

PROPOSED SOUTH EAST ANGLIA LINK (SEA LINK) DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER

PINS REFERENCE: EN020026

LONDON GATEWAY PORT LIMITED (LGPL) ()

COMMENTS ON DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT DEADLINE 3

(A) LGPL'S COMMENTS ON THE APPLICANT'S COMMENTS ON OTHER SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 2 [REP3-064]

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]				
Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
2.1.1 Comments on Table 2.1 of the Applicant's Response to ISH1 (11 Nov 2025) [REP1-124]				
AP10	Technical note regarding protection of under keel clearance including in relation to cable crossings on bedrock where external protection or backfilling will be required above seabed level.	Our comments on the technical note provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 A [REP1A-038] are set out in the table titled LGPL Comments on Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note below. In particular, as set out below, LPGL does not see how a TDOL approach alone guarantees the possibility of a future dredge of - 22m CD (with necessary tolerances).	This is noted by the Applicant. Further responses to the safeguarding of water depth are provided below.	Please refer to our comments at AP13 below which set out the necessary mechanism to secure depths in the PLA's Areas of Interest.
AP12	Ports such as Medway, Tilbury and London Gateway Port do not appear to have been consulted on the Navigational Risk Assessment [APP-203]. Provide an explanation as to how the necessary additional consultation will be carried out.	Notwithstanding LGPL's status as a statutory consultee (the basis on which LGPL is a statutory consultee is set out in paragraph 4 of its Written Representation [REP1-142]). Contrary to the Applicant's statement at para 3.13.5 of REP1-112 (Applicant's Comments on the Relevant Representations of the Port of London Authority), LGPL has no record of any engagement from the Applicant prior to 28 October 2025. LGPL's first discussions with the Applicant regarding the Application took place on 17 November 2025.	The Applicant can confirm that London Gateway Port was specifically engaged early on via email at the start of the project on the 20 April 2021 and 30 April 2021. The port falls outside of the Sea Link 10 NM shipping and navigation study area, however, the Applicant has and will continue to engage further with London Gateway Port.	LGPL will pick up with the Applicant directly regarding communications in 2021. As previously noted, although the port physically lies outside the 10 NM study area, its vital shipping lanes and the area in which it may exercise its powers as statutory harbour authority fall squarely within the study area.
AP13	Consideration as to whether there are adequate controls in the draft Development Consent Order/Deemed Marine Licence with regard to under keel clearance during construction and future requirements.	As set out in LGPL's Written Representations [REP1-142], presently there are not adequate controls in the dDCO to secure the passage of vessels in the future. The Applicant has indicated the DML, protective provisions (or other agreed means of securing the requirements) will be provided alongside the management plans, such as the NIP and outline CSIP. Whilst this is helpful, we note the Applicant has: (i) not yet committed to securing the necessary controls in respect of under keel clearance by way of a Requirement in the dDCO (the reasons for a Requirement being necessary are set out in paragraph 5 of LGPL's Written Representations [REP1-142]); (ii) not committed to a deadline for the provision of the NIP and outline CSIP nor the cable protection plan for LGPL's consideration; and (iii) has not confirmed LGPL will be given adequate approval rights (either by way of protective provisions or by provision in the DML) of the plans and documents governing cable laying works and future maintenance.	The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities and described in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering implications of these requirements, specifically the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be necessary in parts of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area" where depths are already less than the 22 m CD safeguard level. The Applicant confirms that the assessment outlined in paragraph 2.3.9 of Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] is ongoing, and an update on the outcome will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water	Whilst LGPL is grateful that the Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard depths within the PLA's Areas of Interest, we note that the Applicant's position on this is subject to the completion of its assessment and that there will be an update on the outcome at D4. We are not clear whether that means that the outcome itself will be known by D4. LGPL therefore presently does not know whether the Applicant agrees to protect the dredge depths, to the depths specified, in the Areas of Interest or not, or quite when the Applicant will have a position on these matters. Separately, the Applicant continues to consider that Protective Provisions could serve as an appropriate safeguarding mechanism. However, LGPL considers that reliance on Protective Provisions alone would be inappropriate and risks making the DCO unnecessarily complex. LGPL has consistently stated throughout its submissions both in writing and at hearings that a

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
		<p>LGPL looks forward to sight of a revised draft of the dDCO as soon as possible so that these matters can be progressed and agreement reached with the Applicant.</p>	<p>Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders. The Applicant agrees with the port stakeholders that the aim is to secure these commitments through appropriate mechanisms, such as Protective Provisions and DCO provisions as necessary, and is working collaboratively with the port stakeholders to agree both the mechanism and the wording.</p> <p>The Applicant will provide an updated version of Application Document 9.12 Outline Navigation and Installation Plan [AS-104] at Deadline 4.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently drafting the outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (oCSIP) which will be provided at Deadline 4. This document will also incorporate the outline Sediment Disposal Management Plan (oSDMP).</p>	<p>Requirement is necessary to secure the depths. This is because the requirement not to preclude the specified dredge depth is a fundamental parameter to, or restriction on, the carrying out of the authorised development – it is in a sense akin to an upwards limit of deviation. It is for the Order itself to specify such a restriction – this is in accordance with the <i>Guidance on the content of a Development Consent Order required for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project</i> [Paragraph 003, Reference ID 04-003-20240430 and Paragraph 008, Reference ID 04-008-20240430] and would follow accepted practice across other development consent orders and harbour orders under the Harbours Act 1964. It is also consistent with the Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm Order 2025 (Requirement 2(3) of Schedule 2 to that Order). A Requirement is the simplest approach LGPL looks forward to sight of a revised draft of the dDCO as soon as possible so that this matter can be progressed and agreement reached with the Applicant.</p> <p>We look forward to receiving the updated Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note, the Outline Navigation and Installation Plan, and the oCSIP at Deadline 4 (including the oSDMP). In addition to the oSDMP, LGPL would be grateful if the Applicant could confirm which documents will comprise the CSIP, and provide copies of all documents and plans that will form part of the CSIP as soon as possible during the Examination, allowing sufficient time for stakeholders to review and exchange comments with the Applicant. The Applicant has not yet confirmed that LGPL will be granted adequate approval rights - either through Protective Provisions or by inclusion in the DML - over the plans and documents governing cable laying works and future maintenance (including the CSIP), insofar as they relate to the PLA's Areas of Interest. LGPL considers that such approval rights are essential. The plans and documents should be secured by way of a condition in the DML.</p> <p>LGPL also requests that the draft cable protection plan be provided as soon as possible, and again with sufficient time remaining in the Examination to enable all parties to consider and exchange submissions.</p>
AP14	Response to London Gateway Port's questions about provision of draft cable laying and burial plan, cable	It is unclear at what stage the outline version of the CSIP will be provided in the Examination. LGPL will require sight of the outline CSIP at the earliest possible opportunity and reserves its position regarding approval rights over the CSIP which is to be submitted pre-	The Applicant is currently drafting the outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (oCSIP) which will be	Noted. We refer to LGPL's comments in respect of AP13 above.

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
	protection plan and the cable specification installation plan.	<p>construction in accordance with the DML. In addition, the proposed content that the plans comprising the CSIP must cover should be prescribed in the outline CSIP (i.e. the outline CSIP must not simply reference the plans which will make up the CSIP without saying what they must cover). LGPL request the Applicant provides the outline CSIP as soon as possible and by Deadline 3 at the latest.</p> <p>The DML must contain sufficient provisions in the conditions to ensure that the final form of the CSIP is in accordance with the outline CSIP and LGPL (and the other relevant harbour authorities and the MCA) should have rights of approval (otherwise similar effect must be achieved in protective provisions).</p>	provided at Deadline 4. This document will also incorporate the outline Sediment Disposal Management Plan (oSDMP).	
2.1.2 Comments on the Applicant's Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]				
2.1.4 (Introduction)	<p>The following summarises the ongoing engagement with stakeholders on the matter of under-keel clearance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Port of London Authority (PLA) has provided GIS data for three Areas of Safeguarded Depth (the Areas of Interest): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — 1) "Sunk Pilot Boarding area" where PLA have requested 22 m below Chart Datum (CD) minimum water depth; — 2) "Long Sand Head Two-Way Route crossing area" where PLA request 12.5 m below CD to be preserved; and — 3) "North East (NE) Spit area" where 12.5 m below CD is to be preserved. The PLA also require in all areas of interest (1) to (3) to make allowance for an 'over-dredge' tolerance of 0.5 m in addition to the stated depths attributable to standard dredging methodology. 	<p>LGPL are of the view a Requirement must be added to the draft DCO [REP1-036] to ensure a dredge depth of 22 metres below CD is not precluded in the Sunk Pilot Boarding Area. LGPL also endorses the proposed over-dredge tolerance 0.5 metres in addition to the stated depth proposed by the PLA and this must also be secured as part of the Requirement. These allowances are required to ensure larger vessels in the future can use the Sunk route into the Thames Estuary.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, LGPL maintains the view expressed in its Written Representations [REP1-142] that 12.5 metres below CD should also be maintained at Long Sand Head Two-Way Route crossing area and the North East Spit area. An allowance of 0.5 metres for over-dredging should also be secured in addition to the stated depths. Again, this safeguarding must be secured by way of a Requirement in the draft DCO.</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities and described in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering implications of these requirements, specifically the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be necessary in parts of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area" where depths are already less than the 22 m CD safeguard level. The Applicant confirms that the assessment outlined in paragraph 2.3.9 of Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] is ongoing, and an update on the outcome will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders. The Applicant agrees with the port stakeholders that the aim is to secure these commitments through appropriate mechanisms, such as Protective Provisions and DCO provisions as necessary, and is working collaboratively with the port stakeholders to agree both the mechanism and the wording.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently drafting the Protective Provisions for London Gateway Port and these will be sent for review in good time prior to Deadline 4.</p>	<p>We refer to LGPL's further comments above on Table 2.1 of the Applicant's Response to ISH1 (11 November 2025) [REP1-124] in relation to AP13.</p> <p>LGPL received a draft Protective Provision from the Applicant on 29 January 2026 and will provide its comments to the Applicant shortly.</p>

