

THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATIONS PROCEDURE) RULES 2010

SEA LINK DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER

PINS REFERENCE EN010119

DEADLINE 4: WRITTEN SUMMARY OF ORAL

SUBMISSIONS MADE ON BEHALF OF

LONDON GATEWAY PORT LIMITED



AT ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 2

This is a written summary of the oral submissions made on behalf of London Gateway Port Limited during Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) on 29 and 30 January 2026.

<p>Agenda Item 19</p> <p>Shipping and Navigation</p>	<p>19.1 - Safeguarding of dredge depths</p> <p>London Gateway Port Limited (LGPL) agrees with the Port of London Authority (PLA) that dredge depths must be secured by way of a Requirement in the development consent order (DCO). In addition to the submissions made by the PLA, LGPL considers dredge depths as a fundamental parameter and a key constraint to the extent of the authorised development comparable to maximum deviation or heights restrictions in terrestrial proposals. In accordance with the guidance on drafting development consent orders, parameters of this nature should be a Requirement of the DCO. LGPL has been consistent in this regard throughout its submissions.</p> <p>Although, LGPL does not suggest that the Applicant would necessarily do so, if depths were regulated only under the DML, the Applicant could, in theory, depart from those requirements by obtaining a licence on alternative terms. From the ExA's perspective looking at the application in the round now, depths should therefore be secured within the DCO by way of a Requirement.</p> <p>LGPL is happy with the Areas of Interest as defined by the PLA.</p> <p>19.3 - Cable joints</p> <p>LGPL welcomes the Applicant's confirmation there are no planned cable joints in the safeguarded Areas of Interest and its recognition that a scenario where unplanned joints are required needs to be assessed. However, LGPL is concerned it has not yet seen anything in respect of how and where that position on cable joints will be secured. LGPL considers commitments in respect of cable joints could be secured by way of Requirement, but might be better addressed by way of condition in the DML to give some flexibility, subject to oversight by the MMO. LGPL's would like to discuss this further with the Applicant and the PLA in order to ensure a general principle there are no cable crossings or joints in the PLA's Areas of Interest.</p> <p>In LGPL's view the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) does not secure restrictions but rather summarises commitments and records where they are committed to elsewhere.</p>
--	---

	<p>19.6 & 7 – Safety Zones and Exclusion Zones</p> <p>LGPL reiterates the REAC does not itself <i>secure</i> commitments in respect of zones. LGPL considers Exclusion Zones could be secured in the Navigation Installation Plan or in another document to be approved under the DML as suggested in LGPL’s Responses to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions and Requests for Information (ExQ1) issued on 17 December 2025 [REP3-093].</p> <p>LGPL requested in their Responses to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions and Requests for Information (ExQ1) issued on 17 December 2025 [REP3-093] the Applicant improve its commitments on a practical level by way of communication with LGPL in order to mitigate the effects on vessels entering or exiting London Gateway Port because the Applicant’s proposed Safety Zones could function as a temporary blockage to the channel. At present, the Applicant has not provided any details in respect of how this could be achieved and LGPL would welcome the Applicant’s response on this.</p>
<p>Agenda Item 21 –</p> <p>The draft Development Consent Order</p>	<p>21.1 – Article 10</p> <p>LGPL entirely understands and sympathises with the intent of Article 10 as a whole, in light of the <i>Hillside</i> legal judgment.</p> <p>However, references to development in Article 10(2) could include development authorised in and around the Sunk under third party development consent orders. LGPL has obtained commitments and requirements under other development consent orders in the Sunk area, specifically the Five Estuaries and North Falls projects. LGPL is concerned that the commitments and restrictions imposed on those schemes for the benefit and protection of London Gateway Port, as well as the mechanisms for liaison with those developments, could be circumvented or diluted as a result of Article 10(2)(b) of this Order. Specifically, LGPL is concerned that Article 10 could enable other schemes to be released from obligations that LGPL has already secured under existing DCOs for example in relation to their equivalents to the CSIP and NIP.</p> <p>LGPL does not believe this is the Applicant’s intent and will raise its concerns regarding the drafting of Article 10 directly with the Applicant.</p>