

Winckworth Sherwood  
Minerva House  
5 Montague Close  
LONDON  
SE1 9BB

DIRECT LINE: 020 7944 2529  
e-mail: ellen.duffy@dft.gsi.gov.uk

Web Site: [www.dft.gov.uk](http://www.dft.gov.uk)

Our Ref: PCP 5/1/17  
Your Ref: HXA/11051/14/PFI

FAO Ms Hazel Anderson

29 May 2012

Dear Sirs

**Port of London Authority: Thames Byelaws**

1. The Secretary of State has considered the application for confirmation of the above named byelaws made under section 168 of the Port of London Act 1968 (the Act) that was submitted by you as agents of the Port of London Authority (the PLA).
2. The PLA require their existing byelaws to be updated in order to better regulate the use of that part of the River Thames that is within its control as a harbour authority to among other things improve safety along the River following significant increases in passenger traffic.

**Notice of Proposed Byelaws**

3. A notice of intention to apply for the confirmation of byelaws was published as follows:-
  - The Independent of 26 July and 2 August
  - The Evening Standard of 26 July
  - The Metro of 26 July
  - The Thanet Times of 26 July
  - The Canterbury Times of 27 July
  - The London Gazette 26 July
4. In addition, the PLA sent copies of the notice to various bodies as required in the Act, including local authorities, the Ministry of Defence and the Port of Medway. The notice stated that the byelaws may be inspected at the offices of the Port of London Authority, or through its website. Any objection to the application for confirmation of the byelaws was to be made to the Department for Transport by 2 September 2011. The PLA, when requested by Thames RIB Experience and London RIB Voyages, agreed to extend the period for representations until 15 September.

## **Objections received against the byelaws**

5. There were 11 objections received on time with a further 5 late responses. There were two responses that either had no comment or did not object to the proposed byelaws.
6. There was one objection to byelaw 5 that was not withdrawn, which sets the level of fines for failing to comply with the byelaws. The objector (Dr Sturgess) considered that this showed that the PLA wished to make recreational users criminals.
7. There were 10 objections or late responses to byelaw 9, of which 5 were withdrawn and 4 did not respond when asked to confirm that their objection stood.
8. There were 14 objections or late responses to byelaw 16, none of which were formally withdrawn, although 4 did not respond when asked to confirm their objection.
9. There were 10 objections or late responses to byelaw 24 of which 5 were withdrawn and 4 did not respond when asked to confirm that their objection stood.
10. There was one objection to each of byelaws 31, 48 and 57 by Thames Clippers, which were all withdrawn.

## **Byelaw 5**

11. There was one objection to this byelaw from Dr Kim Sturgess, as a leisure sailor. He is a member of Greenwich Yacht Club. Byelaw 5 sets the level of maximum fine for any breach of the byelaws. Dr Sturgess was concerned that the PLA was attempting to criminalise all recreational users of the river Thames.

## **Byelaw 9**

12. The objections or late responses to this byelaw were from Greenwich Yacht Club, the Association of Yacht Clubs of Southend on Sea, and seven members of Greenwich Yacht Club (Dr Sturgess, Mr Michael Wood, Mr Graham Baker, Mr Richard Senior, Ms Jennifer Scarfe, Mr Jeremy Fox, and Mr F Lerner) and a recreational user (Ms Ann Baker). This byelaw relates to the holding of boat races, regattas, processions and other river events and provides that these should have the consent of the harbour master before being held. The objections were very similar and related to the impact that the byelaws would have on events organised by sailing clubs. Those objecting sought assurances that consent would not be unreasonably withheld and raised concerns that the 4-week notice period would limit the ability of recreational sailors to hold races, while the provision of a comprehensive risk assessment would be difficult to achieve as weather conditions or numbers of racers may not be known until the day of the race.
13. Following discussions and meetings between PLA and Greenwich Yacht Club, and others that provided sufficient reassurance so that Greenwich Yacht Club and the Association of Yacht Clubs of Southend on Sea, along with Mr Senior, Ms Scarfe and Mr Fox, have written withdrawing their objections. Dr Sturgess has confirmed that he still objects to this byelaw, while others did not respond to an e-mail from PLA asking them to confirm their position and stating that no response would be considered a withdrawal of their objection.