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harwich Haven Authority (HHA) has also requested that 22 m below CD is safeguarded within "the Sunk area". Further detail on precise geographical extent of this area was provided on 7 November 2025. Further communication has established that the area of interest for the HHA consists of two circles centred at the Sunk Pilot Boarding Station charted and actual boarding locations. • London Gateway Port has expressed that they support the PLA in seeking safeguarding of 22 m in the PLA's "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area", and 12.5 m below CD within the "Long Sand Head Two-Way Route crossing area" and "NE Spit area". They also have interest in regards powers of dredging rights adjacent to the Sunk which need to be considered. 			
<p>2.3.8 – 2.3.13 (PLA's Sunk Pilot Boarding Area)</p>	<p>Analysis of the seabed morphology within the PLA's "Sunk Pilot Boarding area" indicates that the seabed is in the main greater than 22 m CD, however in the northwest of the area there are linear seabed features trending SSW to NNE. The seabed features comprise of London Clay ridges with local accumulations of sands and granular material. The baseline depth along the corridor which passes through the low point in the ridge, is shallower than the PLA's requested 22 m below CD.</p> <p>The Applicant's main protection strategy for Sea Link</p>	<p>LGPL notes the Applicant is considering additional cable depth of lowering in respect of parts of the Sunk Pilot Boarding Area which are already shallower than 22 metres below CD and that the Applicant is assessing engineering implications of the additional depth. The Applicant also notes the presence of London Clay ridges in the northwest of the identified area. LGPL has no concerns in respect of the methodology adopted by the Applicant, provided the approach does not preclude LGPL's ability to dredge to 22 metres below CD across the Sunk Pilot Boarding Area. Such is required notwithstanding (i) current depths already being shallower than 22 metres below CD; and (ii) the presence of the London Clay ridges. For this reason, describing the methodology alone is not sufficient as DoL is always relative to the existing bathymetry – instead the Requirement (which delivers an absolute, not relative outcome) must be included.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant's commentary refers to the current absence of dredging applications in respect of the Sunk which, although not expressly stated, calls into question the need for depths to be secured across the area of concern and whether those areas would,</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities and described in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering implications of these requirements, specifically the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be necessary in parts of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area" where depths are already less than the 22 m CD safeguard level. The Applicant confirms that the assessment outlined in paragraph 2.3.9 of Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] is ongoing, and an update on the outcome will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders. The Applicant agrees with the port</p>	<p>We refer to LGPL's further comments above on Table 2.1 of the Applicant's Response to ISH1 (11 November 2025) [REP1-124], in relation to AP13.</p> <p>LGPL notes the Applicant's confirmation that there "no existing or known planned crossing locations within the Area of Safeguarded Depth "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area". As per LGPL's original comment, this should be secured. LGPL accepts a condition to the DML may be a more appropriate provision that a Requirement, as was previously stated. The condition should ensure there will be no cable crossings at the Sunk or Long Sand Head and any crossing at North East Spit will be at the deepest part possible and so as not to preclude depths of 12.5m below Chart Datum plus 0.5m over dredge tolerance.</p>

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
	<p>is cable lowering, with the intention to lower the cable bundle between 2 m to 2.5 m deep within identified "High Risk Areas", of which the Sunk region is one (Application Document 9.21 Sea Link Cable Burial Risk Assessment [PDA-039]). The trench containing the lowered cable bundle will be backfilled with up to 2 m of protective rock, to 80% (maximum 2 m backfill) of the lowered depth, to provide additional protection against anchor strike or drag interactions.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering implications of the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be required in areas of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding area" that are already shallower than the 22 m CD safeguard level. In the worse case, the cable DoL required may increase from 2.5 m to approximately 4.5m in the shallowest sections of the route. These changes require further investigation in terms of cable burial methodology and cable system design. The Applicant is undertaking the necessary technical assessments in order to reach agreement on wording of Protective Provisions on this matter.</p> <p>To note, the PLA and HHA have informed the Applicant that the current Sunk Pilot Boarding Station charted diamond is located to the west of the previously described</p>	<p>in reality, be dredged. LGPL is not aware of any reason why the entirety of the Sunk Pilot Boarding Area could not be dredged nor why the necessary consents to carry out such dredging would not be issued.</p> <p>We also note the Applicant has suggested there are no "known cable crossings planned" within the PLA's Sunk Pilot Boarding Area. LGPL's position is that there must be no cable crossings due to Work No. 6 within the Sunk unless such crossings are either (i) in areas where depths already exceed 22 metres below CD (with a 0.5 metre tolerance for over-dredging); or (ii) are implemented using a methodology which ensures a future dredge depth of 22 metres below CD plus the 0.5 metre tolerance is not precluded. Again, this must be secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO.</p> <p>A fuller description of the pilotage activities in the Sunk area is set out in the Written Representations of LGPL [REP1-142] and the PLA [REP1-155].</p>	<p>stakeholders that the aim is to secure these commitments through appropriate mechanisms, such as Protective Provisions and DCO provisions as necessary, and is working collaboratively with the port stakeholders to agree both the mechanism and the wording.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently drafting the Protective Provisions for London Gateway Port and these will be sent for review in good time prior to Deadline 4.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that there are no existing or known planned crossing locations within the Area of Safeguarded Depth "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area".</p>	

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
	<p>shallow seabed feature within the Sunk region and therefore is not an area where large ships can receive pilots.</p> <p>Pilot boarding does not take place at the Sunk Pilot Boarding Station charted diamond, but currently takes place up to approximately 1.5 km to the east of the charted diamond i.e. in the vicinity of the large ridge where water depths are considerably shallower than 22 m CD.</p> <p>In discussions with PLA and HHA, they currently have been no detailed applications or provision of confirmed development plans for dredging of the natural features in question within the Sunk area.</p>			
<p>2.3.14 – 2.3.16 (PLA's NE Spit Area)</p>	<p>The Applicant has been engaging with the Port of London Authority in respect of under-keel clearance within the PLA's "NE Spit area". Of particular consideration is the GridLink planned cable crossing, which is expected to be located within this area at approximately KP 101.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with GridLink to understand the development's plans for installation in this area, and with the goal of coengineering and collaborating as required in order to ensure that the PLA's</p>	<p>LGPL are content for the GridLink crossing at NE Spit to be located in deeper waters so as to ensure sufficient water depth in the area of concern. We assume therefore that there would be no difficulty in entering into the Requirement sought in the DCO. LGPL's rights to approve the cable specification and installation plan (CSIP) must be secured by way of protective provisions or pursuant to the deemed marine licence.</p> <p>LGPL provided the Applicant with example wording for the relevant protective provision on 21 November 2025.</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities and described in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering implications of these requirements, specifically the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be necessary in parts of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area" where depths are already less than the 22 m CD safeguard level. The Applicant confirms that the assessment outlined in paragraph 2.3.9 of Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] is ongoing, and an update on the outcome will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water</p>	<p>We refer to LGPL's further comments above on Table 2.1 of the Applicant's Response to ISH1 (11 November 2025) [REP1-124], specifically in relation to AP13.</p> <p>The Applicant's comments do not deal with the specific matter of the interaction with the GridLink planned cable in the NE Spit area and the need to ensure the Requirement to safeguard dredge depths to 12.5m in that Area of Interest applies. As noted above, the condition on the DML should ensure there are no cable crossings at the Sunk or Long Sand Head and any crossing at North East Spit will be at the deepest part possible and so as not to preclude depths of 12.5m below Chart Datum plus 0.5m over dredge tolerance</p>

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
	<p>requirement for 12.5 m depth below CD can be met within the "NE Spit area", which is an area with shallow sections.</p> <p>The Applicant is satisfied that it has a solution to ensure that the 12.5 m depth is preserved even at the GridLink crossing location, by moving the planned Sea Link cable route at this point into deeper waters to the east (while still within the Order Limits) ensuring sufficient water depth above the expected crossing location. The Applicant had kept the Order Limits wide here to enable such solutions to be possible.</p> <p>The Applicant is undertaking the necessary technical assessments in order to reach agreement on wording of Protective Provisions on this matter.</p>		<p>Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders. The Applicant agrees with the port stakeholders that the aim is to secure these commitments through appropriate mechanisms, such as Protective Provisions and DCO provisions as necessary, and is working collaboratively with the port stakeholders to agree both the mechanism and the wording.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently drafting the Protective Provisions for London Gateway Port and these will be sent for review in good time prior to Deadline 4</p>	
5.2.1 – 5.2.2 (Cable Specification and Installation Plan)	<p>The Applicant has submitted a draft DML which describes the provision of pre-construction plans and documentation including the CSIP.</p> <p>The CSIP will be submitted preconstruction in accordance with the DML and will be informed by the Contractor's final assessment of the site data, burial assessment study and detailed design and methodologies. The Contractor's detailed design is still to be undertaken and therefore the final design and methodologies to inform the final CSIP is not currently</p>	<p>The Applicant has not committed to a deadline to provide the outline CSIP.</p> <p>LGPL requests sight of the draft outline CSIP as soon as possible and at the latest by Deadline 3 of the Examination (9 December 2026). A summary of the details to be contained in the documents/plans comprising the CSIP must be included in the outline CSIP (i.e. not simply references to the plans which will make up the CSIP).</p> <p>LGPL's right to approve the final CSIP must be secured by way of protective provisions or pursuant to the deemed marine licence.</p>	<p>The Applicant is currently drafting the outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (oCSIP) which will be provided at Deadline 4. This document will also incorporate the outline Sediment Disposal Management Plan (oSDMP).</p>	<p>LGPL looks forward to receiving the oCSIP at Deadline 4 together with the oSDMP.</p> <p>We reiterate that LGPL's right to approve the final CSIP must be secured by way of protective provisions or pursuant to the deemed marine licence.</p>

