



CHART STANDARDIZATION & PAPER CHART WORKING GROUP (CSPCWG)

[A Working Group of the Committee on Hydrographic Requirements for Information Systems – CHRIS]

Chairman: Peter JONES
Secretary: Andrew HEATH-COLEMAN

UK Hydrographic Office
Admiralty Way, Taunton, Somerset
TA1 2DN, United Kingdom

CSPCWG Circular Letter: 16/2004

UKHO ref: HA317/010/031-01 & HA405/005/023-01

Telephone:
(Chairman) +44 (0)1823 723343
(Secretary) +44 (0) 1823 337900 x 3656
Facsimile: +44 (0)1823 325823
E-mail: peter.jones@ukho.gov.uk
andrew.coleman@ukho.gov.uk

To CSPCWG Members

Date 30 July 2004

Dear Colleagues,

Subject: Regulated limit of wind farm or turbine field (further to CL 13/2004)

In Circular Letter 13/2004, I asked whether you agreed to a French proposal that the limit of wind farms and turbine fields should always be charted by black dashes. We received 11 responses, which included an opposing argument put by Denmark that magenta T-shaped dashes should be used whenever the area is regulated.

The responses and supporting arguments were almost equally divided between the two positions. As a result, there is currently **no consensus** in favour of one or the other; therefore, I have to find a way forward. I am also aware that only one of the arguments was included in CL13/2004, and that all members should have the opportunity to consider both arguments together and all the options (including the original wording - attached to CL 11/2004 - which left the style of limit when regulated as optional, by use of the word 'may').

In order for you to judge the merits of each position, I repeat the respective arguments that you may have seen in email discussions (for convenience attributed to France and Denmark):

French position:

I think that the appropriate boundary for wind farm is always IN 1.1 even if the zone is regulated. In fact, the physical obstructions aspect seems more important than the regulation aspect. Regulation aspect could be shown on chart by adding a magenta legend within the black limit.

Although current § B - 439 isn't very clear on this topic, IL 5.2 with IN 2.1 introduces in fact a new rule that I don't agree. This rule favours the regulation aspect with the detriment of physical obstructions aspect. I think it does not totally conform to the principles of the use of magenta as described in the § B 143 ("To distinguish information superimposed on the physical features").

Same comments on B-445.11 (Current Farm)

Danish position:

We do not agree with the French proposal. We see it just the other way around. E.g. wind farms.

Nobody can overlook the tall physical structures (obstructions) when passing or approaching a wind farm. And the physical obstructions are either shown on the chart by the individual wind turbine symbol or by the symbol for a wind farm in black. What can not immediately be seen when using the black dashed line symbol is that there is a restriction associated with the area. Therefore we feel that the outer limit of a restricted wind farm area should always be shown by a T-shaped dashed line in magenta. The restriction could be shown either by a symbol within the area or given by a note. However if there is no restriction the outer limit of the wind farm should be shown by black dashed lines.

Also: We do not see the difference between the symbol for a restricted wind farm/ turbine field and e.g. a historical wreck with a safety zone and an associated restriction (B 449.5) or e.g. a safety zone around offshore installations (B 445.2). You may have a physical obstruction (either above the water surface or sub-merged) shown by a symbol in black and you have an outer limit of a restricted area shown by a magenta T-shaped dashed line.

Original draft:

The symbol IN 1.1 (black dashes) should normally be used for the limit of a wind/current farm. However, this may be replaced by IN 2.1 or 2.2 as appropriate, where restrictions on navigation apply.

In order to help us arrive at a conclusion, I encourage **all** members to voice their opinion on this matter (including those members who have previously indicated a position). I would be grateful if you would use the attached voting slip to express your first and second preferences, and return to me by 6 September 2004.

Yours sincerely,



Peter G.B. Jones,
Chairman

CSPCWG Member: <i>insert your name & country</i>		
OPTION: <i>insert "yes" in only one box of each column</i>	1st preference	2 nd preference
1. Always use black dashes		
2. Replace dashes by magenta T-shaped dashes if regulated		
3. Original optional wording		