



**RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank  
South (West) Limited**

**RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank  
South (East) Limited**

**Dogger Bank South Offshore  
Wind Farms**

**Statement of Commonality of Statements of  
Common Ground and Examination Progress Tracker  
(Revision 2)**

**Submission for Deadline 4**

**Document Date: April 2025**

**Document reference: 9.1**

**Revision Number: 02**

**Classification: Unrestricted**



Company:	RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited	Asset:	Development		
Project:	Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms	Sub Project/Package	Consents		
Document Title or Description:	Statement of Commonality of Statements of Common Ground and Examination Progress Tracker (Revision 2)				
Document Number:	005405064-02	Contractor Reference Number:	PC2340-RHD-ZZ-ZZ-RP-Z-0188		
<p><i>COPYRIGHT © RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited, 2024. All rights reserved.</i></p> <p><i>This document is supplied on and subject to the terms and conditions of the Contractual Agreement relating to this work, under which this document has been supplied, in particular:</i></p> <p><b>LIABILITY</b></p> <p><i>In preparation of this document RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited has made reasonable efforts to ensure that the content is accurate, up to date and complete for the purpose for which it was contracted. RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited makes no warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of material supplied by the client or their agent.</i></p> <p><i>Other than any liability on RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited detailed in the contracts between the parties for this work RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited shall have no liability for any loss, damage, injury, claim, expense, cost or other consequence arising as a result of use or reliance upon any information contained in or omitted from this document.</i></p> <p><i>Any persons intending to use this document should satisfy themselves as to its applicability for their intended purpose.</i></p> <p><i>The user of this document has the obligation to employ safe working practices for any activities referred to and to adopt specific practices appropriate to local conditions.</i></p>					
Rev No.	Date	Status/Reason for Issue	Author	Checked by	Approved by
01	January 2025	Submission for Deadline 1	RHDHV	RWE	RWE
02	April 2025	Submission for Deadline 4	RHDHV	RWE	RWE

## Contents

1	Introduction .....	7
1.1	Purpose.....	7
1.2	Structure .....	7
2	Statements of Common Ground .....	8
3	Status of SoCGs at Deadline 4 .....	9
4	Commonality .....	12
5	Examination Tracker .....	16

## Tables

Table 3-1 - List and Status of SoCGs at Deadline 1 and Deadline 4 .....	9
Table 4-1 - Table of Commonality.....	13
Table 4-2 - Habitats Regulations Assessment Table of Commonality .....	15

## Plates

Plate 4-1 – Traffic light system indicating the status of matters covered in the SoCGs .....	12
Plate 5-1 - RAG system indicating the status of matters within the Examination Tracker .....	16

## Glossary

Term	Definition
Development Consent Order (DCO)	An order made under the Planning Act 2008 granting development consent for one or more Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP).
Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)	The process that determines whether or not a plan or project may have an adverse effect on the integrity of a European Site or European Offshore Marine Site.
The Applicants	The Applicants for the Projects are RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited. The Applicants are themselves jointly owned by the RWE Group of companies (51% stake) and Masdar (49% stake).
The Projects	DBS East and DBS West (collectively referred to as the Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms).

## Acronyms

Term	Definition
AEP	Annual Energy Production
AoS	Area of Search
ANS	Artificial Nesting Structure
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
DBS	Dogger Bank South
DCO	Development Consent Order
DML	Deemed Marine License
EA	Environment Agency
ERYC	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
ExA	Examining Authority
HAP	Humber Archaeology Partnership
ISH1	Issue Specific Hearing 1
ISH2	Issue Specific Hearing 2
LIR	Local Impact Report
LoS	Line of Sight
MCA	Maritime & Coastguard Agency
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
MMMP	Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol
MOD	Ministry of Defence
NAS	Noise Abatement Systems
NFFO	National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations
NGET	National Grid Electricity Transmission