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
	<p>known. The Applicant is in discussions with the relevant stakeholders on the scope of the CSIP to be submitted preconstruction. Discussions are ongoing to understand whether any further additional documents are required or whether the scope of information required can be captured in the documents proposed in the draft DML. The Applicant currently intends to submit an outline version of the CSIP once these discussions have progressed further.</p>			
<p>2.1.3 Comments on the Table 6.1 of the Applicant's Responses to Selected Relevant Representation Responses [REP1-115]</p>				
6.11.1	<p>Introduction and Background London Gateway Port Limited, LG Park Freehold Limited and LG Park Leasehold Limited (collectively hereinafter referred to as DPWLG) are the owners and operators of DP World London Gateway Port (the Port) and DP World London Gateway Logistics Park (the Logistics Park) on the north bank of the Thames Estuary in Stanford-le Hope, Essex. The Port is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and makes a significant contribution to the national economy¹. Once fully developed, the Port will comprise deep sea shipping and container handling facilities with an annual throughput that will equate to approximately 27% of the predicted national growth in such trade by 2030. The Logistics Park will provide up to approximately 740,000sq.m of</p>	<p>As explained in paragraph 4 of its Written Representation [REP1-142] LGPL is a statutory consultee.</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
	vital commercial floorspace. Both are of national significance and importance.			
6.11.2	<p>DPWLG Concerns - The proposed cable corridor appears to run close to the Sunk and North East Spit pilot station areas. The aforementioned pilot stations are the only ones available for larger vessels to access London Gateway Port. In addition, the cable burial depth is key to ensure future vessel can be accommodated. Possible impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent impacts because of cable depths • Permanent and temporary impacts from surveys, cable laying and repair/maintenance • Permanent impacts from interaction with third party schemes (cable crossings) • Temporary impacts from interaction with third party schemes simultaneous operations) • Temporary and permanent impacts from the safety zones • Temporary and permanent impacts from dredging • Permanent impact from the change in cable depth due to changes in riverbed/sea • Temporary impact in the dredged depth during installation. The range of 	Please see the relevant points made in relation to the action points and technical note above.	This is noted by the Applicant.	None

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
	impacts vary from vessel displacement and delays to placing a constraint on the size of vessel that achieve access to London Gateway port and thus, its future growth and overall capacity			
2.1.4 Comments on the Applicant's Responses to Supplementary Agenda Additional Questions for ISH1 [REP1A-033]				
ISH1.01	<p>The shipping and navigation chapter 7 part 4 [APP-080] from paragraph 7.9.69 deals with the reduction in under-keel clearance. It acknowledges that this is an issue in particular locations including the Sunk but there is no clear assessment of baseline conditions in terms of depths below chart datum along the cable route or a clear conclusion as to the effect. The chapter [APP-080] states in paragraph 7.9.75 that the aim will be for the cable to be located in the deepest waters possible through the Sunk to avoid reduction to water depth.</p> <p>Provide a clear baseline for areas where sea depth is critical to shipping.</p>	<p>The Applicant explains its commitment to increasing cable burial depth throughout the Sunk Traffic Separation Scheme area, however, its commitment is then caveated by references to the need to ensure "minimal impact" to shipping and navigation and such measures will be carried out "so far as reasonably practicable". LGPL has no concerns in respect of the methodology adopted by the Applicant, provided (i) the approach does not preclude LGPL's ability to dredge to 22 metres below CD across the Sunk Pilot Boarding Area; and (ii) such is secured by way of Requirement. The importance of Gateway to UK trade is set out at paragraph 2 of LGPL's Written Representations [REP1-142].</p> <p>Please see the relevant points made above in relation to Applicant's engagement with LGPL (being a statutory consultee and therefore a key stakeholder).</p> <p>Also, please see out comments above in respect of Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038].</p>	This is noted by the Applicant.	None.
ISH1.02	<p>Paragraph 9.9.2 of the other sea users chapter 9 part 4 [APP-082] states that where burial of the cable cannot be achieved, rock backfill or external protection will be required where soil or rock conditions are too hard to achieve effective burial, or third party assets cross the route. Expected areas of rock backfill are located between KP38 to KP58 and KP81.5 to KP96.5.</p>	<p>Please refer to our comments below on the updated version of Application Document 6.2.4.9 (B) Part 4 Marine Chapter 9 Other Sea Users submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-061].</p> <p>We also refer to paragraphs 4.13 to 4.14 of LGPL's Written Representations [REP1-142] which consider the shortcomings of the Applicants assessment in Document 6.2.4.7 (B) Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation [APP-080]. Measures to avoid disruption during construction are to be welcomed and LGPL looks forward sight of the outline CSIP on that point, but such measures do not deal with the more fundamental issue of ensuring sufficient</p>	The Applicant can confirm the clarification was sought with the PLA and LGP during the monthly online meeting on the 19 December 2025 regarding the requirement for no crossings at all to be located in North East Spit Area. All parties agreed that this statement is incorrect, and planned crossings within this Area of Interest are permitted providing they do not exceed the 12.5 m below Chart Datum (and 0.5 m overdredge) which is preserved for future safeguarding.	LGPL would prefer no cable crossings in any of the Areas of Interest. Where such a crossing is unavoidable in NE Spit Area of Interest, it must not preclude dredge depths of 12.5m (with the 0.5m tolerance for over dredging). As noted above, a condition on the DML should be included to ensure there are no cable crossings at the Sunk or Long Sand Head and any crossing at North East Spit will be at the deepest part possible and so as not to preclude depths of 12.5m below Chart Datum plus 0.5m over dredge tolerance.

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
	<p>On this basis, the first area roughly coincides with the Sunk. The second area coincides with the North East Spit. These areas include anchorages and pilot boarding stations as well as having a high vessel track density, as shown for example on Figure 6.4.4.7.A 10 [APP-283].</p> <p>Has this information been carried across to chapter 9 as it shows that cables may not be buried in these areas. If not, why not?</p>	<p>future depths and ensuring no reduction in present under-keel clearance.</p> <p>LGPL's position is that there should be no cable crossings in the areas of interest (see para 5.2 of REP1-142). Outside those areas, LPGL defers to and supports the MCA's position.</p>		
ISH1.03	<p>Chapter 9 [APP-082] table 9.12 indicates future developments that would have cable crossings in the study area. Five Estuaries, NeuConnect and North Falls are all planned to cross between KP50 and KP54. This is also within the Sunk.</p> <p>The proposed development design as set out in [APP-037] indicates that where cables cannot be buried they would be covered in rock berms, to a height of 1 metre. Where cables cross over unburied assets it would result in a reduction in under-keel clearance of in excess of 1 metre, with the use of a mattress over the unburied asset, followed by a rock berm over the new cable. Can the applicant confirm that the reduction in depth due to cable crossings could be in excess of 1 metre?</p>	<p>LGPL welcomes the confirmation that there will be no cable crossings within the Sunk area of interest. This will need to be secured by the DOC Requirement. LGPL looks forward to similar confirmations regarding the other areas of interest. LGPL's right to approve the final CSIP must be secured by way of protective provisions or pursuant to the deemed marine licence.</p> <p>(Otherwise, please refer to our comments immediately above with regards LGPL's requirements for cable crossings.)</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities and described in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering implications of these requirements, specifically the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be necessary in parts of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area" where depths are already less than the 22 m CD safeguard level. The Applicant confirms that the assessment outlined in paragraph 2.3.9 of Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] is ongoing, and an update on the outcome will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders. The Applicant agrees with the port stakeholders that the aim is to secure these commitments through appropriate mechanisms, such as Protective Provisions and DCO provisions as necessary, and is working collaboratively with the port stakeholders to agree both the mechanism and the wording.</p>	<p>The Applicant's response does not deal specifically with the point raised – presumably this depends on the further work referred to.</p>

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
	In the context of the baseline depths below chart datum, what would be the effect of the development on depths within the Sunk area, including cumulatively with existing and proposed cable routes, in situations where they cannot be buried?			
ISH1.04	<p>Chapter 7 [APP-080] states in paragraph 7.9.80 that reductions greater than 5% will be discussed with the harbour authorities and the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA), but the MCA has said that less than 5% reduction in underkeel clearance could still be a problem for the larger vessels. If there is a reduction in under-keel clearance that would affect the ability of large vessels to access the ports have you considered what the implications are for those ports?</p> <p>Provide more precise assessment of the effects of a reduction in under-keel clearance on shipping through important routes such as the Sunk. What is the basis for concluding that this would not result in a likely significant effect for shipping and navigation, particularly in terms of access to ports by the largest vessels, when considered cumulatively with other planned cable crossings?</p>	<p>The Applicant states "The Applicant considers that pilots of these very large vessels would be very well versed in navigating these waters in the Sunk region, very well trained and skilled, and would pay close attention to charted water depths, and as such would not route through specific areas where water depth is insufficient for their vessels, and would instead utilise different routes Therefore, in terms of likely significant effects, potential for vessel collision impacts is considered low." (emphasis added). This relies on the pilots avoiding areas where the required depths are not available – LGPL does not dispute that of course pilots would do so, so as to manage this risk. But none of this considers the concern that this need to ensure safety may mean that larger vessels have to cease to call at the Thames ports at all. Indeed, it is not clear from this Applicant's response it has grasped LGPL's concern that unless the necessary Requirement is included in the DCO then the routes into the Thames Estuary could be precluded (rendering the Applicant's statements which focus on safety and rely on the skill of pilots, irrelevant).</p> <p>Whatever cable laying and installation methodology is proposed to be adopted by the Applicant the result must not preclude LGPL's ability to dredge to 22 metres below CD across the Sunk Pilot Boarding Area – this much be secured by way of Requirement. The detail in relation to additional TDOL does not alter that position.</p> <p>We refer to our comments above in respect of cable crossings.</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities and described in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering implications of these requirements, specifically the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be necessary in parts of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area" where depths are already less than the 22 m CD safeguard level. The Applicant confirms that the assessment outlined in paragraph 2.3.9 of Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] is ongoing, and an update on the outcome will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders. The Applicant agrees with the port stakeholders that the aim is to secure these commitments through appropriate mechanisms, such as Protective Provisions and DCO provisions as necessary, and is working collaboratively with the port stakeholders to agree both the mechanism and the wording.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently drafting the Protective Provisions for London Gateway Port and these will be sent for review in good time prior to Deadline 4.</p>	<p>We refer to the further comments above on Table 2.1 of the Applicant's Response to ISH1 (11 November 2025) [REP1-124] in relation to AP13. The Applicant's comments do not respond to the points made in the LGPL Comment / Response.</p>
ISH1.05	If there are likely significant effects in relation to the reduction in underkeel clearance, both as an individual	As set out above, whatever cable laying and installation methodology is proposed to be adopted by the Applicant the result must not preclude a future dredge depth of the specified depths in	The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities and described in Application Document 9.74	We refer to the further comments above on Table 2.1 of the Applicant's Response to ISH1 (11 November 2025) [REP1-124] in relation to AP13.