## **Byelaw 24**

14. The objections or late responses to this byelaw were from Greenwich Yacht Club, the Association of Yacht Clubs of Southend on Sea, and seven members of Greenwich Yacht Club (Dr Sturgess, Mr Michael Wood, Mr Graham Baker, Mr Richard Senior, Ms Jennifer Scarfe, Mr Jeremy Fox, and Mr F Lerner) and a recreational user (Ms Ann Baker).
15. The concerns about this byelaw were related to that for byelaw 9, in that this byelaw would restrict the ability of sailing clubs to conduct races on the Thames. There was particular concern that this byelaw prohibited vessels from crossing the river "as to obstruct another vessel proceeding along the fairway". It was considered that this did not reflect the constraints faced by sailing vessels that use the wind for propulsion, and which when racing may frequently need to cross the river Thames.
16. Following discussions and meetings between PLA and Greenwich Yacht Club, and others that provided sufficient reassurance so that Greenwich Yacht Club and the Association of Yacht Clubs of Southend on Sea, along with Mr Senior, Ms Scarfe and Mr Fox, have written withdrawing their objections. Dr Sturgess has confirmed that he still objects to this byelaw, while others did not respond to an e-mail from PLA asking them to confirm their position and stating that no response would be considered a withdrawal of their objection.

## **Byelaw 31**

17. Thames Clippers objected to wording of this byelaw and sought to extend the requirement for a yellow flashing light for all non-emergency vessels that hold an exemption certificate under byelaw 16.1 and were thereby permitted to exceed the speed of 12 knots.
18. The PLA is content for this byelaw to be amended as Thames Clippers has proposed, so that any non-emergency vessel with an exemption to the speed limit under byelaw 16.1 to display a yellow flashing light when exceeding 12 knots. The PLA are also content for this byelaw to be amended to include the technical specification for the yellow flashing light, instead of a cross-reference to the *International Regulations for Preventing Collision at Sea 1972*. Therefore Thames Clippers has withdrawn its objection to this byelaw.

## **Byelaw 48**

19. Thames Clippers were concerned about the potential wide ranging impact of this byelaw, as the PLA had not yet published its guidance for working on vessels near the foreshore. The PLA has slightly amended the wording and provided Thames Clippers with a copy of its proposed guidance.
20. Thames Clippers has withdrawn its objections to this byelaw.

## **Byelaw 57**

21. This byelaw deals with the need for vessels to navigate at a speed so that its wash or draw-off does not compromise the safety of others using the River Thames, its foreshore, piers, moorings, berths, etc or damage the integrity of the foreshore itself. Thames Clippers objected to the wording of the note to this byelaw, which it considered to be uniquely detailed and complex compared other Notes in the

byelaws. Thames Clippers were also concerned that there was lack of clarity about how the byelaw would be enforced.

22. The PLA has removed the note to this byelaw and will publish guidance on its website to clarify. As a result, Thames Clippers are content to remove their objection to this byelaw.

### **Byelaw 16**

23. This byelaw would impose a speed limit between Wandsworth Bridge and Margaretness of 12 knots. This stretch of the river does not currently have any speed limit. The PLA are proposing that as well as emergency vessels, those vessels holding a certificate of compliance issued by the PLA should be able to travel faster on certain stretches of the River (ie St Saviour's Dock and Margaretness at 30 knots and Wandsworth and Lambeth Bridges at 25 knots). For the river below Margaretness the proposed speed limit is 30 knots.
24. There were objections to these provisions that can be broadly grouped as follows:-
  - a. Greenwich Yacht Club and its members and the Globe Rowing Club are concerned about the impact of the exemption from the 12-knot speed limit (9 objections in total) between Cherry Garden Pier and Margaretness;
  - b. Thames Clippers, London RIB Voyages (LRV), Thames RIB Experience (TRE) objected to the principle of a speed limit.
  - c. LRV and TRE and two recreational RIB users object to the 12-knot speed limit, as it is too low for a RIB to operate optimally. LRV & TRE favour speeds of 18 knots and assert that this would be safe for other river users.
  - d. Thames Clippers and the RIB companies wish to see longer lengths of the River exempted.
  - e. Thames Clippers also felt that the requirements of High Speed Craft Code (HSCC) are sufficient to control those operating under the exemptions the speed limits in certain places and object to the need for a certificate of compliance.
25. Following assurances from the PLA, Globe Rowing Club wrote on 20 February 2012 saying that their immediate concerns are 'assuaged' and also recognising that the new byelaws should increase the PLA's control over high-speed vessels and thereby withdrawing their objection.
26. The remaining objections from Greenwich Yacht Club and their members are that vessels travelling at speeds greater than 12 knots may create wash that causes damage to moored vessels and that allowing vessels to travel at 30 knots places recreational sailors or oarsmen at increased risk. The objections from the leisure sailors and rowers were focused on incidents where vessels travelling at high-speed had not adjusted their speed to accommodate local conditions and this had resulted in damage to moored vessels or wash which had unbalanced dinghies or rowing boats in use. Globe Rowing Club cited incidents where operators had denied they were responsible and they had been unable to establish who was operating the vessel concerned.
27. Thames Clippers submitted an objection to the requirement for vessels that already possess a UK High Speed Craft Safety Certificate and a Permit to Operate High Speed Craft to demonstrate their suitability to operate above the mandatory speed

