

# NAVIGATIONAL ADVISORY PANEL REPORT


<b>NAP Date:</b>	12.10.09	<b>Owner:</b>	HM(L)	<b>NAP Ref:</b>	31	<b>NAP Title:</b>	BUNKERING OPERATIONS IN THE THAMES ESTUARY
------------------	----------	---------------	-------	-----------------	----	-------------------	--

**Panel Members:**

Name	Organisation	Name	Organisation	Name	Organisation
Roy Stanbrook	PLA – Chair	Cerwyn Phillips	PLA		
Chris McQueen	PLA	Steve Taylor	PLA		
Julian Parkes	PLA	Phil Shayler	PLA (DPC)		
Barry Goldman	PLA	Robert Thompson	Cockett Marine		

Detail / Terms of Reference	Observation/Recommendation	Variation
<p>The Navigational Advisory Panel (NAP) is asked to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undertake a navigational safety risk assessment in respect of the proposed bunkering facility in the area of the Queen’s Channel, and as part of that process, comment on the initial proposal in respect of the: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>location, size, depth of water and holding ground of the anchorage;</li> <li>safe access to and departure from the anchorage;</li> <li>position of the bunkering anchorage in</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Three anchorages were identified in the Queens Channel numbered 1 to 3 from west to east. The limit for anchorage 3 is 240mLOA at 14m draft. When all three anchorages are occupied the limit is 180m LOA in each with a draft limit of 9m in No 1 and 10m in 2 and 3. Action on HML to consult Trinity House over holding ground in Princes Channel. (Post meeting note – Trinity House have limited data on the holding ground but believe it to be good.</p> <p>Due to the nature of tidal sets and relatively confined area, large vessels would only anchor on the ebb tide and sail on the flood removing the need to swing. Smaller vessels would be required to anchor on the ebb but would be able to sail at any state of the tide. A variation to Pilotage Directions allowing vessels to anchor and depart</p>	<p><b>Background to the variations</b> The Navigational Advisory Panel was based on the premise that the Queens Channel anchorages would be exempt from compulsory pilotage. Since then the decision has been made to retain the requirement for pilotage due to the relatively constrained area for anchoring and the necessity to attract large ships to the service.</p> <p><b>Variation</b> The size limits for anchorages Q1 and Q2 remain unchanged. The length limit for Q3, however, has been lifted following consultation with pilots but the draught limit of 14m remains.</p> <p>The restrictions were deemed to be appropriate only for unlicensed vessels. The variation to PDs is no longer required.</p>

<p>relation to the adjacent navigational channels;</p> <p>d) type and density of traffic levels in the area, including leisure traffic and any potential interaction with bunkering vessels.</p> <p>2. Identify any new hazards to navigation prompted by these proposals;</p> <p>3. Identify potential risk control measures which could be implemented to mitigate any newly identified hazards to navigation;</p> <p>4. Consider any regulatory / procedural changes deemed necessary to PLA rules and regulations, and operational systems prompted by the introduction of the new bunkering service;</p> <p>5. Identify any emergency planning (in particular oil spill contingency) and security risks or issues raised by the proposal;</p>	<p>without a pilot is to be sought. Pilotage would be available on request and for vessels unable to meet requirements for navigational Assistance Service.</p> <p>Access to the anchorage requires crossing the flow of inward and outward traffic from the Princes Channel. Enhanced VTS monitoring of vessels proceeding to the bunkering area would provide sufficient mitigation.</p> <p>Monitoring of traffic in the Queens Channel area to continue.</p> <p>Hazards identified; Dragging anchor. Proximity of submarine power cables and extreme weather and tidal conditions. [Post meeting note- 2 years of data obtained from Cefas for S Knock Waverider Buoy].</p> <p>Weather and tidal guidelines to be developed. Operational responsibilities for DPC and bunkering master to be developed.</p> <p>OPRC oil plan to be updated and consultation to take place.</p> <p>Implications of introduction of MS Ship to Ship Transfer Regulations to be taken into account.</p> <p>Changes to pilotage Directions to allow relaxation of compulsory pilotage for vessels taking bunkers.</p> <p>Introduce legislation to allow for a charging regime. (HRO?)</p> <p>Bunker vessel to have a Tier 1 response capability.</p> <p>Oil plan to be expanded to accommodate operations in the outer estuary. Tier 2 responder to be included.</p> <p>Adjacent sand banks are in a proposed Special Protection Area.</p>	<p>Receiving vessels piloted thus removing the requirement for enhanced monitoring.</p> <p>All bunkering pilots issued with chartlet showing position of BritNed cable in the vicinity of Queens Channel.</p> <p>Experience has shown that the bunker barge and the requirement for boarding and landing pilots at the spit are the limiting weather factors.</p> <p>This has been achieved.</p> <p>In spite of the government promise to delay implementation and review the S to S regs, Cockett have confirmed their desire to operate within port limits..</p> <p>Changes to legislation to introduce charging not required.</p> <p>Achieved.</p> <p>Noted, but did not affect the outcome of the environmental consultation.</p>
--	---	---

<p>6. Identify any environmental considerations raised, but not covered above;</p> <p>7. Consider any wider statutory requirements/limitations that may constrain of impact upon the proposals; and</p> <p>8. Identify any other issues raised by these proposals, not covered by the above, but which have the potential to impact upon navigational safety or PLA interests.</p>	<p>The reputational risk to the PLA was identified.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
<p>Panel Chairman:</p>	<p>Roy Stanbrook</p>	<p>Signature:</p> 	<p>Date:</p> <p>21/9/10</p>