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
	project and cumulatively, how could this be mitigated?	<p>the areas of interest (i.e. 22 or 12.5m respectively, with the appropriate tolerances).</p> <p>LGPL's right to approve the final CSIP must be secured by way of protective provisions or pursuant to the deemed marine licence.</p> <p>LGPL requests sight of the draft outline CSIP as soon as possible and at the latest by Deadline 3 of the Examination (9 December 2026). A summary of the details to be contained in the documents/plans comprising the CSIP must be included in the outline CSIP (i.e. not simply references to the plans which will make up the CSIP).</p>	<p>Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering implications of these requirements, specifically the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be necessary in parts of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area" where depths are already less than the 22 m CD safeguard level. The Applicant confirms that the assessment outlined in paragraph 2.3.9 of Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] is ongoing, and an update on the outcome will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders. The Applicant agrees with the port stakeholders that the aim is to secure these commitments through appropriate mechanisms, such as Protective Provisions and DCO provisions as necessary, and is working collaboratively with the port stakeholders to agree both the mechanism and the wording.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently drafting the Protective Provisions for London Gateway Port and these will be sent for review in good time prior to Deadline 4.</p>	<p>LGPL would be grateful if the Applicant could confirm which documents will comprise the oCSIP, and provide copies of all documents and plans that will form part of the oCSIP as soon as possible during the Examination, allowing sufficient time for stakeholders to review and exchange comments with the Applicant.</p> <p>LGPL received a draft Protective Provision from the Applicant on 29 January 2026 and will provide its comments to the Applicant shortly.</p>
2.1.5 Comments on Chapter 7 of Part 4 – Shipping and Navigation [REP1-059]				
7.7.3	N/A	The Applicant has amended the list of harbour authorities "which overlap with the shipping and navigation Study Area" to include Sizewell C Harbour Authority, yet continues to overlook LGPL, notwithstanding LGPL as harbour authority, has express statutory powers within the Study Area as defined in para. 7.6.2 ('a 10 nautical mile buffer around the Offshore Scheme') as set out in the London Gateway Port Harbour Empowerment Order.	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant will provide an updated version of Application Document 6.2.4.7 (B) Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation [REP1-059] at Deadline 4 which will address this.	LGPL looks forward to considering the updated chapter of the ES which is to be provided at Deadline 4 to address these points.
7.7.53	N/A	Future Baseline – despite the representations made by LGPL, the MCA and the other harbour authorities (see for example para 2.16 onwards of REP1-142, no update has been made to the Future Baseline description to acknowledge the increase in vessel sizes / draughts.	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant will provide an updated version of Application Document 6.2.4.7 (B) Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation [REP1-059] at Deadline 4 which will address this.	LGPL looks forward to considering the updated chapter of the ES which is to be provided at Deadline 4 to address these points.
7.9.75	N/A	In relation to the assessment of the reduction in under-keel clearance, amendments have been made acknowledging the PLA's concerns and the importance of the NE Spit buoy. However, there is no acknowledgement of LGPL or its concerns. As LGPL was not consulted, understandably the Applicant has not been able to add	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant will provide an updated version of Application Document 6.2.4.7 (B) Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation [REP1-059] at Deadline 4 which will further acknowledge and address	LGPL looks forward to considering the updated chapter of the ES which is to be provided at Deadline 4 to address these points.

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
		LGPL to the paragraph 7.9.85. However, in any event, the key point as set out in paragraph 4.13 onwards of REP1-142 remains – that is to say there is still no assessment of reduction in under-keel clearance from the perspective of preventing access of vessels to the Thames estuary. Ultimately, as set out in paragraph 7.9.87 of REP1-059, the conclusion on EIA significance still considers only the risk of vessel foundering.	London Gateway Port's concerns, including further consideration of the matter of access to ports.	
Table 7.11	N/A	Through the table, additions have been made to acknowledge the commercial impacts of the various impacts listed. This in particular includes the commercial impacts of 'reduction in under-keel clearance' and 'disruption to multiple vessels using established routes and areas due [to] activities of the Offshore Scheme'. However, in all cases there has been no change to the mitigations identified (and see on this point the comment on the REAC below) and the conclusions on significance also remain unchanged. There is no clarity of how these conclusions have been reached.	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant will provide an updated version of Application Document 6.2.4.7 (B) Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation [REP1-059] at Deadline 4 which will address this.	LGPL looks forward to considering the updated chapter of the ES which is to be provided at Deadline 4 including any updates to the conclusions on significance of impacts. LGPL considers the ES should be updated to properly assess the socioeconomic impact should any vessels be precluded, now or in the future, from using navigation channels into the ports if adequate dredge depths are not secured.
General	N/A	In LGPL's view there has been no substantive changes to assess really the concerns that LGPL (and the other harbour authorities) raise regarding the impacts of preventing access by larger vessels if future dredge depths are prevent by the presence of the cable (Work No. 6)	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant will provide an updated version of Application Document 6.2.4.7 (B) Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation [REP1-059] at Deadline 4 which will further acknowledge and address London Gateway Port's concerns, including further consideration of the matter of access to ports.	See comments immediately above.
2.1.6 Comments on Chapter 9 of Part 4 – Other Sea Users [REP1-061]				
9.9.1	N/A	Additional text has been added in relation to cable crossings between KP 38 and KP 58 and KP 81.5 and KP 96.5. Those areas contain certain areas of interest to LGPL and the PLA. The additional text states that "where cable crossings are required in these areas, these will be designed in consultation with key shipping and navigation stakeholders to avoid, where possible, any potential reductions in current and future navigable water depths." LGPL does not raise concerns about the methodologies used or rock backfill save that in all cases, these should not preclude a future dredge depth of the specified depths in the areas of interest (i.e. 22 or 12.5m respectively, with the appropriate tolerances).	This is noted by the Applicant.	To clarify, LGPL is not concerned about the methodology to lay the cables, provided the necessary depths are secured, including after any maintenance activities, within the Areas of Interest. LGPL does of course remain concerned regarding methodologies in so far as they relate to the presence of vessels in the navigational channels for the purposes of construction or maintenance and accordingly seeks the rights of approval over the final CSIP under the Protective Provisions or by way of a condition in the DML. In any event, we consider the DML condition we refer to above to be necessary to ensure there are no cable crossings at the Sunk or Long Sand Head and any crossing at North East Spit will be at the deepest part possible and so as not to preclude depths of 12.5m below Chart Datum plus 0.5m over dredge tolerance.

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
9.9.1	N/A	The additional text also states that "An assessment of potential impacts of cable protection and cable crossings on shipping and navigation receptors is provided in Application Document 6.2.4.7 (B) Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation" – as set out in REP1-142 and above in this document, LGPL does not consider that to be the case.	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant will provide an updated version of Application Document 6.2.4.7 (B) Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation [REP1-059] at Deadline 4 which will provide further consideration of this matter.	LGPL looks forward to considering the updated chapter of the ES which is to be provided at Deadline 4. We refer to our comment immediately above with regards the cable crossing condition on the DML.
2.1.7 Comments on Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP1-103]				
N/A	N/A	The concerns set out in para 4.16 to 4.18 of REP1-142 also remain - although the above assessment acknowledges the potential for impact and asserts measures will be proposed, LGPL notes (i) there is currently no meaningful assessment of the impacts on shipping and navigation and areas where cables are to be buried have not been identified; and (ii) the Applicant has not proposed any means of securing mitigation beyond "avoiding disruption" and holding discussions with stakeholders. All of the measures focus on safety which we assume would be in place anyway. No additional provision has been set out in the revised document. The proposed mitigation therefore continues to be insufficient and do not give LGPL the certainty that it requires.	The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities and described in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering implications of these requirements, specifically the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be necessary in parts of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area" where depths are already less than the 22 m CD safeguard level. The Applicant confirms that the assessment outlined in paragraph 2.3.9 of Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] is ongoing, and an update on the outcome will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders. The Applicant agrees with the port stakeholders that the aim is to secure these commitments through appropriate mechanisms, such as Protective Provisions and DCO provisions as necessary, and is working collaboratively with the port stakeholders to agree both the mechanism and the wording. The Applicant is currently drafting the Protective Provisions for London Gateway Port and these will be sent for review in good time prior to Deadline 4	The Applicant's comments do not address the LGPL Comment / Response which were on the basis that the REAC as revised does not adequately secure the necessary protections. However, if the various matters sought by LGPL by way of a Requirement and in the Protective Provisions / DML are secured (see LGPL's further comments above on Table 2.1 of the Applicant's Response to ISH1 (11 November 2025) [REP1-124], in relation to AP13), then LGPL is content that matters will be adequately secured. In this regard we also refer to our comments below at 1SN14 of LGPL'S Comments on the Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions [REP3-069] concerning Recommended Restricted Zones during the construction phase of the offshore phase of the construction scheme.
2.1.8 Comments on the Navigational Risk Assessment (NRA) [REP1-064]				
Table 7.7	N/A	Contrary to the Applicant's statement at para 3.13.5 of REP1-112 (Applicant's Comments on the Relevant Representations of the Port of London Authority), there is no reference in Table 7.7 (as now amended) to any consultation with LGPL on the NRA.	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant will provide an updated version of Application Document 6.3.4.7.A ES Appendix 4.7.A Navigational Risk Assessment [APP-203].	LGPL looks forward to considering the updated chapter of the ES which is to be provided at Deadline 4.

