear to be reasonable, although the HMH reserves the right to change his position as the examination progresses. HMH notes that his own MarNIS risk assessment will be carried out in accordance with usual practice prior to the coming into operation of the new marine infrastructure and any additional requirements found to be necessary at that time must be met before operation is agreed. HMH has the following points of detail: At paragraph 1.2, HMH believes the reference to the Harbour Master is, in fact, to the Immingham Dockmaster and, at paragraph 3.7.2, the Harbour Master and VTS are referred to as "port personel" which is incorrect. Paragraph 4.2 suggests that there is no physical overlap between the Humber and Immingham SHAs whereas there are some areas over which each has jurisdiction. Paragraph 4.2 could be read to suggest that there is a single MSMS	Assessment Assessment (APP-191) Code. The conclusions are consistent with what HMH would expect and the proposed mitigation measures appear to be reasonable, although the HMH reserves the right to change his position as the examination progresses. HMH notes that his own MarNIS risk assessment will be carried out in accordance with usual practice prior to the coming into operation of the new marine infrastructure and any additional requirements found to be necessary at that time must be met before operation is agreed. HMH has the following points of detail: At paragraph 1.2, HMH believes the reference to the Harbour Master is, in fact, to the Immingham Dockmaster and, at paragraph 3.7.2, the Harbour Master and VTS are referred to as "port personnel" Which is incorrect. Paragraph 4.2 suggests that there is no physical overlap between the Humber and Immingham SHAs whereas there are some areas over which each has jurisdiction. Paragraph 4.2 could be read to suggest that there is a single MSMS



ID	Matter	Reference	Harbour Master Humber Position	ABP Position	Status	Date
			whereas there are two separate Marine Safety Management Systems (MSMSs).			
			At table 11.3 (as in the table in Chapter 12 of the ES) the list of mitigation measures is not entirely accurate. Point (1) should refer to the Port MSMS, Humber Passage Plan (HPP), Humber Clean and Humber Estuary Serious Marine Emergency Plan, all of which will be updated to take the Project into account. Finally, Point (31) refers to "Harbour Works Consent" which would be disapplied by the dDCO. It should refer instead to the approval of tidal works etc. as set out in the protective provisions for the SCNA. HMH does not consider any of the above points to be material.			
	Marine exclusion zone associated with the handling of ammonia at the jetty	6.4 Environmental Statement Appendices - Appendix 12.A: Navigational Risk Assessment [APP-191]	The HMH requires further information from ABP to ensure that potential risks to river users, in particular those associated with the handling of ammonia or carbon dioxide at the jetty are fully understood and addressed			

Deleted: [APP-191]

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR030008 Examination Document Ref: TR030008/EXAM/9.19

9



D	Matter	Reference	Harbour Master Humber Position	ABP Position	Status	Date	
				questions and requirements in this respect.			
	Navigational simulations	6.4 Environmental Statement Appendices - Appendix 12.B: Navigational Simulation Survey [APP- 192]	The Harbourmaster attended the nautical simulations at HR Wallingford, who are recognised as being industry leaders in their field. The success of these simulations runs, coupled with the known hydrodynamic regime of this area, give the HMH confidence that this marine facility can be operated safely and successfully.	The HMH's position is acknowledged.	Agreed	31 January 2024	Deleted: [APP-192]
			HMH notes that, in his opinion, the Navigational Simulation Survey (NSS) was fit for purpose and the methodology followed was appropriate. The conclusions – that the IGET project can be successfully and safely operated by the vessels simulated - are noted, as are the mitigation measures that have been proposed. Subject to the same minor points referred to above, the mitigation measures appear to be appropriate, but the HMH reserves the right to further alter and amend this text during the course of examination.				
	Cumulative and in- combination effects	Various 6.2 Environmental Statement -	HES and the HMH serve the needs of all navigational users of the Humber. As is usual when there is any development in the river, HMH expects		Agreed	31 January 2024	



ID	Matter	Reference	Harbour Master Humber Position	ABP Position	Status	Date	1
		Cumulative and In <u>-</u> Combination Effects [APP-	there to be close liaison between HES and the Immingham SHA, during the IGET construction process, as well as when it is in operation. The HMH is of the opinion that the IGET project – and				Deleted: [APP-067]
			its attendant vessels – can be readily assimilated into HES's existing processes for managing commercial vessels. In-combination effects with other marine construction sites will also be manageable by applying the same controls to ensure safe navigation for all users. HMH is comfortable that the additional traffic associated with IGET in combination with the IERRT facility (if authorised) is well within the capacity of what the river can move in a regulated fashion.				
7		[PD-005], 6.2 Environmental Statement - Chapter 12: Marine Transport and Navigation	page F6 of the ExA's Rule 6 letter, HMH notes that his interest is limited to ensuring the safety of navigation for all vessels using the Humber whatever their destination. In relation to the suitability and deliverability of the mitigation measures in Table 12-6 of the		Agreed	31 January 2024	Deleted: [PD-005]
		2.1 Draft	Environmental Statement, HMH considers these measures adequate and deliverable through the existing mechanisms for ensuring navigational				Deleted: [APP-054]



ID	Matter	Reference	Harbour Master Humber Position	ABP Position	Status	Date	
		Consent Order [REP3-004],	safety on the Humber, which are compliant with the Port Marine Safety Code and associated guidance rather than through prescriptive provisions in the dDCO.				Deleted: 2.1 Draft Development Consent Order [APP-006]
			HMH also notes the following provisions in the dDCO which ensure that mitigation can be secured:				
			 Article 49 – provision against danger to navigation; 				
			 Article 50 – lights on tidal works during construction; 				
			 Article 51 – permanent lights on tidal works; 				
			 Requirement 6 – compliance with CEMP; 				
			Notice to Mariners;				
			 Deemed Marine Licence – paragraph 6 – approval of details by MMO; 				
			• The protection for the SCNA conferred by the protective provisions in Part 1 of Schedule 14 to the dDCO, including:				
			 Approval and inspection of tidal works under the 				



ID	Matter	Reference	Harbour Master Humber Position	ABP Position	Status	Date
			protective provisions for the SCNA;			
			 Discharges only with prior consent of the SCNA; 			
			 Protective works if required by the SCNA pursuant to the protective provisions; and 			
			 Safe operating procedure approved by the SCNA, as may be amended from time to time. 			



4 Glossary

I

Abbreviation / Acronym	Definition
ABP	Associated British Ports
DCO	Development Consent Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
HMH	Harbour Master Humber
HPP	Humber Passage Plan
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
MSMS	Marine Safety Management System
NRA	Navigational Risk Assessment
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
NSS	Navigational Simulation Survey
PA 2008	Planning Act 2008
PINS	Planning Inspectorate
SCNA	Statutory Conservancy and Navigation Authority
SHA	Strategic Harbour Authority
SCNA	Statutory Conservancy and Navigation Authority