

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

CONFIDENTIAL

Title of Report: Port Project - Feedback on Industry and Public Consultation

Paper No: 117/12

Date: 25th April 2012

Report of: Projects Director

1. Purpose

- 1.1 To provide feedback to ExCo on the results of the Industry and Public consultation process with regard to the preferred site for the port location and to propose next steps.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That Executive Council notes the results of the feedback process and that Port William, Navy Point, was the preferred location of the majority of both industry and the general public.
- 2.2 That Executive Council notes that the phased interim development of FIPASS, throughout the development of a new facility, was also strongly favoured by responders.
- 2.3 That Executive Council approves detailed environmental surveys of the Port William – Navy Point site as outlined in ExCo Paper 265/11.
- 2.4 That Executive Council approves detailed geo-technical surveys of the Port William – Navy Point site and surrounding areas to proceed concurrently with technical surveys of swell and meteorological monitoring.

3 Financial Implications summary

- 3.1 None – Expenditure can be met from existing funding in the 2011/12 Deep Water Consultancy budget (0959-3211)

4 Background

4.1 *Prior related Executive Council Decisions*

- On 14th December 2011, Paper 265/11 refers, ExCo:
 - approved the inclusion of Mare Harbour as a potential port site;

- *agreed that the potential joint use of Mare Harbour be considered on an incremental basis in order to prove through the potential to share the facility, and its suitability for private sector industry traffic;*
- *approved the proposed strategy for proving through the shared use of Mare Harbour;*
- *agreed that Port Harriet and Ordnance Point should no longer be considered a potential port site;*
- *approved a process of industry/public consultation in respect of the sites proposed;*
- *confirmed that the Projects Director should be asked to manage industry/public consultation in respect of potential port sites;*
- *approved that technical surveys of un-established port sites (Port William) should proceed concurrently with public consultation; and*
- *resolved to review the list of potential port sites on receipt of responses from public consultation prior to approving further expenditure on environmental surveys at port sites.*

5 Public and Industry Consultation Process

5.1 General

5.1.1 The FIG Projects Director formulated a strategy for both Industry and Public consultation which was approved by the Major Projects Board by e-mail in the week beginning 30th January 2012.

5.1.2 Terms of Reference (TOR's) for the process were agreed and implemented.

5.1.3 TOR's included the following key questions;

- How are current resources meeting the need?
- Is there an anticipated time that these resources will not meet expectations, if they are right now - i.e. when will FIPASS no longer be big enough to cope from a specific industry point of view?
- Has there been a shift in requirements from the previous consultations (Royal Haskoning/Mott McDonald etc)?
- Is there a perceived preference from your specific industry for location?
- What are your specific industries thoughts on the sharing of military facilities?

5.1.4 The Projects Director conducted the consultation process via a number of methods including 1:1 meetings, public meetings, stakeholder workshops, radio phone ins and print media press releases.

5.1.5 The consultation process concluded with a 'think tank' session involving members of the FIG Leadership Programme Group.

5.2 Executive Summary – Port Options

5.2.1 An Executive Summary of the responses received throughout the process is held at Appendix A.

5.2.2 Three further sites were raised throughout the process, those being

- Port William – Ordnance Point – Raised by both industry and public responders. Previously ruled out by ExCo in December 2011
- Berkeley Sound – Raised by an industry rep. Previously ruled out as a site through previous phases of the project
- Port Smyley – Raised by a private sector responder. Not previously considered within the port project.

5.2.3 **Port William – Navy Point**

Favoured by the majority of responders throughout the process for development as a greenfield site due to its close proximity to Stanley, open development area and open approach for mariners. Some cautions were noted in terms of cost (long causeway (400M), amenities, road and potential need for a causeway) and visual impact both on the arrival experience for cruise based tourists and from Stanley itself.

It is recommended that Port William Navy Point is further explored as a potential greenfield site for the development of a new port through a series of environmental and geo-technical surveys.

5.2.4 **Stanley Harbour - FIPASS**

Favoured by some due to its close proximity to Stanley and already developed infrastructure. The majority of responders, however, did not favour FIPASS as a sole port due to its close proximity to Stanley and lack of manoeuvrability for large vessels within Stanley Harbour, though it is felt that this could be negated by the use of tugs. The Narrows was also raised as an issue by many mariners and fishing companies.