Chapter 10. Applicant's Comments on the Submission from London Gateway Port Limited [REP2-055]

Reference	Matter	LGPL Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Further Comment
General	N/A	No relevant substantive changes have been made to the NRA to take into account the harbour authorities' concerns regarding future vessels sizes / draught.	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant will provide an updated version of Application Document 6.3.4.7.A ES Appendix 4.7.A Navigational Risk Assessment [APP-203] to include further consideration of the matter of future vessel draughts.	LGPL looks forward to considering the updated chapter of the ES which is to be provided at Deadline 4.

(B) LGPL'S COMMENTS ON THE APPLICANT'S COMMENTS ON OTHER SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 2 [REP3-064]

Table 20.1 Applicant's Comments on the Port of London Authority's Deadline 2 Submission [REP2-060]				
Reference	Matter	PLA Comment / Response	Applicant's Comments	LGPL Comment
2.1.1 Comments on Any Other Submissions Received at Deadline 1				
8.1	Marine Chapter 9 – Other Sea Users [REP1-062]	The Other Sea Users Chapter of the ES [REP1-062] has been updated to include clarification that rock backfill may be up to or below seabed level (para 9.9.1 emphasis added). This is inconsistent with the Applicant's Response to ISH1 Action Points [REP1-124] which states rock backfill is proposed to a level below the original seabed level. The PLA has no in principle concerns about the use of rock backfill provided that its use does not impact future bed levels i.e. any rock backfill is placed at a depth that does not prohibit maintenance of water depths of -22m CD at the Sunk, -12.5m CD at Long Sand Head and -12.5m CD at North East Spit regardless of existing water depths (see section 5 of the PLA's Written Representation [REP1- 156]). The PLA raises this matter due to entry 3.3.11 in the Trinity House draft Statement of Common Ground [REP1-083] where Trinity House request that backfill should not overtop the top of the trench and the Applicant's response is that they are unable to commit to that request until a full CBRA has been completed.	<p>The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities and described in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering implications of these requirements, specifically the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be necessary in parts of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area" where depths are already less than the 22 m CD safeguard level. The Applicant confirms that the assessment outlined in paragraph 2.3.9 of Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] is ongoing, and an update on the outcome will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders. The Applicant agrees with the port stakeholders that the aim is to secure these commitments through appropriate mechanisms, such as Protective Provisions and DCO provisions as necessary, and is working collaboratively with the port stakeholders to agree both the mechanism and the wording.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees in-principle that rock emplacement should not overtop the top of trenches where used as backfill. This will be confirmed after the full Cable Burial Risk Assessment has been completed. The development of the Cable Burial Risk Assessment is ongoing and will be consulted on with the consultee post submission. A preliminary Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) has been undertaken which defines the target Depth of Lowering (DoL) and has been submitted to PINS at Procedural Deadline A (Application Document 9.21 Sea Link Cable Burial Risk Assessment [PDA-039]).</p>	We note the Applicant agrees in principle that rock emplacement should not overtop trenches where it is used as backfill and this will be confirmed <u>after</u> the CBRA has been completed. However, the CBRA is ongoing and will be consulted on with the PLA post submission. LGPL is clear in its position that the dredge depths to be secured in the Areas of Interest apply equally in respect of any backfill – that is to say that any over-topping should not penetrate above the secured dredge depths. The Order must be clear that the CBRA process does not provide for an exemption to this.

(C) LGPL'S COMMENTS ON THE APPLICANT'S RESPONSES TO FIRST WRITTEN QUESTIONS [REP3-069]

