

**Application by RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Ltd and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Ltd for an Order granting Development Consent for the Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms (Ref: EN010125)**

**Action points arising from Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) 3 on 8 April 2025**

| Action No | Directed to:                | Action   | Deadline |
|-----------|-----------------------------|--|----------|
| 1         | The applicants              | To submit a copy of the updated helicopter access study.   | 4        |
| 2         | The applicants              | Update the information provided in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 15 [APP-125] to reflect the consultation with offshore platform and helideck operators since the application was submitted regarding the mitigation for aviation obstacle environment effects by the proposed development.   | 4        |
| 3         | The applicants              | To submit their position and evidence as to why the maximum height of the proposed turbine blade tips could not be reduced to <u>avoid</u> adverse effects on the operation of military radar without affecting the installed generating capacity of the proposed west array. This should include the turbine blade tip heights relative to radar line of sight coverages identified in Table 3 [APP-128].   | 4        |
| 4         | The applicants              | Confirm whether the National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations (NFFO) attended the commercial fisheries working group meeting held on the 22 November 2024 and provide details of the separate meeting that was held with the NFFO on 27 November 2024.  | 4        |
| 5         | The applicants and the NFFO | To continue discussions with the NFFO to reach agreement on outstanding concerns by the close of the Examination, including the definitions of receptor sensitivity and magnitude of impacts.  | 8        |
| 6         | The applicants              | Provide a written response to the following questions asked by the Examining Authority (ExA):<br>The Outline Fisheries Liaison and Coexistence Plan [REP2-053, para 54] explains alternative dispute resolution may be activated where agreements aren't reached. Who would usually fulfil the role of the arbitrator, and would they be independent? What would happen if the undertaker didn't agree to refer the dispute to the alternative dispute resolution? | 4        |

|    |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|---|
| 7  | The applicants   | Review the recording/ transcript and submit any corrections to the wake loss summary provided by Mr Boswall in relation to the approach to assessment of wake loss effects in other examinations and made Development Consent Orders (DCOs).   | 4 |
| 8  | DBA Projco, DBB Projco and DBC Projco (The Dogger Bank Projcos IPs)                            | Mr Garden to submit any points he was unable to make following loss of his internet connection with regards to the distance between the proposed development and the Dogger Banks A, B and C.  | 4 |
| 9  | The applicants   | Submit the sensitivity analysis that they are preparing, which considers the approach to the greenhouse gas assessment and environmental effects from wake loss.   | 4 |
| 10 | The applicants   | Include the impact of wake effects on carbon payment back timescales in the sensitivity analysis/ technical note that is due to be submitted.  | 4 |
| 11 | Ørsted Hornsea Project Three (UK) Limited and Ørsted Hornsea Project Four Limited (Ørsted IPs) | Provide a written response to the following question asked by the Examining Authority (ExA):<br><br>Race Bank would be located approximately 134 kilometres (km) from the proposed array areas, Lincs Wind Farm would be located 154km from the proposed array area and Westermost Rough would be located 112km from the proposed array areas. Explain why they consider that there would be likely effects from wake loss from the proposed development to these wind farms given the distances involved and evidence provided to date? | 4 |
| 12 | The Ørsted IPs   | Depending on Deadline 4 submissions, advise the ExA whether they will be providing their own wake loss assessment(s) and if so, explain when this would be provided and for which offshore wind farms.   | 5 |
| 13 | The Ørsted IPs   | The information provided on the generating capacity of the Ørsted IPs wind farms at Deadline 3 in the table on page 4 of <a href="#">[REP3-064]</a> presents the maximum installed generating capacity of the wind farms - provide the actual wind generating capacity for each of the wind farms referred to.   | 4 |
| 14 | The Ørsted IPs   | Provide the minimum lifespan expectancies for the Ørsted IPs windfarms as offered in their Deadline 3 response <a href="#">[REP3-064]</a> .  | 4 |
| 15 | The Dogger Bank Projcos IPs  | Provide an explanation as to how the 55% generating capacity factor was determined as appropriate and what this was based on.  | 4 |