limit on certain stretches of the Thames. Thames Clippers considered that the need for a Certificate of Compliance for vessels to be exempt from speed limits would impose additional costs on operators.

28. LRV and TRE and two recreational RIB users object to the 12-knot speed limit, as it is too low for a RIB (rigid inflatable board) to operate optimally, as such vessels are more stable and create less wash when 'planing'. LRV and TRE favour speeds of 18 knots and assert that this would be safe for other river users as this would be sufficient speed to allow their vessels to operate in 'planing mode'.
29. Thames Clippers and the RIB companies wish to see longer lengths of the River exempted from the speed limit. In response to these representations, the PLA is willing to change the exemption zone so that it operates from St Saviour's Docks, which is approximately 400 metres below Tower Bridge, instead of Cherry Garden Pier, to Margaretness. The LRV and TRE would like vessels holding a certificate of compliance to be able to operate at a higher speed between Lambeth Bridge and Cherry Garden Pier. TRE argue that a rigid and inflexible speed limit between Lambeth Bridge and Cherry Garden Pier is not justified by safety concerns. TRE consider that the harbour master should be able to decide on a case by case basis whether a relaxation of or exemption from the speed limit is appropriate
30. In response to Thames Clippers' proposals in relation to the 15-knot speed limit through the Thames Barrier, the PLA is now willing to reduce this to 100 metres either side of the Barrier, which is represented by the existing No Anchoring Zone and is shown on the relevant maritime charts. The PLA considers that this should be a safe speed for vessels to transit the Barrier, where the vessels hold a certificate of compliance and comply with the associated requirements for the competency of the persons navigating such vessels.
31. The PLA has been in discussion with the various parties who made objections to byelaw 16 to seek to provide reassurances. It has also proposed some modifications to meet some of the concerns raised. The PLA considers that if it did not make provision for speed regulation, it would be failing in its duties to provide for the safety of river users, particularly given the growing number of river passenger journeys (some 4 million in 2009-10 and likely to continue to increase given the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy 2010 and the London Plan 2011) and the expectations of greater use of river services. PLA intend the introduction of a speed limit to improve navigational safety on what can be a congested river with, in certain places, limited sight-lines and limited room for manoeuvre.
32. The MAIB in a recently published accident report<sup>1</sup> notes that the current advisory 12-knots speed limit '*was based on the careful consideration of a number of factors, including reaction times and the proximity of dangers. ... the limit is considerably more generous than the speed limits imposed by many other harbour authorities*'. The MAIB report continues that '*the 12-knot speed limit between Wandsworth Bridge and Cherry Garden Pier will further contribute to the safe navigation of vessels on the River Thames when it is made mandatory and enforced.*'
33. The PLA established a Navigational Advisory Panel (NAP) that was chaired by the PLA's Chief Harbour Master with its members drawn from experience practitioners, operators, river users and specialists. The NAP concluded that a 12-knot speed limit

---

<sup>1</sup> Morfil and Sun Clipper Accident Investigation Report MAIB Report 12/2012

was required above the Thames Barrier with exemptions where it could be demonstrated that individual craft have the necessary risk mitigation measures in place and acceptable wash characteristics. The PLA consider that a speed limit is justified because