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Applicant's response	LGPL's comments regarding the Applicant's response
1. General and Cross-topic Questions				
1GEN7.	Applicant	<p>Errata within the REAC</p> <p>The measures listed under the heading of shipping and navigation in the REAC [CR1-043] in several cases are identified incorrectly in terms of the potential changes and effects in column (3). For example SN21 and SN22 do not relate to the Sunk. Review column (3) and provided an updated version of the REAC.</p>	<p>The description of changes and effects for measures SN21 and SN22 have been updated in Application Document 9.84 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) submitted at Deadline 3. Additionally, further Column 3 updates have been made for measures SN01 to SN05.</p>	<p>We note an updated REAC [REP3-078] has been provided by the Applicant which continues to refer to cabling commitments in the offshore Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). However, the CEMP commitments are inadequate (see our comments in LGPL's Responses to ExQ1 [REP3-093]) – we do not see that there has been any update to the offshore CEMP [APP-339]</p> <p>We note the changes to Schedule 3, paragraph 6 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP3-006] where the REAC is now listed as a construction management plan to be approved by the local planning authority.</p> <p>However, now certain of the measures of the REAC are circular. For example, SN11 and SN12, in relation to the The Sunk and of interest to LGPL, are now apparently secured in the REAC as document (column 7) by the REAC as mechanism (column 8). Therefore, the full extent and description of those measures is simply the wording set out in column 4 of the REAC. For SN11, there is no detail of or expansion on the "coordination" that is to occur. Further, this approach means that there is no clear definition of what is meant here by "The Sunk".</p> <p>Additionally, it is problematic that the REAC is approved under Requirement 6 to the DCO by the local planning authority who will have no marine expertise or jurisdiction.</p> <p>Rather than this sparse detail in the REAC alone, these measures should be further detailed in a revised offshore CEMP or perhaps more fittingly in the Outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan, or the Navigation and Installation Plan as appropriate. LGPL will want rights of approval of the relevant parts of those plans under the protective provisions (or via the DML). LGPL presently has no role in relation to the REAC.</p> <p>In view of the above, the REAC should be updated to explain which of those plans will secure the relevant provisions.</p>
20. Shipping and navigation				
1SN1.	Applicant	<p>Baseline depths</p> <p>Provide the relevant Admiralty chart extracts at a resolution that shows baseline depths.</p>	<p>The Applicant will produce plates as requested and submit them at Deadline 4.</p>	<p>LGPL looks forward to reviewing the plates.</p>
1SN2.	Applicant	<p>Depth of lowering (DoL) in the Sunk</p> <p>Provide a timescale for the assessment of the engineering implications of the additional cable</p>	<p>The Applicant is in ongoing discussion with the Port of London (PLA), London Gateway Port (LGPL), Harwich Haven Authority (HHA) and the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA). These discussions are currently being undertaken through individual stakeholder meetings where requested, and through a shipping and navigation</p>	<p>LGPL looks forward to considering the Applicant's update at Deadline 4 and the updated note which is to follow. It would be helpful if the note could be provided as soon as possible in the Examination and with sufficient time for LGPL and the Applicant to exchange comments.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Applicant's response	LGPL's comments regarding the Applicant's response
		DoL set out in [REP1A-038] paragraph 2.3.9 that may be required in the areas of the Sunk Pilot Boarding area that are already shallower than the 22m safeguard level, including the submission of updated documents.	<p>monthly working group online call where Port Authorities, MCA and Coastguard representatives are invitees.</p> <p>A summary of stakeholder engagement on under-keel clearance and the requirements for the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depths ("Sunk Pilot Boarding area", "Long Sand Head Two-Way Route Crossing area", and "North East Spit area") is provided in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities, and as described below is working to reach a final position.</p>	
1SN3.	Applicant and relevant stakeholders	<p>Depth of lowering</p> <p>Provide an update on reaching an agreement with the relevant stakeholders on safeguarding current and future navigable water depths. In responding, explain how DoL commitments can most effectively be secured in order to secure existing and reasonable future under keel clearance requirements. If this is to be through protective provisions, provide suggested wording for how this can be appropriately secured. Also explain any alterations or additions to the REAC, for example MPE02.</p>	<p>The Applicant is in ongoing discussion with the Port of London (PLA), London Gateway Port (LGPL), Harwich Haven Authority (HHA) and the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA). These discussions are currently being undertaken through individual stakeholder meetings where requested, and through a shipping and navigation monthly working group online call where Port Authorities, MCA and Coastguard representatives are invitees.</p> <p>A summary of stakeholder engagement on under-keel clearance and the requirements for the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depths ("Sunk Pilot Boarding area", "Long Sand Head Two-Way Route Crossing area", and "North East Spit area") is provided in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities, and as described below is working to reach a final position.</p> <p>In respect of the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth already agreed with PLA, HHA, Port of Tilbury and LGPL, the Applicant confirms that it they are currently assessing the engineering implications of these requirements, specifically the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be necessary in parts of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area" where depths are already shallower than the 22 m CD safeguard level. An update on the outcome of this assessment will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders. The Applicant agrees with the port stakeholders that the aim is to secure these commitments through appropriate mechanisms, such as Protective Provisions (PPs) and DCO provisions as necessary, and is working collaboratively with the port stakeholders to agree both the mechanism and the wording. The Applicant is currently agreeing the wording on commitments in Protective Provisions with all relevant stakeholders. While the wording in the PPs is comprehensive in scope and is subject to the ongoing discussions between the parties, an example of draft wording in the PLA Protective Provisions in relation to securing existing and reasonable future under keel clearance requirements is as follows:</p>	<p>LGPL looks forward to the Applicant's update on the outcome of its engineering assessment which is to be provided at Deadline 4.</p> <p>We note the Applicant has provided example draft wording from a Protective Provision provided to the PLA. LGPL has consistently stated throughout its submissions both in writing and at hearings a Requirement is necessary to secure the depths. This is because the requirement not to preclude the specified dredge depth is a fundamental parameter to, or restriction on, the carrying out of the authorised development – it is in a sense akin to an upwards limit of deviation. It is for the Order itself to specify such a restriction – this is in accordance with the <i>Guidance on the content of a Development Consent Order required for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project</i> [Paragraph 003, Reference ID 04-003-20240430 and Paragraph 008, Reference ID 04-008-20240430] and would follow accepted practice across other development consent orders and harbour orders under the Harbours Act 1964. It is also consistent with the Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm Order 2025 (Requirement 2(3) of Schedule 2 to that Order). A Requirement is also practically simpler as it needs only be set out once in the DCO for all parties to rely on, rather than across different Protective Provisions for the benefit of different parties.</p> <p>LGPL would be very happy to discuss with the Applicant, the PLA and HHA specific wording for the Requirement.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Applicant's response	LGPL's comments regarding the Applicant's response
			<p><i>"10. The cable specification and installation plan referred to in paragraph 3 must be informed by a cable burial risk assessment, and set out for Work No.6, in so far as it applies to the Areas of Interest:</i></p> <p><i>(1) That any part of Work No.6, including any associated development or ancillary works, located within the Areas of Interest must be installed at a level which would not impede the dredging of those parts of the Areas of Interest to the following depths:</i></p> <p><i>(a) Labelled "Sunk Pilot Boarding area", to a level of 22 metres below Chart Datum;</i></p> <p><i>(b) Labelled "Long Sand Head Two-Way Route crossing", to a level of 12.5 metres below Chart Datum; and</i></p> <p><i>(c) Labelled " North East Spit area" to a level of 12.5 metres below Chart Datum; and</i></p> <p><i>(d) and in all cases (a) to (c) makes allowance for an 'over-dredge' tolerance of 0.5 metres in addition to the stated depths attributable to standard dredging methodology.</i></p> <p>Further comments on the three Areas of Safeguarded Depth outlined in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] were received from the MCA on the 18 December 2025 via email and are currently under review by the Applicant. An additional meeting took place on the 19 December 2025 to further understand the MCA's position. The Applicant has scheduled a meeting with the MCA on the 16 January 2026 to refine the MCA's requirements and agree appropriate wording for their Protective Provisions and/or DML. Further commentary on this ongoing discussion will be provided in the MCA SoCG. Updates to the REAC will be undertaken once Applicant and the MCA have further discussed and agreed their requirements.</p>	
1SN4.	Applicant	<p>National Policy Statement for Ports (January 2012)</p> <p>Consider whether the National Policy Statement for Ports (January 2012) (Ports NPS) is an important and relevant matter in relation to the proposed development. If so, provide a summary of which aspects of the Ports NPS are important and relevant and a summary assessment of the proposed development in relation to those aspects as an update to the Planning Statement [AS-057].</p>	<p>The National Policy Statement for Ports (Ports NPS) (January 2012), as indicated in its paragraph 1.2.1, provides "the framework for decisions on proposals for new port development" and associated development Paragraph 1.2.4 makes it clear that the Ports NPS "provides the framework for decisions on proposals for new port development". Therefore, the Ports NPS does not apply directly to the Proposed Project.</p> <p>However, the Ports NPS can be considered to be an important and relevant matter in so far as it highlights, in its Section 3.1, the essential role of ports in the UK economy, and in its Section 3.3, the Government's support for:</p> <p><i>"sustainable port development to cater for long-term forecast growth in volumes of imports and exports by sea with a competitive and efficient port industry capable of meeting the needs of importers and exporters cost effectively and in a timely manner (paragraph 3.3.1)."</i></p> <p>The Government has decided to update the Ports NPS and has published a draft revised NPS in June 2025, which reiterates the above points in Sections 2.1 (the essential role of ports in the UK economy) and 2.2 (Government policy for ports) Discussions with London Gateway Port Ltd and Port of London Authority (the Ports)</p>	<p>We note the Applicant agrees with LGPL's consideration the Ports NPS is important and relevant.</p> <p>LGPL looks forward to considering the updates to Application Document 6.2.4.7 (B) Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation [REP1-059] and Application Document 6.3.4.7.A Appendix 4.7.A Navigational Risk Assessment [REP1-063] to be issued at Deadline 4.</p> <p>LGPL also considers the ES should be updated to assess the socioeconomic impact of vessels being precluded, now or in the future, from using navigation channels into the ports, should the commitments regarding dredge depths not be secured.</p> <p>We also look forward to receiving any update to the Planning Statement.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Applicant's response	LGPL's comments regarding the Applicant's response
			<p>with regard to the impact of the Proposed Project on navigable depths and vessels' access to the London Gateway Port,(and by the same token, on its ability to cater for the long-term forecast growth in volumes of imports and exports by sea) are ongoing. The outcome of these discussions will be reflected in a further update to Application Document 6.2.4.7 (B) Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation [REP1-059] and Application Document 6.3.4.7.A Appendix 4.7.A Navigational Risk Assessment [REP1-063] to be issued at Deadline 4. Following the update to this chapter (setting out the conclusions in relation to any impacts on the long-term forecast growth in volumes of imports and exports by sea as a result of the navigable depths and vessels' access to the Ports as caused by the Proposed Project) and the outcome of the discussions with the Ports, the Applicant will confirm whether any update to the Planning Statement is required.</p>	
1SN5.	Applicant	<p>East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan</p> <p>Respond to LGP's assessment [REP1-142] that the proposed development is in conflict with policies PS1, PS3, DD1 of the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan. Provide an explanation of how the conflict, if any, can be overcome.</p>	<p>Policy PS1</p> <p>Policy PS1 of the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan makes it clear that proposals requiring static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under-keel clearance (UKC) should not be authorised in International Maritime Organization designated routes.</p> <p>Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] provides a summary of engagement and collaboration undertaken to date with port and harbour authorities on the topic of UKC within the Sunk region. The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance for future deep draught vessels in key areas, such as the Sunk region. The Applicant is able to confirm in-principle that agreement can be reached on the three Areas of Safeguarded Depth outlined in detail in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] by the port authorities for safeguarding future water depths. Internal discussions are ongoing on the best approach to securing this commitment, whether it is within the DCO, DML or Protective Provisions.</p> <p>Policy PS3</p> <p>Policy PS3 requires proposals to demonstrate that they will not interfere with current activity and future opportunity for expansion of ports and harbours, and if they will interfere, how they will minimise this.</p> <p>The Offshore Scheme does not involve the installation of any permanent static sea surface infrastructure that would interfere with current and future port activities.</p> <p>Matters concerning UKC for future deep draught vessels, which may interfere with future opportunity for expansion of ports and harbours, are discussed above. The Applicant is in ongoing discussion with the Port of London, London Gateway Port, Harwich Haven Authority and the Maritime and Coastguard Agency to agree wording on commitments surrounding safeguarding water depths. An update to Application Document 6.2.4.7 (B) Part 4 Marine Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation [REP1-059]</p>	<p>We note the Applicant agrees with LGPL's assessment of the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan. LGPL believes that the Applicant will be able to satisfactorily update its Marine Plan Policy Assessment [APP-298] to demonstrate compliance if the measures requested by LGPL are secured, particularly that: (i) the depths required by LGPL will be secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO; (ii) granting LGPL (and other port stakeholders) approval rights over the final CSIP and other plans governing cable laying works and future maintenance insofar as they relate to the Areas of Interest, with that right of approval secured by way of a condition in the DML (or under Protective Provisions); (iii) including adequate measures in the outline CSIP to provide for liaison with LGPL as to the timings of Restricted Zone (see further in relation to 1SN14 below); (iv) including a condition that there will be no cable joints or wet storage areas in the Areas of Interest in the DML; and (v) including a condition in the DML that there will be no cable crossings at the Sunk or Long Sand Head and any crossing at North East Spit will be at the deepest part possible and so as not to preclude depths of 12.5m below chart datum plus 0.5m over dredge tolerance.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Applicant's response	LGPL's comments regarding the Applicant's response
			<p>and Application Document 6.3.4.7.A Appendix 4.7.A Navigational Risk Assessment [REP1-063] will be issued at Deadline 4</p> <p>Policy DD1</p> <p>Policy DD1 requires proposals within or adjacent to licensed dredging and disposal areas to demonstrate that they will not adversely impact dredging and disposal activities, and if they are, how they will minimise these impacts. Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] outlines in its Section 4.2 how the Applicant's proposed marine works (Work No 6) will safeguard water depth and ensure that dredging in the relevant parts of the Sunk Pilot Boarding area can be proceed to a depth of 22 m below CD (Chart Datum). As stated above, the Applicant is in ongoing discussion with the Port of London, London Gateway Port, Harwich Haven Authority and the Maritime and Coastguard Agency to agree wording on commitments surrounding safeguarding water depths.</p>	
1SN6.	Applicant	<p>Consultation with the Coastguard</p> <p>Can the applicant provide assurance that His Majesty's Coastguard will be engaged in discussions which impact their jurisdiction in relation to the delivery of the Sunk Vessel Traffic Services, which has been raised by the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) [REP2-063].</p>	<p>The Applicant and MCA attended a call on the 11 December 2025 where a review of the invitee list was undertaken for the monthly Shipping and Navigational Stakeholder Meeting hosted online by the Applicant. This invite has now been shared with the relevant individuals.</p>	None.
