THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATIONS PROCEDURE) RULES 2010

NORTH FALLS OFFSHORE WIND FARM DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER

PINS REFERENCE EN010119

DEADLINE 2: PORT OF LONDON
AUTHORITY'S RESPONSE TO EXAMINING
AUTHORITY'S WRITTEN QUESTIONS AND
RESPONSE FOR INFORMATION ISSUED
ON 4 FEBRUARY 2025



Set out below are the Port of London Authority's comments on the Examining Authority's Written Questions and requests for Further Information issued on 4 February 2025 directed at the Port of London Authority.

| | Question to: | Question | Port of London Authority Response |
|---------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | | |
| Q6.1.47 | Port of London Authority | Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession | The Port of London Authority ("PLA") is at an advanced stage of discussing protective provisions for the PLA in relation to the Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm project. |
| | | The RR [RR-272] of the Port of London Authority makes reference to various matters including Protective Provisions to safeguard its interests. Port of London Authority is requested to provide details of the Protective Provisions that it seeks to be included in the dDCO [AS-022]. | The parties have been unable to reach agreement on the drafting of the protective provisions and as a result, the PLA submitted at deadline 7 of the Five Estuaries examination (03 March 2025) its preferred drafting. A copy of the PLA's preferred drafting for Five Estuaries is appended to the PLA's Written Representation for North Falls. |
| | | | The PLA would expect to see similar protective provisions incorporated for North Falls and will approach the Applicant with a view to agreeing the changes required to the Five Estuaries protective provisions to reflect the North Falls proposals. |
| | | | The protective provisions will also need to deal with the potential impacts of the vessels required to undertake the horizontal directional drilling at landfall interfering with the PLA's radio link and lowering its reliability (RR-272). |

| | Question to: | Question | Port of London Authority Response |
|---------|--|---|---|
| Q15.1.3 | Trinity House, UK Chamber of Shipping and any other IP | Navigational Risk Assessment methodology Are you content with the methodology that has been applied to assess the Proposed Development's shipping and navigational risks in the submitted NRA Chapter 3 in [APP-106])? The ExA notes the MCA responded in their RR [RR-048] that: "A completed MGN 654 Checklist has been provided as part of the NRA, and we are content the recommended NRA methodology process has been followed." However, the views of other stakeholders on this matter are sought. If you are not content, what are your concerns and how might they be addressed? | The PLA is content with the methodology applied in the NRA [APP-106] |
| Q15.1.4 | Trinity House, UK Chamber of Shipping and any other IP | NRA data sources Are you content that the NRA has been informed by the correct sources of data (Chapter 5 in [APP-106])? The ExA notes the MCA confirmed in their RR [RR-048] that "MCA is content that the traffic data collection is suitable for the assessment." However, the views of other stakeholders on this matter are sought. If you are not content, what other data do you think should be taken into account when assessing the navigational and shipping risks associated with the Proposed Development? | The PLA is broadly content with the sources of data used to inform the NRA. Whilst port and Sunk VTS data has not been included in the Maritime incidents data, the PLA considers that this data is unlikely to make a material difference. |

| | Question to: | Question | Port of London Authority Response |
|---------|--|--|--|
| Q15.1.5 | Trinity House, UK Chamber of Shipping and any other IP | Paragraph 852, Chapter 21 Summary, from the NRA Part 2 of 3 [APP-107] states that "The significance of risk has been determined as either Broadly Acceptable or Tolerable for all shipping and navigation hazards assessed. With additional mitigation measures applied, the residual risk is Broadly Acceptable or Tolerable with Mitigation for all shipping and navigation hazards and ALARP." | (i) In terms of risk to navigational safety, the PLA considers that the submission and approval of the navigation and installation plan is an important mitigation that is required to reduce the risk to navigational safety to 'as low as reasonable practicable.' As set out in the PLA's Written Representation, amendments are required to the outline navigation and installation plan and an updated plan needs to be submitted into the examination. |
| | | (i) Are you satisfied that the Proposed Development, subject to implementation of management plans and the level of mitigation proposed by the Applicant, reduces the risks to navigational safety to 'as low as reasonably practicable' (ALARP)? (ii) Are you content with the NRA and that the MGN 654 checklist has been satisfactorily completed to demonstrate compliance? If not, what more needs to be done to give you reassurance? | (ii) The PLA is content with the NRA and that the MGN 654 checklist has been satisfactorily completed. |