That FIPASS is either just or not coping (dependent on the viewpoint), was clear through the process. Both lack of berthing space and lack of lay down space was highlighted as an issue. It was felt that these issues would be further exacerbated by potential heavier traffic from within the oil and gas industry.

Whilst FIPASS was not favoured as a greenfield or further developed site, it was heavily favoured as an interim development site in order to allow containerisation to continue in the light of potential development in other industries.

It is recommended that a phased interim development of FIPASS, throughout the development of a new facility is progressed as soon as possible.

The Projects Director is working with the Director of Natural Resources on a FIPASS Action Plan in order to seek capital funding to progress this work, it is envisaged that this paper will be presented to ExCo in June 2012.

5.2.5 **Port William – Ordnance Point**

Raised by a number of individuals within the public and industry consultation with the view that it was excluded without proper consultation or

consideration. The Site was favoured by some due to its close proximity to Stanley, ready access to amenities, relative low cost (road, infrastructure etc) and the fact that it has deep water close to land.

The majority of responders actively opposed its consideration due to the high environmental impact on the Cape Pembroke National Nature Reserve and the heavy impact on the visual impact from Stanley.

It is recommended that Ordnance Point continues to be ruled out as an option for a greenfield site.

5.2.6 Mare Harbour – East Cove

Favoured by a small number of individuals due to the obvious benefits of infrastructure in place. Caution was noted on the suitability of Hecate Channel for larger vessels and the potential high additional cost of developing both the road network and additional berthing space within the port. East Cove has less berthing space than FIPASS at present. The cost of the duplication of resources for this location, due to the distance from Stanley, was also raised as an additional cost issue.

Many responders were cautious regarding joint work with the military. It was clear throughout the process that there is much to be done in order to build confidence in the public sector with regard to the benefits of joint work with the military.

The FIG Projects Director will continue to accelerate work on the localisation of port facilities within Mare Harbour through development of a Joint Port Authority. This work will now be developed through the localisation programme

5.2.7 Falklands Conservation were commissioned to complete ‘broad sweep’ environmental assessments of all sites, including Ordnance Point, these are held at Appendix B.

5.2.8 A full copy of all responses received and meeting notes from 1:1 and public meetings is available at Gilbert House for further consultation, though is not appended to this document.

5.2.9 The phased interim development of FIPASS and further detailed environmental and technical assessments of Port William – Navy Point was the agreed outcome of the ‘think tank’ session with the Leadership Group.

6 Next Steps

6.1 Technical surveys, wind and swell, for the Port William – Navy Point site, are progressing well with the buoy expected to be in place by August 2012.

6.2 ExCo paper 265/11 recommended a number of environmental, benthic and habitat surveys for any unestablished sites. It is intended that this work progresses as soon as possible on the Port William - Navy Point site.

- 6.3** Following the assessment of the locally based environmental assessments by the Environmental Planning Department, it is intended that a series of geo-technical surveys are undertaken to establish the suitability or otherwise of the sea bed and land areas to sustain and support development.
- 6.4** This will include both terrestrial and marine surveys as well as survey work on the proposed route of any new roads to the port site; all work will be carried out under the supervision of the FIG Design Office.
- 6.5** This work is vital prior to any preliminary design work and any preliminary pricing work in order to fully cost the project.

7 Financial Implications

7.1 Financial Implications of environmental surveys;

| Port Site | Benthic Survey | Habitat Survey | Total cost |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Port William – Navy Point | £14,450 | £400 | £14,850 |

7.2 Financial Implications of geo-technical assessments;

| Port Site | Land survey | Seabed survey | Total cost |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| Port William – Navy Point | £4,000 | £29,000 | £33,000 |

- 7.3** Funding available in the Deep Water Consultancy vote for 2011/12 is £164,111
- 7.4** It is worthy of note that the land survey fees are FIG internal transfers, however will contribute to the total cost of the project.
- 7.5** It is likely that further environmental surveys will be needed in future, in order to inform a full environmental impact assessment, which will be necessary for the site chosen for port development. Further technical surveys may also be required at that stage.
- 7.6** It will be possible to contain the total costs involved within the funds allocated in the capital programme for port development. There are therefore no additional financial implications of this paper.
- 7.7** Any FIPASS Action plan will be subject to further funding requests, however no application has been made in the 2012-13 budget cycle. It is anticipated that a request will be formed in readiness for the 2013-14 budget cycle.