1SN8.	Applicant	<p>Pre and post construction surveys and activities</p> <p>Provide a detailed response to PLA's suggested restrictions in relation to pre and post construction surveys and activities in paragraph 7.1 of [REP1-155].</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that activities relating to UXO are not considered within this DCO application and will be submitted separately through a Marine Licence. The restrictions outlined by the PLA in Written Representations (WR) and summaries for any that exceed 1500 words [REP1-155] from Port of London Authority will be considered within this application.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that re-routing around boulders and archaeological finds is the Proposed Project's primary solution when installing the cable. If re-routing around boulders is not practicable, these features will be repositioned within the Order Limits in consultation with PLA prior to commencing pre-clearance activities, and considering Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth. Furthermore, the Applicant is also preparing an outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (oCSIP) which will be provided at Deadline 4. This document will incorporate an outline Sediment Disposal Management Plan (oSDMP). The status and proposed structure of the oCSIP is provided in</p>	<p>The Applicant has stated that, should re-routing around boulders prove impracticable, those features will be repositioned within the Order Limits, following consultation with the PLA and with "consideration" given to the PLA's Areas of Interest. However, consideration of the Areas of Interest is plainly inadequate. While LGPL has full confidence in the PLA, consultation with a third party does not provide LGPL with sufficient protection.</p> <p>LGPL's position is that the depths across the Areas of Interest must not be reduced under any circumstances, including as a consequence of relocating boulders. Accordingly, boulders must be moved only to locations where the required depths within the Areas of Interest would not be compromised. To ensure this, LGPL requires approval rights over the CSIP insofar as it relates to those areas.</p> <p>LGPL welcomes the Applicant's confirmation wet storage areas will not occur within the Areas of Interest, however, notes the Applicant's response does not confirm how</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Applicant's response	LGPL's comments regarding the Applicant's response
			<p>Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038].</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that location of planned wet storage areas will also not occur within three Areas of Safeguarded Depth, as defined by the Port of London Authority as being the "Sunk Pilot Boarding area", "Long Sand Head Two-Way Route crossing area" and "Northeast Spit area".</p>	<p>this restriction will be secured. LGPL considers the exclusion of wet storage areas must be secured by way of a condition in the DML.</p>
1SN9.	Applicant	<p>Wet storage</p> <p>In its deadline 2 comments on submissions received at deadline 1 and deadline 1A, PLA raised consistency with the ES Part 4, Chapter 6 Marine Archaeology [REP2-005] in relation to wet storage. Where relevant update or amend as necessary to ensure consistency.</p>	<p>Application Document 6.2.4.6 (C) Part 4 Marine Chapter 6 Marine Archaeology [REP2-005] will be updated and submitted at Deadline 4 to include the following text:</p> <p><i>“The location of planned wet storage areas will be confirmed in advance to prevent impact to archaeological remains and will also not occur within three Areas of Safeguarded Depth, as defined by the Port of London Authority as being the “Sunk Pilot Boarding area”, “Long Sand Head Two-Way Route crossing area” and “North East Spit area.”</i></p>	<p>We refer to our comments immediately above.</p>
1SN10.	Applicant	<p>Sediment disposal management plan (SDMP)</p> <p>There is reference in the draft Statement of Common Ground between National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) and the PLA [REP1-082] to the submission of a sediment disposal management plan. Provide confirmation that relevant stakeholders will be engaged, including the PLA. Provide an explanation as to whether it should be secured by the dDCO as a certified document.</p>	<p>The Applicant is preparing an outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan (oCSIP) which will be provided at Deadline 4. This document is expected to incorporate an outline Sediment Disposal Management Plan (oSDMP). The status and proposed structure of the oCSIP is provided in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] with relevant stakeholders, including the PLA to be consulted as appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that the CSIP will be included as a Certified Document in the draft DCO.</p>	<p>As explained above, LGPL will require approval rights over the final CSIP (and other documents relating to cable burial and maintenance) insofar as it relates to the Areas of Interest and we look forward to reviewing the outline version to be provided at Deadline 4.</p> <p>LGPL notes the Applicant is unable to confirm at this stage whether the oSDMP will comprise one of the plans that makes up the CSIP. LGPL would be grateful if the Applicant could confirm which documents will form the CSIP and provide copies of all plans which will make up the CSIP as soon as possible in the Examination and with sufficient time to allow the parties to exchange comments.</p> <p>We note the Applicant has committed in its response to 1SN8 to provide the oSDMP by Deadline 4 whereas here it advises the oSDMP is “expected”.</p>
1SN11.	Applicant	<p>Cable joints in the areas of interest</p> <p>REAC commitments SN19 and SN20 indicate that cable joints in the Sunk would be avoided where possible and where practicable. Provide a response to the request from the PLA that there would be no planned cable joints within the Areas of Interest due to the</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that there are no planned cable joints within the three Areas of Safeguarded Depth excluding the need for any unforeseen repairs during installation and/or the operational lifetime.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering and operational implications of a cable joint in the Areas of Safeguarded Depth due to unforeseen repairs during installation and/or the operational lifetime. An update on the outcome of this assessment will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>As explained above, there should be no cable joints in the Areas of Interest and this should be secured by way of a condition in the DML. Unforeseen repairs should be affected with the cable joints outside those Areas. LGPL is happy to discuss the question of cable joints further with the Applicant.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Applicant's response	LGPL's comments regarding the Applicant's response
		disruption to heavily trafficked routes.		
1SN14.	Applicant Harwich Haven Authority, London Gateway Port Ltd, Maritime and Coastguard Agency, Port of London Authority	<p>Exclusion zones</p> <p>The applicant has stated in section 7.3 of ES Part 4, Chapter 7 Shipping and Navigation [REP1-059] that exclusion zones will not be required. Does this need to be added to the REAC to be secured?</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that exclusion zones are not required, in line with standard industry practise, as the Offshore Scheme is a permanent subsea structure with no offshore surface infrastructure, and therefore there is not a need to secure this within the REAC.</p> <p>The Applicant commits to instituting a rolling 500 m Recommended Restricted Zone (RRZ) around the installation vessel during cable lay as is standard practise, and this is secured as SN29 in Application Document 9.83 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) submitted at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>We note the Applicant has confirmed no exclusion zones will be required and therefore there is no need to secure this. LGPL considers the exclusions zones must be secured by way of condition in the DML relating to the NIP (or another document to be approved under the DML).</p> <p>The proposed rolling 500 metre radius Recommended Restricted Zones is consistent with Rule 2 of the COLREGs. However, in terms of the purported commitment actually set out in SN29 of the REAC [REP3-079] in relation to the practical implementation of that Zone, the degree of commitment is currently insufficient. LGPL requests that the commitment is bolstered to provide for far better liaison with the Applicant on the following basis:</p> <p>(a) two weeks prior to works starting in LGPL's Areas of Interest (being the Sunk, North East Spit and Long Sand Head), the Applicant will notify LGPL of that fact and LGPL will in turn provide the Applicant with its schedule of vessel calls. The Applicant will have regard to the schedule in relation to the timings of the presence of its vessels so as to avoid and minimise disruption to vessels navigating to and from London Gateway Port;</p> <p>(b) pre-commencement meetings between LGPL and the Applicant / the Applicant's relevant contractors will take place either one or two days before works begin in each of LGPL's Areas of Interest. Again, the Applicant will have regard to LGPL's representations at those meetings when carrying out activities in the Areas of Interest; and</p> <p>(c) the Applicant will provide LGPL with daily updates whilst activities in the Areas of Interest are carried out to inform LGPL's scheduling.</p> <p>These commitments should be secured in the NIP. LGPL would be happy to discuss the specific detail of these proposals with the Applicant.</p>
1SN15.	Applicant Maritime and Coastguard Agency	<p>Magnetic compass deviation</p> <p>In the draft Statement of Common Ground with the MCA [REP1-081], the applicant states that a full update to the Electromagnetic Field report will be carried out once a full analysis update has been carried out pre-construction and will be shared with the consultee at the earliest opportunity. Can the applicant clarify whether this will be submitted to the examination or whether it intends for this to be post consent. Can the MCA comment as to whether it is necessary for this information to</p>	<p>Once a finalised pre-construction design is available, a desk-based assessment will be completed by The Applicant and submitted to MCA post-consent. This data can then be verified with as-built drawings if required in consultation with the MCA.</p>	<p>None.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Applicant's response	LGPL's comments regarding the Applicant's response
		be made available prior to the decision being made on the DCO.		
1SN16.	Applicant MMO	<p>Consultation with MCA</p> <p>Provide confirmation that there would be provision for the MCA to be consulted on the discharge of relevant shipping and navigation related conditions in the DML.</p>	Consideration on the requirements and conditions of the DML are ongoing and will be subject to change upon further engagement with stakeholders. This text is being updated to include provision for the MCA to be consulted on the discharge of relevant shipping and navigation related conditions in the DML. An updated draft DML will be provided at Deadline 3.	As noted above, LGPL requires approval rights over the plans and documents governing cable laying works and future maintenance insofar as they relate to the PLA's Areas of Interest, with those plans secured by way of a condition in the DML.
1SN17.	Applicant and relevant stakeholders	<p>Vessel management plan (VMP)</p> <p>Several stakeholders have requested a VMP. Can the applicant confirm that their proposal is that this takes the form of a navigation and installation plan (NIP), for which an outline version has been submitted [AS-104]?</p> <p>Taking into account that section 1.2 of [AS-104] states that project activities outside of the three defined areas of interest are not covered by the NIP, can the applicant confirm that it does not consider that there is a need for a VMP with a wider geographical scope.</p> <p>Can the stakeholders provide comment as to whether they are satisfied that a separate VMP is not required.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that the requested Vessel Management Plan takes the form of a Navigation and Installation Plan (NIP), for which an Outline NIP has been submitted. The Applicant will provide an updated version of Application Document 9.12 Outline Navigation and Installation Plan [AS-104] at Deadline 4, taking into account stakeholder comments from Written Representations.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that it does not consider that there is a need for the NIP to cover a wider scope than the three areas identified. These areas have been selected based on density of traffic and shallow water depths, where vessel management and enhanced communication protocols are important for control of risk as identified by the Application Document 6.3.4.7.A (B) ES Appendix 4.7.A Navigational Risk Assessment [REP1-063].</p>	<p>LPGL is of the view that such matters should be dealt with in the NIP and there is no value in an unnecessary proliferation of plans.</p> <p>LPGL looks forward to considering the updated version of the Outline Navigation and Installation Plan which will be provided at Deadline 4.</p>
1SN19.	Applicant Port of Ramsgate	<p>Navigational Risk Assessment</p> <p>Port of Ramsgate to provide comments on the NRA [REP1-064] including in relation to potential future impacts on commercial ferries.</p> <p>Applicant to engage with the MCA in relation to their suggested additional risk mitigation measures</p>	The Applicant can confirm that a meeting with the MCA took place on 11 December 2025, and the matter of the MCA's suggested additional mitigation measures was raised. The MCA confirmed that there were no further mitigation measures beyond securing commitments in the DCO that they would suggest at this time.	None.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Applicant's response	LGPL's comments regarding the Applicant's response
		[REP1-162] in relation to ensuring that the risk to shipping and safe navigation is As Low As Reasonably Practicable (ALARP).		
22. Other sea users				
10SU1.	Applicant Relevant Stakeholders	<p>Cable crossings</p> <p>Applicant - It is stated in the responses to the Supplementary Agenda Additional Questions [REP1A-033] ISH1.03 that the expectation is that there are no areas where the Sea Link cables cannot be buried, and that surveys indicate that existing in-service cables are buried, so that there would not be a scenario where Sea Link cables would cross over unburied cables. Each individual crossing location would be surveyed in detail and would be agreed with each crossing agreement with the third-party asset owner. Provide an explanation of how this will be secured in the dDCO.</p> <p>Applicant - Stakeholders such as London Gateway Port Ltd (LGP) and Port of London Authority (PLA) require that there are no cable crossings at all in the Sunk, Long Sand or North East Spit. Would it be appropriate to include a requirement or DML condition that prohibits cable crossings in these areas?</p> <p>Applicant and relevant stakeholders - Cable crossing agreements with third-party asset owners have not been included in table 2.1 of the Consents and Agreements Position Statement</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that Crossing Agreements will be created for any third party assets being crossed by the Proposed Project. Meetings with third party asset owners are now underway. This commitment is outlined in OSU01 Application Document 9.84 Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC), submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that the relevance of cables crossings within the three Areas of Safeguarding Water Depth for ports is in regards to under-keel clearance and future safeguarding. The Applicant can confirm that there are no planned crossings within the "Sunk Pilot Boarding area" and "Long Sand Head Two-Way Route Crossing area".</p> <p>Clarification was sought with the Port of London Authority (PLA) and London Gateway Port (LGP) during the monthly virtual meeting on the 19 December 2025 regarding the requirement for no crossings at all to be located in North East Spit Area. All parties agreed that this statement is incorrect, and planned crossings within this Area of Safeguarded Water Depth are permitted providing they do not exceed the 12.5 m below Chart Datum (and 0.5m over dredge) which is preserved for future safeguarding. A Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) is being drafted for LGP which will be submitted to LGP for comment prior to submission to the Examining Authority at Deadline 5 at the latest. The updated SOCG for the PLA will be submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities and described in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering implications of these requirements, specifically the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be necessary in parts of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area" where depths are already less than the 22 m CD safeguard level. The Applicant confirms that the assessment outlined in paragraph 2.3.9 of Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] is ongoing, and an update on the outcome will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders. The Applicant agrees with the port stakeholders that the aim is to secure these commitments through appropriate mechanisms, such as Protective Provisions and DCO provisions as necessary, and is working collaboratively with the port stakeholders to agree both the mechanism and the wording.</p>	<p>LGPL welcomes the Applicant's indication there are no planned cable crossings at the Sunk and Long Sand Head. This should be noted in the outline CSIP</p> <p>Whilst the Applicant's record regarding the meeting which took place on 19 December 2025 is accurate, LGPL would prefer for there to be no cable crossing at North East Spit due to consequential increased construction and maintenance activities, if possible. A condition should therefore be included on the DML ensuring that there will be no cable crossings at the Sunk or Long Sand Head and any crossing at North East Spit will be at the deepest part possible and so as not to preclude depths of 12.5m below chart datum plus 0.5m over dredge tolerance.</p> <p>As noted above (LGPL's further comments above on Table 2.1 of the Applicant's Response to ISH1 (11 November 2025) [REP1-124] in relation to AP13), LGPL considers depths in the PLA's Areas of Interest must be secured pursuant to a Requirement of the DCO rather than by way of condition of the DML or pursuant to Protective Provisions.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Applicant's response	LGPL's comments regarding the Applicant's response
		[APP-010]. Give consideration as to whether they should be added.	Terrestrial and marine crossing agreements have not been individually listed out within Table 2.1 of Application Document 3.5 Consents and Agreements Position Statement [APP-010] but have instead been discussed within Section 1.5 of Application Document 3.5 Consents and Agreements Position Statement [APP-010].	
1OSU2.	Applicant	<p>Cable crossings with third party assets</p> <p>Provide a full response to PLA's concerns expressed in [REP1-155] about GridLink (KP 101.27) and Q&E North (KP 100.151) in paragraph 6.3.</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees in principle with the need to safeguard water depths to ensure sufficient under-keel clearance within the Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth identified by the port authorities and described in Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]. The Applicant is currently assessing the engineering implications of these requirements, specifically the additional cable Depth of Lowering (DoL) that may be necessary in parts of the "Sunk Pilot Boarding Area" where depths are already less than the 22 m CD safeguard level. The Applicant confirms that the assessment outlined in paragraph 2.3.9 of Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038] is ongoing, and an update on the outcome will be provided at Deadline 4. Further work may be required beyond Deadline 4 for the Applicant to reach a final position, which will be informed by the final Areas of Safeguarded Water Depth and associated requirements agreed with all relevant stakeholders. The Applicant agrees with the port stakeholders that the aim is to secure these commitments through appropriate mechanisms, such as Protective Provisions and DCO provisions as necessary, and is working collaboratively with the port stakeholders to agree both the mechanism and the wording.</p> <p>The Applicant is satisfied that it has a solution to ensure that the 12.5 m depth is preserved even at the GridLink location, by moving the planned Proposed Project cable route at this point into deeper waters to the east (while still within the Order Limits) ensuring sufficient water depth above the expected crossing location. The Applicant had kept the Order Limits wide here to enable such solutions to be possible (Application Document 9.74 Shipping and Navigation Under-Keel Clearance Marine Engineering Technical Note [REP1A-038]). An updated SOCG for the PLA will be submitted at Deadline 3.</p>	We refer to our comments immediately above.