|    |  |  |   |
|----|--|--|---|
| 16 | The Dogger Bank Projcos IPs and the Ørsted IPs | Clarify which of the array areas ie Dogger Bank South East, Dogger Bank South West or both is of most concern regarding wake effects and why it is of concern?   | 4   |
| 17 | The Dogger Bank Projcos IPs                    | Confirm whether wake loss from the Hornsea Offshore Wind Farms already affects Dogger Bank A, B and C offshore wind farms.   | 4   |
| 18 | The applicants                                 | Provide details of Mr Bernstein's qualifications and experience.   | 4   |
| 19 | The applicants                                 | Set out the mitigation measures researched regarding wake loss and why these were deemed not to be feasible/ reasonable.   | 4   |
| 20 | The Dogger Bank Projcos IPs and the Ørsted IPs | Provide a view on wind sector management as a form of mitigation for wake loss effects and how this could be captured by the draft DCO.  | 4   |
| 21 | The Ørsted IPs                                 | Confirm if there is any additional information which could be provided by the applicants, noting the high level of nature of the details of the proposed array areas, which would assist in any potential wake loss assessment(s)?   | 4   |
| 22 | The applicants                                 | <p>Provide an answer to the following points which the ExA raised during the hearing for which the Applicants requested additional time to respond:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether they are prepared to submit the wake loss assessment carried out for Dogger Bank A.</li> <li>• Provide the predicted annual energy production loss to Dogger Bank A as calculated in the wake loss assessment referred to in the first iteration of ES Chapter 16 [APP-130]? Confirm the load or capacity factor used in this wake loss assessment for the proposed development and Dogger Bank A.</li> <li>• Confirm which parameters for Dogger Bank A they based the assessment on.</li> <li>• ES Chapter 16 [APP-130] refers to the effects from wake loss on Dogger Bank A as being negligible in comparison to the wind resource available. Explain, with reference to definitions in Tables 16-6, 16-7 and 16-8 of ES Chapter 16 how this conclusion was reached.</li> </ul> | Orally at ISH4 or ISH5, and/or in writing at Deadline 4 |
| 23 | The Applicants                                 | Liaise with the Ørsted IPs to provide information which they may request regarding any wake loss assessment (if requested by the Ørsted IPs).  | 4   |

|    |   |  |   |
|----|---|--|---|
| 24 | The Dogger Bank Projcos IPs and The Ørsted IPs              | Submit any proposed draft protective provisions, draft wording for a requirement, or how a separate private agreement would mitigate any effects from potential wake loss with an explanation on how these would meet any relevant statutory tests and how they would address potential effects. | 4 |
| 25 | The Dogger Bank Projcos IPs                                 | Set out the significance of effects from wake loss on Dogger Banks A, B or C with reference to Tables 16-6, 16-7 and 16-8 of ES Chapter 16 <a href="#">[REP1-011]</a> .  | 4 |
| 26 | The applicants  | To provide a note confirming the oral response to item 3.1 explaining how the effect on transit durations could be reported on to the Secretary of State in the context of National Policy Statement for renewable energy infrastructure (NPSEN-3), paragraph 2.8.329.                           | 4 |
| 27 | The applicants  | To update Table 1-6 of the In-principle Monitoring Plan <a href="#">[REP2-043]</a> to include the frequency of monitoring for proposed assets based on their associated engineering risks, and confirm the monitoring would be for the full proposed development lifetime.                       | 4 |
| 28 | The applicants and the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) | The MCA and the applicants to co-ordinate on updating Section 3.3 of the Outline Vessel Traffic Monitoring Plan <a href="#">[APP-254]</a> to provide more certainty on how changes identified as a result of monitoring would be addressed and secured.  | 5 |