9. Legal Implications

- 9.1** The land likely to be affected by a proposed port development at Navy Point, Port William is not all in Crown ownership (in particular bearing in mind the need for appropriate access as well as lay down areas etc).
- 9.2** Research is currently being carried out to establish ownership of the relevant areas, but the fact that private land ownership is involved would be relevant to development of the site, and inadequacies in existing compulsory purchase legislation could, ultimately, also be a relevant factor

10. Human Resources Implications

- 10.1** None specific to this report.

Appendix A - Executive Summary Port Consultation Process

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. Each site is summarised, in no particular order, many environmental and technical issues are dealt with in ExCo 265/11 and the Royal Haskoning 2010 report. All new issues raised through the process are summarised here.

2. Port William Navy Point

2.1. General

- Caution noted by Cable and Wireless PLC regarding high infrastructure costs for Port William Navy Point, due to lack of current demand in the area.

2.2. Environmental

- Listed as having 3 environmental constraints by Falklands Conservation (FC). Noted that if development was to be restricted to the northern shore of Navy Point, would have marginally fewer constraints than East Cove.
- The Narrows is the gateway to Stanley for cruise passengers; the arrival experience may well be negatively impacted.
- Met and Swell monitoring buoy has been ordered and will be installed in August 2012.

2.3. Fishing Industry

- Heavily favoured by the fishing industry due to its close proximity to Stanley and open development area.
- Caution noted by some on costs incurred, particularly with regard to breakwaters and the long causeway.

2.4. Oil Industry

- No objections raised and the favoured option of Rockhopper PLC.

2.5. Cruise Industry

- Some concerns raised as to whether the port will be utilised by large cruise ships. Large vessels can move 1000 pax. per hour on tenders, to move that many by bus or coach would potentially be cost prohibitive
- Noted that smaller vessels will come to a jetty, however with the advent of the Waterfront Master Plan and the development of the Public Jetty this could be negated
- The Narrows is the gateway to Stanley for cruise passengers, the arrival experience may well be negatively impacted

2.6. Mariners

- No objections noted with regard to access to either anchorages or the Narrows
- Open approach is favoured by all
- May be unusable for some periods due to northerly/easterly winds and swell. This will be closely assessed by the met./swell buoy readings.

2.7. Public

- Favoured by the majority, the following being a summary;
 - close enough to the road network.
 - will boost the expansion of Stanley to the West.
 - *“for the 50 year scenario, it is the right place.”*
 - would allow for progressive expansion.

- Others have raised the following issues;
 - high cost of building road.
 - lay down already in place at FIPASS.
 - no potable water (not verified).
 - no power.
 - high cost of land clearance.
 - long way from current facilities (container park).
 - land is owned by FIC, not accurate, though access would potentially be required through FIC land.

3. Port William Ordnance Point

3.1. General

- Caution noted by Cable and Wireless PLC regarding high infrastructure costs for Port William Ordnance Point due to lack of current demand in the area.
- Likely to require a breakwater on both sides due to swell, high cost.

3.2. Environmental

- Noted as having 13 environmental constraints by FC, the site with the highest environmental impact.

3.3. Fishing Industry

- Not favoured by most industry reps due to high impact on the social amenity.
- One rep felt that it was excluded too early, in a non transparent manner and requires further exploration as an option.

3.4. Oil Industry

- Not favoured by some industry reps due to the potential negative impact on individual companies reputations.

3.5. Cruise Industry

- Not favoured at all by FITB or industry reps.

3.6. Mariners

- No objections noted with regard to access to either anchorages or the Narrows.
- Open approach is favoured by all.
- May be unusable for some periods due to northerly/easterly winds and swell.
- Preferred by some due to ready access to deep water.
- Potential clashes with anchored cruise and other vessels

3.7. Public

- Favoured by the some, who are in effect in the minority. The following being a summary;
 - cheapest to develop, closest to town,
 - road of sorts already exists to Gypsy Cove,
 - will boost the expansion of Stanley to the east,
 - close to current amenities (power water etc),
 - plenty of room for expansion,
 - deep water at a short distance from the shore,
 - the loss of the social amenity will be counteracted by the opening of other areas within the BACTEC land clearance programme.
- The vast majority of public responders do not favour Port William Ordnance Point, raising the following issues;
 - impact on a valuable social amenity,
 - impact on wildlife and on a the surrounding nature reserve,

- impact on the view from Stanley,
- the site is the habitat of a number of protected flora and fauna.