DEADLINE 4: (D) LGPL'S COMMENTS ON SELECTED SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 2 (ISH2) [EV6-003]

Number	Subject	Response by	Question/Clarification	LGPL response / comment
ISH2.02.	National Policy Statements	Applicant, local authorities and IPs	<p>The following National Policy Statements (NPS) were designated on 6 January 2026: EN-1, EN-3, EN-5. Considering paragraph 1.6.3 of EN-1 (2026) whilst the revised NPS's will only have effect in relation to those applications for development consent accepted for examination after 6 January 2026 they are capable of being important and relevant considerations in the decision-making process for this application.</p> <p>Applicant: Review the application documents (in particular but not limited to ES part 1, chapter 2 Regulatory and Planning Context [APP-043]) in light of the newly designated NPSs and provide any updates and amendments as necessary.</p> <p>Local authorities and interested parties: Submit any comments in relation to any implications of the newly designated NPSs for the examination of this application.</p>	<p>Section 3 of LGPL's Written Representations [REP1-142] (WRs) reviewed the applicable NPS from LGPL's perspective.</p> <p>Reference was made to paragraph 4.2.15 of the former EN-1 which made clear impacts which present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference with offshore navigation are excluded from the presumption that residual impacts are unlikely to outweigh the need for energy infrastructure. We note the same position has been carried across in paragraph 4.2.28 of the new EN-1 designated on 6 January 2026. Similarly, the provisions we referred to in relation to taking account of relevant marine plans remain (paras. 4.5.8 and 4.5.10 of the new EN-1).</p> <p>Further, the provisions on which we rely in relation to the former EN-3 at paras 3.13 and 3.14 of LGPL's WRs also remain in the newly designated EN-3, although in renumbered paragraphs – see, in respect of para 3.13 of the WRs, paras 2.8.153, 2.8.154, 2.8.156 and 2.8.159 of the new EN-3 and, in respect of para 3.14 of the WRs, paras 2.8.295, 2.8.296, 2.8.298 and 2.8.302 of the new EN-3 accordingly.</p> <p>The points previously made by LGPL in respect of policy would therefore retain their full force and validity in the context of the new NPSs.</p>
ISH2.037.	Schedule 16 DML Part 2 Condition 4 Pre-construction plans and documentation paragraph 4.(1)	Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and any other relevant stakeholders	<p>In response to ExA question 1GEN16 the applicant amended the wording in Schedule 16 DML Part 2 Condition 4 Pre Construction Plans and Documentation paragraph 4(1) to include the words “in general accordance with” [REP3-006]. Provide comments as to whether the wording is satisfactory, or suggest alternative wording.</p>	<p>A requirement that a final document be in general accordance with the principles of an outline version is not very strong or exacting – what the principles of a document are could be quite nebulous and then there needs only be a general accordance with that – in places therefore the final form could depart materially.</p> <p>For LGPL's purposes, in so far as it has a right of approval over the content of the final form of the relevant plans, i.e. the final CSIP (and to the extent separate to the CSIP, the NIP) and to the extent relevant to navigational matters the offshore CEMP, the loose wording is not a concern.</p> <p>However, should LGPL not secure such a right of approval, LGPL will wish to see more tightly drafted wording that ensure that the final form of the plans will be “substantially in the form of” the outline versions and also that the outline versions have sufficient content for LGPL to be able to gauge the likely impacts / benefits of the final version.</p>

Addleshaw Goddard LLP
10 February 2026