

THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATIONS PROCEDURE) RULES 2010

SEA LINK DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (PINS REFERENCE EN010119)

LONDON GATEWAY PORT LIMITED ( [REDACTED] )

DEADLINE 2: COMMENTS ON OTHER PARTIES' WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS SUBMITTED AT DEADLINE 1

Selected Written Representations  <i>[referencing relevant sections / relevant extracts]</i>	LGPL Comment
<b>REP1-162</b>  <b>Maritime and Coastguard Agency</b>	
<b><i>Shipping and Navigation Mitigation Measures</i></b>  <i>The MCA would request the following to be implemented by the project:</i>  <i>1) Construction and installation activities for Sea Link should not coincide with those of the Five Estuaries and North Falls Offshore Windfarm projects (and other future projects) to avoid cumulative impacts and navigational risks.</i>  <i>2) No activities involving vessels Restricted in Ability to Manoeuvre (RAM) should run concurrently with activities involving RAM vessels planned by the Five Estuaries and North Falls project developers in the SUNK area (or other future projects). This is mainly near the SUNK Pilot Boarding Ground (PBG).</i>  <i>3) No project vessels with Restricted Ability to Manoeuvre (RAM) (cable laying, UXO clearance, survey etc) are to operate in the wider Sunk area when visibility is below nautical 2 miles.</i>	LGPL agrees with points 1 to 3 and suggests the CSIP should be required under the Deemed Marine Licence ( <b>DML</b> ) to secure such matters.  LGPL agrees with point 4, and as set out in LGPL's Written Representation [REP1-142] ( <b>LGPL WRs</b> ), these matters should be secured by way of a requirement to the development consent.

<p>4) The cable (and any covering material e.g. rock armour) must be at least 22 metres below Chart Datum in the vicinity of the Deep-Water (DW) Route and DW Anchorage to allow future vessels with a draught of 20 metres. The MCA would expect a post-lay cable burial survey to be carried out to confirm where the target depths have or have not been met and secured in the DCO.</p>	
<p><b>Development Consent Order</b></p> <p><i>It is the MCA's view that the controls are not currently adequate in the draft DCO to address the reduction of navigation depth and Under Keel Clearance (UKC).</i></p> <p><i>1) The draft DCO (AS-088) references the reduction in navigable depth by more than 5% within Schedule 16 Part 2 (12.3). We would like to highlight that as per MCA Relevant Representation (RR-5382) submitted on 23 June 2025, any depth reduction in areas where deep-draught vessels operate must be reviewed. Any reduction caused as a result of the cable lay or any associated cable protection measures should be discussed and agreed by the local ports and MCA and secured through consent conditions.</i></p> <p><i>This condition also only deals with maintenance, and for installation we would like a bespoke condition to ensure the 22m below chart datum is secured. Therefore, we would like to amend the condition in Schedule 16 Part 2, 12 (3) and add a new condition which is to be discussed and agreed between the applicant, the ports and the MCA. This requirement is particularly critical near North Shipwash, the SUNK area (including W1, precautionary areas, SUNK Deep Water Anchorage, and the Long Sand Heads two-way route), west of Thanet OWF, and approaches to Pegwell Bay.</i></p> <p><i>2) The cable (and any covering material e.g. rock armour) must be at least 22 metres below Chart Datum in the vicinity of the Deep-Water (DW) Route and DW Anchorage to allow future vessels with a draught of 20 metres. The MCA would expect a post-lay cable burial survey to be carried out to confirm where the target depths have or have not been met and secured in the DCO.</i></p>	<p>On point 1, LGPL shares the MCA's concerns. As per the LGPL WRs, LGPL considers the 22m dredge depth should be secured by Requirement in the DCO.</p> <p>LGPL agrees with the points made in relation to 2 to 3.</p>