4. Stanley Inner Harbour – FIPASS

4.1. General

- Potential for there always to be a need for a berth at the FIPASS location.

4.2. Environmental

- Noted by FC as having 6 environmental constraints.

4.3. Fishing Industry

- Favoured by some within the fishing industry.
- Phased incremental approach of this location preferred by many in the initial stages, amenities are nearby and business is already centred on FIPASS.
- Some in the industry expressed the view that the visual and noise/light pollution would be unacceptable.
- Many in the industry cited the Narrows as an issue; this was negated somewhat by the DNR who cited examples of very large vessels navigating the Narrows recently. Manoeuvrability is certainly an issue for larger vessels.
- Heavily favoured by SAAS reps.

4.4. Oil Industry

- Strong objections raised regarding the social and environmental impact of a major port within Stanley Inner Harbour.

4.5. Cruise Industry

- Not favoured by industry reps, large vessels simply will not navigate the Narrows.
- Tugs could mitigate this risk.

4.6. Mariners

- No objections noted, mariners did however note that if the terminal was to protrude any further north it would seriously impinge on manoeuvrability of larger vessels.
- Note from the Director of Natural resources
 - *Some of the manoeuvrability issues could be overcome by the provision of an appropriate tug. This has been a long standing request by industry. A Navy Point – Port William option is equally likely to benefit from a tug. If a £50M dock has been built there would be a big question as to whether ‘large’ vessels would be allowed to berth without using a tug in my view. Whilst some might contend a tug is more necessary for FIPASS than P William, the requirements may not be so different. It may also depend on whether people subscribe to the view that vessels will get larger.*
 - *There is quite major lay down space in the vicinity of FIPASS at present, and it is being extended at present. There are options to add to that space at the current site or to develop additional options. This does not seem to be so limiting. FIPASS has 300m of berthing space, and at some point FIPASS needs replacing. Building 300m of berthing at Navy Point replicates FIPASS. It provides additional berthing for as long as FIPASS can be used in tandem, but if FIPASS fails the berthing limitation remains the same. Adding 100-200 m to FIPASS extends berthing.*

4.7. Public

- Favoured by some, the following being a summary;
 - Obvious benefits of infrastructure already in place
 - There has always been a port in Stanley, there will always need to be a port in Stanley
 - Definitely favoured by many as an interim solution.

- others have raised the following issues;
 - Noise and light pollution an issue.
 - Perception of limited development space.

5. East Cove Military Port – Mare Harbour

5.1. General

- Duplication of resources/services.
- Already mainly there so some shared costs – caution to be noted in this, civilian facilities will still need to be delivered.
- Currently less berthing space at ECMP than at FIPASS
- Facilities are aging and are in need of investment.

5.2. Environmental

- Noted by FC as having 2 environmental constraints. The site having the lowest environmental impact from those assessed.

5.3. Fishing Industry

- Favoured by very few within the fishing industry.
- Reps. raised concerns regarding access to the port with any military involvement.
- Favoured as a potential lay-up facility off season.

5.4. Oil Industry

- Strong objections raised. Oil reps were clear; any military involvement in the management of the port would result in oil avoiding the facility.
- Already planned to be utilised by B&S for Leiv Eiriksson risers.

5.5. Cruise Industry

- Not favoured by industry reps, some did indicate that the port could be utilised for passenger exchanges and would potentially open up new tours.
- Some noted that it would ‘spell the end of tourism’ if the only option.
- Clear that vessels would still tender into Stanley.

5.6. Mariners

- No objections noted.
- Mariners raised concerns regarding access to the port with any military involvement in the management of the port.

5.7. Public

- Favoured by some due to obvious benefits of infrastructure already in place.
- Muted by some as a possible oil terminal.
- others have raised the following issues;
 - High cost of road development.
 - Strong objections noted with regard to joint working with the MOD.
 - Large discontent and mistrust regarding joint working.

