



## 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: 13/2004

UKHO refs: HA317/010/031-01, HA405/005/023-01,  
HA405/005/025-01

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 25 June 2004

Dear Colleagues,

### **Subject 1: New symbols for activities prohibited or “not advisable” (further to CL 10/2004)**

We received 16 replies from CSPCWG members to CL 10/2004. The following summary is for your information.

1. The revised “Entry Prohibited” symbol was unanimously supported, so the Secretary will shortly forward our proposal to IHB for dissemination to IHO Member States. In order to maintain progress on this symbol, at this stage we shall merely replace the current depiction in M-4 B-439.3 and B-441.6 and add a small area to B-439.4 (with some minor editorial changes to the words). It is recognised that B-439 needs some more general improvements, including detailing how the new symbol could be used in a maritime “one-way” system, but this is best left until we revise that section of M-4.
2. Support for a simplified “Diving Prohibited” symbol was evenly divided. As there are clearly a number of HOs who have a use for such a symbol, if a sufficiently simple and intuitive symbol can be developed, I believe it is worth progressing. We had earlier received a suggestion from France, and now a further suggestion from Colombia, both of which we have forwarded to Denmark. We understand that Germany has also forwarded one directly.
3. Members were unanimous that the proposed symbols for “Seabed Operations Prohibited” and for “Activities not Advisable” should **not** be progressed.
4. Members were 11 to 5 against changing the existing anchoring and fishing prohibited symbol to a single stroke. The general view expressed was that while any new symbols should take account of S-52 symbols, existing well-known paper charts symbols should not be changed to align with ENCs.
5. Members were 12 to 2 against developing new symbols for dangerous or hazardous areas, at this time.

### **Subject 2: New symbols for wind and current turbines (further to CL 11/2004)**

We received 14 replies from CSPCWG members to CL 11/2004. Some changes to the specifications were suggested and will be included in the final draft to be submitted to IHB. They were as follows:

1. All those who commented (10) agreed that the existing windmotor symbol should become obsolescent. Details about the old symbol in M-4 will be subordinated under the new entry for wind turbines and read:

Small wind turbines, usually associated with a small isolated community for which they provide power, were formerly charted by the obsolescent windmotor symbol . If such features are sufficiently prominent to justify charting, the symbol  may be used.

2. The symbol for a wind farm (on land) will be included within B-374.6, as follows:

**Wind farms.** On-shore wind turbines are charted as landmarks. It is therefore preferable to chart the individual turbines in their actual positions. However, where scale or available information does not permit this, an on-shore wind farm may be shown by the centered wind farm symbol within a black dashed limit:



3. It was suggested that the word “underwater” in B-445.10 is unnecessary where it is obvious from the symbol combinations (i.e. the danger circle and/or blue tint) that the marked feature is an underwater obstruction. An amendment will be made to clarify this.
4. The legend “*Entry prohibited*” will be replaced by the new symbol .
5. France (Yves Le Franc) has made the following observations:

I think that the appropriate boundary for wind farm is always IN1.1 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”).

We have researched other symbols and not found any that contradict M. Le Franc's comment, and are therefore inclined to support his position. I would welcome your views on this, before completing work on the specification.

6. Two members commented that there were format problems with the symbols at B-445.8 and 445.10. The lit turbine at B-445.8 is slightly raised because the light flare points down, so the flare is the lowest point of the symbol. It will be difficult to change that, unless we point the flare upwards. However, no other format problems were apparent in UKHO, either on screen using “print preview”, or on printed copies. Is it possible that the format problems were a product of printer settings? Please would all members advise whether they had any problems, either on screen or on printed copies. This will help me to assess the nature and scope of the problem as we move towards digital presentation of the standard reference documents.

**In conclusion**, thank you all for your advice on both subjects; this has helped us to maintain good progress with the new symbology. The comments associated with Subject 1 are for information and do not call for a response. **I would be grateful to receive your views on Subject 2, by 23 July**, in particular:

1. Do you agree that the limit of a wind farm, or turbine field, should always be black dashes (implying physical obstructions) rather than replacing it with magenta T shaped dashes if there are associated restrictions? If yes, any restrictions would necessarily be shown by a symbol (or legend) within the limit (and possibly an associated note).
2. Have you experienced any format problems, on screen or on printed copies?

Yours sincerely,

Peter G.B. Jones, Chairman