- a. The River Thames is increasingly used by a wide range of commercial and recreational vessels, especially between Wapping and Vauxhall.
  - b. Vessels of relatively significant size are using the River to facilitate many major infrastructure projects underway or planned (eg Thames Tideway tunnel) for protracted periods.
  - c. In central London, the navigable river is very limited with significant encroachment by bridges, busy operational piers, moorings and moored vessels on the embankments.
  - d. With limited 'sea room' in central London, the ability of vessels operating at high speed to respond quickly and safely and avoid collision or contact depends on the reaction time of the person navigating and the vessel's ability to stop.
  - e. There are very poor sight lines and at night light pollution is another issue.
  - f. The River narrows as it goes west, which supports the long-standing 8-knot speed limit above Wandsworth Bridge. Above Putney, the River has some 75% of the UK tidal river rowing activity.
34. The PLA then convened a further Navigational Advisory Panel (NAP 29) in April 2009 to consider what mitigation measure should be applied where vessels were to be permitted to exceed the 12-knot speed limit between Cherry Garden Pier and Margaretness. NAP 29 included representatives from Greenwich Yacht Club, other recreational users (including rowing clubs), Thames Clippers and London RIB Voyages. It concluded that:-
- a. maintaining the current position (ie no speed limit) was not an option;
  - b. a 12-knot speed limit would be appropriate and could reduce risks associated with speed to as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP);
  - c. any exemption would require robust criteria to be determined on a case by case basis;
  - d. the regulation of speed would need effective policing and enforcement with appropriate sanctions;
  - e. wash and draw off would continue to be an issue on the river irrespective of the 12-knot speed limit.
35. The PLA states that it considered the form and extent of the exemptions from speed limits. With regard to the Thames Clippers, it noted that the schedules are based on the capability of the company's vessels to navigate at a maximum speed of 28 knots. Following the work of NAP 29, and consultations in 2008 and before, it had been judged that 30-knots was a safe maximum speed limit for all vessels below Margaretness and below St Saviour's Dock for those vessels that had been given a certificate of compliance by the Harbour Master. It had also been considered that for vessels that had been approved by the harbour master a speed limit of 25 knots between Lambeth and Wandsworth Bridges would be practical. Vessels would

require a certificate of compliance from the harbour master before being exempt from the speed limit in these two zones.

36. The PLA consulted on the technical criteria for the issue of a certificate of compliance, which would require the vessel among other things to follow an appropriate safety management system, which includes an approved passage plan and would require the vessel to have at least two crew member with specific competencies for watch-keeping on vessels travelling at high-speed and emergency response. All vessels with a certificate of compliance will be required to carry an AIS transponder, which will allow the PLA's Vessel Traffic Service to track exempt vessels and to monitor their speed and highlight the presence of high-speed craft to other river users with the same equipment. In addition, all such vessels will require a yellow flashing light to be used when vessels are travelling at high-speed. The technical criteria for the Certificate of Compliance require commercial vessels to be built to comply with the High Speed Craft Code, Small Commercial Vessel Code or equivalent.
37. PLA considers that it is appropriate for it, as the body responsible for navigational safety on the River, to determine whether a particular operation is allowed on the river, especially when it involves high-speed passenger operations. The PLA considers that the MCA licence relates to compliance with national standards, while it has obligations under the Port Marine Safety Code for a navigational safety management system that takes account of the risks identified in an assessment for its area of responsibility.
38. The PLA considers that the existence of a passage plan will improve safety as operators of high-speed vessels, will be required to identify navigational hazards and anticipate local traffic conditions such as recreational users in a specific locality (eg Greenwich Yacht Club). The certificate of compliance would meet to some extent the needs of commercial users, whether passenger services or tourist attractions, as it would allow them to operate at speeds of up to 30 knots on designated stretches of the River Thames. Passenger services would be able to maintain their current timetables, while the RIB operators would be able to use their vessels at optimum speeds for planning over the water and to provide the 'thrill' that their passengers expect.

## **Consideration**

39. With the exception of byelaw 16, the objections (other than those from Dr Sturgess) have either been withdrawn or not re-stated when asked by the PLA to do so. In each case the PLA either provided assurances about how the byelaws will be applied for sailing vessels in relation to byelaw 9 and 24, or proposed modifications to the wording of the byelaws to meet an objector's concerns without substantially changing the purpose or effect of the byelaws.
40. In compliance with the Port Marine Safety Code, the PLA has reviewed the safety of navigation on the River, including the appropriate speed of vessels in various sections of the river to reflect local conditions and the risks from increasing passenger traffic over the last decade and the expected growth in the future given the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy 2010 and the London Plan 2011.
41. It is clear that the PLA considered that the lack of any speed limit below Wandsworth Bridge presented a risk to all river users and that the introduction of a speed limit would be beneficial. In considering how to apply speed limits the PLA convened two

separate Navigation Advisory Panels, and consulted with river users before preparing and submitting its proposed byelaws. Following its consultations the PLA took account of the needs of commercial river users by allowing an exemption from the speed limit for vessels that hold a certificate of compliance while setting conditions for such an exemption that provides safeguards for smaller or recreational vessels.