6. Berkeley Sound

6.1. General

- Raised by Fortuna only.
- Excluded within the project at an early stage.
- Plenty of land for development.

- Deep water.
- Distance from Stanley.
- Duplication of resources/services.
- Potential need to build a separate centre from Stanley.
- Potential high cost – road development.

6.2. Environmental

- Limited work has been completed formally on Berkeley Sound due to its exclusion officially from the Port project some time ago.

6.3. Fishing Industry

- Favoured by very few within the fishing industry.

6.4. Oil Industry

- Little enthusiasm, oil reps consulted wish to form a community within the Stanley community and not develop another MPA.

6.5. Cruise Industry

- No comments raised, not likely to be favoured other than for operators working in the north of East Falkland.
- Not likely to be utilised by large vessels following comments on Port William/ECMP

7. Port Smyley

7.1. General

- Raised by Port Smyley Ltd only.
- Never considered as an FIG project, considered as a private sector development.
- Plenty of land for development.
- Deep water.
- Distance from Stanley.
- Duplication of resources/services.
- Potential need to build a separate centre from Stanley.
- Potential very high cost – road development.
- At a higher specification than FIG feels is appropriate at present.
- No environmental studies completed.



FALKLAND ISLANDS PORT OPTIONS OUTLINE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

*Dr James Fenton
Falklands Conservation
28 March 2012*

INTRODUCTION

This is an outline Environmental Impact Assessment for each of the four possible port options currently being considered. It has been carried out as a desk exercise based on existing information. Its purpose is to clarify the likely environmental implications of siting the port at each locality so as to assist decision-making.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY FRAMEWORK

Environment Charter, Falkland Islands, 26 September 2001

“The government of the Falkland Islands will...

3. Ensure that environmental considerations are integrated within social and economic planning processes...
4. Ensure that environmental impact assessments are undertaken before approving major projects...”

Falkland Islands Government: The Islands Plan 2010-15: 7) Housing and Environment

“The need to protect, maintain and, where possible, enhance our natural and built environment will be integral to our policies. We will seek to meet international standards and obligations in respect of our environment...”

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

Each potential site has been tested against environmental criteria and the likely impact on each assessed. The results are summarised in the tables below. It should be noted that data on underwater habitats is not available, so the impacts here cannot be assessed.

It will be seen that one site, Ordnance Point, stands out because the environmental impact here will be significantly higher than at the other sites.

East Cove has the fewest environmental constraints.

Navy Point and Stanley Harbour have a similar number of environmental constraints. However if development at Navy Point were restricted to the Port William side, then development here is likely to have environmental impact only marginally higher than East Cove.

| Site | No. environmental constraints | Environmental impact |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| East Cove, Mare Harbour | 2 | Low |
| Navy Point (North shore only) | 3 | ↓ |
| Stanley Harbour (FIPASS area) | 6 | ↓ |
| Navy Point (North & South shores) | 7 | ↓ |
| Ordnance Point | 13 | High |

SUMMARY TABLE

Note that in the summation at the bottom of the table, each environmental constraint has been given equal weight. In practice some may be seen as more important than others. Ticks have only been given where the impact is assessed to be significant.

| Environmental constraints | Ordnance Point | Navy Point North shore (Pt William) | Navy Point South shore (Stanley Hbr) | Stanley Harbour | East Cove |
|--|----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| Designations | | | | | |
| NNR | ✓ | | | | |
| Common land | ✓ | | | | |
| Ramsar site | | | | | (✓) |
| Important Plant Area | ✓ | | | | |
| Habitats/species | | | | | |
| Threatened habitats | ✓ | | | | |
| Natural vegetation | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| Coastal bird breeding colonies | ✓ | | | | |
| Common coastal birds/dolphins | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Important underwater habitats/species | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Landscape & Visual impact | | | | | |
| High landscape value | ✓ | | ✓ | | |
| Visual impact from sea | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| Visual impact from land | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Noise & light pollution | | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Cultural heritage/history | | | | | |
| Archaeological/historical artefacts | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Recreation/tourism value | | | | | |
| Popular for recreation | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| Easy public access to location | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| Sustainability | | | | | |
| Energy (transport) costs to/from Stanley | | | | | ✓ |
| NO. OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS | 13 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 2 |
| | | Combined: 7 | | | |