<p>3) To maintain adequate burial depth in this area, the project must implement timely remedial measures if cable exposure occurs due to seabed mobility and promptly notify all relevant operators of the exposure. We would like to amend the DML condition under Schedule 16 Part 2 (3.12)) to:</p> <p><i>“In case of exposure of cables on or above the seabed, the undertaker must, within five days following identification of a cable exposure, and within SUNK Area and especially near the SUNK DW Anchorage as soon as reasonably practicable notify mariners and port authorities in the SUNK region by issuing a notice to mariners and by informing Kingfisher Information Service of the location and extent of exposure.</i></p> <p><i>Copies of all notices must be provided to the MMO, MCA, Trinity House, Kingfisher Information Service of Seafish and UK Hydrographic Office within seven days of the exposure identification”.</i></p> <p><i>We have identified that there are large container ships (up to 400m LOA) anchoring to the edge of the SUNK DW anchorage to ensure they can be closer to the Pilot Boarding Ground. On certain occasions, they are around 300m North of the proposed cable route. If these large container vessels are to drag anchor (in an adverse weather scenario) onto an exposed cable, there will be damage to the cable and potentially a vessel incident within an already complex area. If such a notice is issued, the vessels can stay clear of the area, and authorities can track any vessels approaching to anchor close to the cable.</i></p> <p><i>The MCA would like to confirm that we wish to be consulted for the relevant shipping and navigation related conditions within the DCO. Confirmation was requested by the ExA at the ISH1 on 11th November 2025.</i></p>	
<p><b>Cable Routes / Cable Protection and Cable Burial Risk Assessment</b></p> <p><i>The draft Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) (PDA-039) states within Table 24 that from KP 35.089 (North of Storm Buoy) to KP 56.887 (SUNK Outer Precautionary Area, NW of Sunk</i></p>	<p>As per the LGPL WR's, it is LGPL's position that a <i>Requirement</i> must be included in the dDCO to the effect that future dredging to 22m is not precluded in the specified Sunk area (and to the depths specified in the LGPL WR's in the other specified areas).</p>

<p><i>S2 Buoy) the Depth of Lowering will be at least 2.0m, and further within the CBRA it is stated that</i></p> <p><i>“The maximum recommended depth of lowering has been calculated as 2.5 m within the areas of highest risk in the vicinity of the SUNK deepwater anchorage and the shipping channels associated with the SUNK Vessel Traffic System (VTS) and the southeastern approaches to the Outer Thames Estuary adjacent to the North Foreland”.</i></p> <p><i>As per above, we would like the project to bury the cable to 22m below chart datum in the vicinity of the DW route and SUNK DW Anchorage to be in line with the burial depths agreed within the Navigation Installation Plan of other projects in the area to ensure any future dredging can be undertaken to accommodate vessels up to 20m draught can safely navigate in this area in future. We believe that a bespoke condition to ensure compliance with this requirement should be secured within the DCO-DML.</i></p> <p><i>Where burial depths as informed by the Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) cannot be achieved in the maintained depth channels, any potential reduction in surrounding depths referenced to Chart Datum will need special attention and further consultation with the MCA, Ports in the area and other relevant stakeholders. Any consented cable protection works must ensure existing and future safe navigation is not compromised</i></p>	
<p><b>Electromagnetic Deviation</b></p>	<p>LGPL defers to the MCA's expertise on the points raised and supports its requests.</p>
<p><b>Navigation Installation Plan (NIP) document 9.12 and Navigation Risk Assessment Process</b></p>	<p>LGPL defers to the MCA's expertise on the points raised and supports its requests.</p> <p>LGPL expects to see amendments to the DML in the dDCO, or otherwise the inclusion of protective provisions to provide for the agreement of LGPL, the MCA and the other harbour authorities, to the NIP (and the other plans referred to in the CSIP).</p>

<b>REP1-156</b>  <b>Port of London Authority</b>	
<b>General</b>	LGPL agrees and supports the points made by the PLA in REP1-156 which concur and align with the points made by LGPL in the LGPL WRs.
<b>Mitigating Potential Impacts to Shipping and Navigation</b>	LGPL agrees and supports the changes proposed to the oNIP and the comments in relation to the production of the oCSIP and oSDMP. As set out in the LGPL WR's, LGPL also seeks a right of approval of the final forms of those plans.
<b>Comments on the DCO</b>	LGPL notes the proposed amendments to the dDCO set out in section 11 of and Appendix 4 to REP1-156. LGPL supports those amendments, subject to any refining of the specific wording and to some additional amendments in respect of the DML to secure the role of LGPL in the various plans and notifications. LGPL looks forward to discussing this jointly with the Applicant and the PLA.
<b>Concluding Remarks</b>	LGPL supports and agrees the proposed mechanisms to secure the various concerns set out in the useful table included at para 13.5 of REP1-156.
<b>REP1-197</b>  <b>Harwich Haven Authority (HHA)</b>	
<i>Key Concerns - Navigational Safety &amp; Pilotage, Cumulative Impact, Procedural Safeguards, Future proof of Navigational depths, Recommendations</i>	LGPL notes that HHA shares the same concerns as LGPL and also seeks adequate controls within the dDCO itself, rather than a need to rely on plans yet to be certified. Further, HHA seeks to protect a

	future dredge depth for vessels of 20m draught, which accords with LGPL's position.
--	---

9 December 2025