42. Currently, below Wandsworth Bridge there are no speed limits, beyond a requirement for operators of vessels to travel at an appropriate speed for local conditions, including the proximity of sailing boats or rowing boats. There is an advisory speed limit of 12 knots, but MAIB consider that this needs to be mandatory and enforced. The certificate for compliance that would allow vessels to travel above 12 knots will require such vessels to have transmitters which will be monitored by the PLA's control centre and help anyone adversely impacted by a vessel to identify it. In addition, each vessel will be required to adopt a passage plan to identify navigational hazards, and local traffic conditions so that the necessary mitigation measures can be identified, agreed and implemented.

### **The Decision of the Secretary of State**

43. The Secretary of State agrees that byelaws are necessary for the PLA, as a harbour authority, to fulfil its duties to ensure the safe navigation of the River Thames. It appears to the Secretary of State that the PLA has reasonable grounds for making these byelaws.
44. The Secretary of State has taken account of the objections made against the byelaws and is satisfied that both the applicant and objectors have agreed wording which has enabled the many of the objections to be withdrawn, other than those relating to setting a speed limit below Wandsworth Bridge.
45. The Secretary of State has noted the PLA efforts to accommodate the concerns of different river users, but in relation to byelaw 16 these are incompatible. The PLA has made its best endeavours to deal with the underlying concerns of both commercial operators, who need to maintain service reliability, and leisure users, to provide for the safety of all users on the river given the recent and continuing growth in traffic, especially on the central London section of the river.
46. The Secretary of State is content that the PLA has not acted arbitrarily in deciding that a speed limit is necessary below Wandsworth Bridge and notes that it has consulted with expert bodies and users through two separate Navigation Advisory Panels.
47. As regards the other byelaws objected to by Dr Sturgess, the Secretary of State is not persuaded that those byelaws should not be confirmed. The Secretary of State notes that others who raised similar objections have been persuaded to withdraw those objections. As regards byelaw 5, it is normal for harbour authorities to have byelaws backed with criminal sanctions to help ensure the proper and effective regulation of the harbour.
48. The Secretary of State has therefore decided that the byelaws as advertised, subject to the modifications proposed by the applicant and agreed with objectors and other modifications that do not substantially change the byelaws, be confirmed under section 168 of the Port of London Act 1968. For the purposes of s168(5), the Secretary of State does not consider these modifications to be substantial. The



modifications have been made to the sealed copy and are listed in Annex A to this letter.

49. The Secretary of State notes by virtue of paragraph 1 of the byelaws, they shall come into force on 1 July 2012.

### **Revocation of Byelaws**

50. In accordance with byelaw 4, the Port of London River Byelaws of 1978 (as amended) as confirmed on 3 December 1979, except for byelaw 9, are revoked with effect from the date on which the new byelaws come into force.

Yours faithfully,

**Ellen Duffy**

## List of modifications to the Thames Byelaws sealed by the Port of London Authority on 14 July 2011

### Title

Replace “2011” with “2012”.

### Byelaw 1 Citation and Commencement

After “Port of London Thames Byelaws”, replace “2011” with “2012”, and replace ‘1 December 2011’ with ‘1 July 2012’

### Byelaw 3.1 Interpretation

- b)** for “Alfa” substitute “Alpha” and delete “as specified by IEC 61993-2 and ITU-R M.1371-1 and IALA technical clarifications of ITU-R M,1371-1”
- l)** delete ‘dated 03.05.06, set out in Appendix I to these byelaws’;
- r)** delete the final bracket at the end of the sentence
- dd)** insert new definition: ““No Anchoring Area” means an area adjacent to the Thames Barrier in which anchoring is prohibited by general direction of the PLA;” previous dd) becomes ee) and all subsequent paragraph lettering amended
- vv)** **(Previously uu)** for “Alfa” substitute “Alpha” and delete ‘dated 03.05.06, set out in Appendix I to these byelaws’;
- ww)** **insert new definition:** ““Thames AIS Technical Requirements Specification” means the PLA publication containing the minimum requirements and settings for equipment forming Thames AIS available from the PLA and published on its website and as updated from time to time as notified in advance by a Notice to Mariners”; previous vv) becomes xx)

### Following Byelaw 3.2

Insert a note that reads

**“Note:** The notes in these Byelaws are for information only; they form no part of the Byelaws and do not have any legal effect.”