ORDNANCE POINT, PORT WILLIAM

Policy Framework

Stanley Town Plan

Policy for Sustainable Development in Stanley, Written Statement, Adopted March 2004

E5 National Nature Reserve

“The Government will only permit development which would affect the Cape Pembroke and Stanley Common National Nature Reserve where:

- i) The objectives of the designation and the overall integrity of the area will not be compromised; or
- ii) Any significant adverse effects on the qualities for which the area has been designated are clearly out-weighed by social or economic benefits of national importance.

Where development is permitted that may affect the site the Government will use conditions or planning agreements to ensure that effects on habitats, species or other interests are avoided, or minimised (where adverse effects are unavoidable) and where possible, compensatory measures are provided.

Issue and Objective:

Cape Pembroke and Stanley Common was designated a National Nature Reserve in 1973, although it has been used since then for a wide range of uses and active conservation work has been minimal. The Common Boundary effectively defines the town boundary for Stanley. The objective will be to ensure that the area continues to be important and is not compromised by development.

Methods and Outcomes:

Where development proposals are presented within the area an environmental impact statement may be required if it raises issues of concern. The outcome will be a safeguarded designation providing a basis on which to build more effective management prescriptions.”

| Environmental constraints | ORDNANCE POINT |
|--|--|
| Designations | |
| NNR | Within Stanley Common National Nature Reserve |
| Common land | Within Stanley Common |
| Ramsar site | No |
| Important Plant Area | Within Cape Pembroke Important Plant Area (non-statutory) |
| Habitats/species | |
| Threatened habitats | Mainland Tussac: there is a fringe of regenerating tussac grass from Hadassa Bay round to Yorke Bay |
| Natural vegetation | Most of the area consists of natural/semi-natural vegetation |
| Coastal bird breeding colonies | Up to 700 breeding Magellanic penguins between Gypsy Cove & Hadassa Bay (IUCN Near Threatened species); black-crowned night heron colony; rock cormorant colonies. |
| Common coastal birds/dolphins | Contains the normal array of common species |
| Important underwater habitats/species | Data deficient |
| Landscape & Visual impact | |
| High landscape value | A previous draft Town Plan for Stanley (1999) identified the area as being of High Landscape Value |
| Visual impact from sea | A port development here would have high visual impact for those arriving by sea |
| Visual impact from land | Any development here would detract from the area's High Landscape Value |
| Noise & Light pollution | There would be some light pollution, particularly from the higher parts of the east end of Stanley. It is possible that light pollution from the port would result in bird strikes from burrowing petrels/prions from the Tussac Is. |
| Cultural heritage/history | |
| Archaeological/historical artefacts | There are World War 2 artefacts on the point, much visited by tourists |
| Recreation/tourism value | |
| Popular for recreation | In 2007-8 there were up to 1,200 visitors <i>per</i> day, with a total of 15,000 for the year (estimated that 27% of all cruise ship passengers visit the area); the area has always been popular with local residents |
| Easy public access to location | Easy access from Stanley |
| Sustainability | |
| Energy (transport) costs to/from Stanley | Minimal transport costs to Stanley |
| NO. OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS | 13 |

NAVY POINT, PORT WILLIAM

Note that this assessment is split into 'North Shore' and 'South Shore': the jetty itself will be in Port William, but there is a possibility that the associated infrastructure (container parks, warehouses, hard standing) will be on the Stanley Harbour side