### Following Byelaw 9.5

Insert three notes that read:-

**“Notes:** 1. Provided they comply with the minimum timescale set out in byelaw 9.2, local sailing, rowing and other marine activity clubs may submit event information to the district harbourmaster in advance on a 6-monthly or annual basis. Such information should include a programme of planned events and proposed regular club activities, such as informal races or training. Both planned events and regular club activities are to be supported by an appropriate generic risk assessment.

2. Subject to the generic risk assessment meeting the requirements in this byelaw, the district harbourmaster will approve club events and activities programmes in advance, for the period in question.
3. However, any unscheduled event or activity which has not been submitted and approved under a general club events and activities programme should be discussed with the district harbourmaster within the timescales required by byelaw 9.2; and if the harbourmaster decides that they fall outside the scope of the club's generic risk assessment, they will be subject to the specific risk assessment requirements of byelaw 9.4."

#### **Byelaw 12.2**

- c) delete "and" at the end;
- d) insert '; and' after 'bulk'
- e) insert new bullet point that reads 'vessels holding a valid certificate of compliance under the provisions of byelaw 16.3'

#### **Byelaw 12.3**

- b) delete 'in Appendix I' and replace with 'in the Thames AIS Technical Requirements Specification'
- c) amend to read with initial capital letters as 'Procedures for the Operation of Thames AIS and Persons On Board Reporting System' and delete "dated 01.12.07 set out in Appendix II".

#### **Following Byelaw 12.6**

Insert a note that reads:-

**Note:** For the purposes of byelaw 12.3, the PLA's Thames AIS Technical Requirements Specification and Procedures for the Operation of Thames AIS and Person On Board Reporting System are published separately by the PLA, and provided to operators whose vessels are subject to carriage requirements under this byelaw prior to procurement and fitting. The documents are also published on the PLA website.

#### **Byelaw 13.1**

- (a) Insert 'a' before 'designated'

#### **Byelaw 14.7**

For "1 June 2012" substitute "1 July 2012"

#### **Byelaw 16.3**

- d) For "amended" substitute "modified";
- d) (ii) Replace 'Cherry Garden Pier' with 'St Saviour's Dock'

#### **Byelaw 16.4**

Insert 'in the designated No-Anchoring Area' after 'Thames Barrier'. Delete 'in the area between Barrier Point Pier and the eastern end of Barrier Gardens Pier'

## Notes following Byelaw 16.4

**Note 1** Delete 'as a minimum,'

**Note 4** Insert new note 4 that reads:-

"4. A certificate of compliance for the purposes of this byelaw is not to be taken as compliance for the purposes of any other requirement in PLA byelaws, general directions or provisions in the Act."

## Byelaw 21. Bathing and Swimming

**21.1** After 'A person must not' insert 'without the prior permission of the PLA, given in writing, and in accordance with such conditions as the PLA may attach to any such permission'

## Note following Byelaw 21.2

Replace 'Appendix IV' with 'Appendix III'.

## Following Byelaw 29

Insert note to read:

**Note:** The lights and shapes rules in byelaw 29 are inconsistent with the provisions of the International Collision Regulations but apply as special rules by virtue of rule 1(b) as applied by the Merchant Shipping (Distress Signals and Prevention of Collisions) Regulation 1996."

## Byelaw 31.1

Insert new bullet b) as below and re-number other bullets:-

"b) any non-emergency service or non-regulatory vessel to which byelaw 16.3(a) applies, while that vessel exceeds a speed of 12 knots when navigating above the Margaretness limit;"

## Byelaw 31.3

Insert new byelaw 31.3

"31.3 In this byelaw "all-round flashing yellow light" means a yellow light flashing at regular intervals at a frequency of 120 flashes or more per minute over an arc of the horizon of 360 degrees."

## Following Byelaw 36

Delete note

## Byelaw 48.3

Delete 'and' before 'where any spillages, ...' and for 'may pollute' substitute 'will pollute'

## Note following Byelaw 57

Replace existing Note following byelaw 57 with the following text:-

**Note:** The PLA publication Guidance on Wash and Draw-off is published on the PLA website."