| Environmental constraints | NAVY POINT | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | North shore: Port William | South Shore: Stanley Harbour (only noted if different from N. shore) |
| Designations | | |
| NNR | No | |
| Common land | No | |
| Ramsar site | No | |
| Important Plant Area | No | |
| Habitats/species | | |
| Threatened habitats | None known | |
| Natural vegetation | Most of the area consists of natural/semi-natural vegetation | This area has been heavily used in the past and no longer has a natural vegetation pattern |
| Coastal bird breeding colonies | None known | |
| Common coastal birds/dolphins | Contains the normal array of common species | |
| Important underwater habitats/species | Data deficient | |
| Landscape & Visual impact | | |
| High landscape value | The landscape is typical of this part of the Falklands | The landscape here is highly visible from Stanley, and provides an undeveloped, natural contrast to Stanley itself |
| Visual impact from sea | A port development here would have high visual impact for those arriving by sea | A port development here would have minimal visual impact for those arriving by sea |
| Visual impact from land | Development here would have minimal impact from the Stanley waterfront, but might have some impact from the higher parts of town (road access would have to be carefully landscaped) | Development here would have high visual impact from Stanley |
| Noise & light pollution | Minimal, except perhaps from the higher parts of town | Development here would have high impact on Stanley |
| Cultural heritage/history | | |
| Archaeological/historical artefacts | None (as far is known) | There are significant remains of the previous naval base |
| | | |

| | | |
|--|--|----------|
| Recreation/tourism value | | |
| Popular for recreation | Evidence suggests the area is rarely visited | |
| Easy public access to location | Hard to access from Stanley | |
| Sustainability | | |
| Energy (transport) costs to/from Stanley | There will some transport costs associated with travelling to Stanley and back | |
| NO. OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS | 3 Combined: 7 | 5 |

STANLEY HARBOUR

| Environmental constraints | STANLEY HARBOUR (FIPASS AREA) |
|--|---|
| Designations | |
| NNR | No |
| Common land | No |
| Ramsar site | No |
| Important Plant Area | No |
| Habitats/species | |
| Threatened habitats | No |
| Natural vegetation | Most of the area consists of artificial habitat or highly modified vegetation |
| Coastal bird breeding colonies | Small number of rock shags use the artificial structures to nest |
| Common coastal birds/dolphins | Contains the normal array of common species |
| Important underwater habitats/species | Data deficient |
| Landscape & Visual impact | |
| High landscape value | A highly modified landscape, often of poor landscape quality |
| Visual impact from sea | A port development here would have little visual impact for those arriving by sea, being seen against the backdrop of an existing industrialised area |
| Visual impact from land | Any development in Stanley Harbour would be highly visible from much of Stanley, particularly if extending further into the sea than FIPASS |
| Noise & Light pollution | Noise and light pollution is likely to be significant, particularly if extending further into the sea than FIPASS |
| Cultural heritage/history | |
| Archaeological/historical artefacts | The wreck of the <i>Afterglow</i> and the remnants of Hutchie's slaughterhouse |
| Recreation/tourism value | |
| Popular for recreation | There is a footpath along the coast with a couple of interpretation boards, which provides a recreational facility for residents and visitors |
| Easy public access to location | Easy access from Stanley |
| Sustainability | |
| Energy (transport) costs to/from Stanley | Minimal transport costs to Stanley |
| NO. OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS | 6 |

EAST COVE, MARE HARBOUR

More detailed information may become available from an EIA undertaken by the MoD.

| Environmental constraints | EAST COVE |
|--|---|
| Designations | |
| NNR | No |
| Common land | No |
| Ramsar site | The area is not within any designated site although the shore to the south is the boundary of the Bertha's Beach Ramsar site. There is little evidence that current port operations are having a significant impact on the wildlife of the site, although any significant oil pollution is likely to have major impact. |
| Important Plant Area | No |
| Habitats/species | |
| Threatened habitats | None known |
| Natural vegetation | Most of the area consists of artificial hard-standing |
| Coastal bird breeding colonies | None known |
| Common coastal birds/dolphins | Contains the normal array of common species |
| Important underwater habitats/species | Data deficient |
| Landscape & Visual impact | |
| High landscape value | An industrial site of low landscape value |
| Visual impact from sea | A port development here would have little visual impact for those arriving by sea, being seen against the backdrop of an existing industrialised area |
| Visual impact from land | The area is already industrialised and development here is likely to make little difference |
| Noise & Light pollution | Any additional noise and light pollution would have minimal impact (as there is no nearby human population) |
| Cultural heritage/history | |
| Archaeological/historical artefacts | None as far as is known |
| Recreation/tourism value | |
| Popular for recreation | No |
| Easy public access to location | No current public access |
| Sustainability | |
| Energy (transport) costs to/from Stanley | High and permanent extra transport costs to Stanley |
| NO. OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS | 2 (assuming minimal impact on the Ramsar site) |