Term	Definition
NGT	National Gas Transmission
NPG	Northern Power Grid
NRIL	Network Rail
PINS	Planning Inspectorate
RCA	River Condition Assessments
RIAA	Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment
RLoS	Radar Line of Sight
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SIP	Site Integrity Plan
SoCG	Statements of Common Ground

# 1 Introduction

1. This Statement of Commonality for the Statements of Common Ground and Examination Progress Tracker (hereafter referred to as the 'Statement of Commonality') has been prepared on behalf of RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited ('the Applicants').
2. The Applicants are developing the Dogger Bank South (DBS) East and DBS West Offshore Wind Farm projects ('the Projects') located approximately 100km and 122km offshore in the North Sea. A detailed description of the Proposed Development is provided in **Chapter 5 Project Description** [APP-071] submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application in June 2024.

## 1.1 Purpose

3. As part of the Examining Authority's (ExA) original **Rules 4, 6, 9, 13 and 17 Letter** thereafter referred to as the **original Rule 6 Letter** [PD-002], a request was made for a Statement of Commonality to be provided at various deadlines to assist the ExA in understanding areas of commonality between stakeholders across the Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs) for the Projects. Additionally, the **Rule 6 Letter** [PD-010] requested the creation and subsequent update of an 'Examination Tracker' to track the principal issues raised by Interested Parties and progress made to address them. Section 5 of this Statement includes an Examination Tracker, as requested.
4. This Statement of Commonality is intended to act as a summary of the progress of the various SoCGs. However, the SoCGs remain the primary record of the status of discussion the various issues that they address. It should be noted that where a broad topic applies to more than one SoCG party the detailed matters discussed within that topic may not be directly comparable or related.

## 1.2 Structure

5. This document is structured as follows:
  - Section 2 provides an introduction to the drafting of the SoCGs along with a summary of their structure;
  - Section 3 provides an up to date list of the SoCGs and their status; and
  - Section 4 details the commonality between the SoCGs, outlines the key issues identified by stakeholders, and progress made in addressing these comments to date
  - Section 5 provides a summary of the principal/notable issues raised by Interested Parties and the status of those issues

## 2 Statements of Common Ground

6. The Applicants have sought SoCGs with Interested Parties in line with the ExA's **Rule 6 Letter** [PD-002 and PD-010]. The purpose of the SoCGs is to set out the position of the parties on key matters relating to the Application, including the construction and operation of the Projects. The SoCGs cover matters raised through ongoing engagement prior to and since the DCO submission, and matters identified within the relevant representations of the Interested Parties. A full list of the SoCGs and their status is provided within section 3.
7. To ensure consistency in the approach taken to documenting matters agreed, matters subject to ongoing discussions or matters not agreed, the SoCGs generally adopt a standard format in order to provide clarity. Each SoCG is broadly structured as follows:
  - A brief introduction setting out the approach to the SoCG, purpose of the document, an explanation of the statutory role of the Interested Party and the structure of the SoCG;
  - A summary of engagement undertaken on the SoCG; and
  - A table(s) setting out the current position of the Interested Party and the Applicants – for most SoCGs this is set out by topic with areas of agreement, disagreement and discussions ongoing stated under each topic or matter.
8. The SoCGs being sought with Statutory Undertakers are in a slightly modified form of the above accounting for their greater focus on items relating to interactions between the Projects and the Statutory Undertakers' assets rather than wider project decisions and or approach.
9. Section 2 of the SoCGs details all key meetings and correspondence with the relevant stakeholder to date on matters discussed within the SoCG.



### 3 Status of SoCGs at Deadline 4

10. This section provides a list and summary of the status of each SoCG at Deadline 1 and Deadline 4.

Table 3-1 - List and Status of SoCGs at Deadline 1 and Deadline 4

Applicants' Document reference	Interested Party	Position at Deadline 1	Position at Deadline 4	Position at Deadline 8
9.2	East Riding of Yorkshire Council	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was shared with East Riding of Yorkshire Council on 28/01/2025 by email with nine matters outstanding.	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was shared with East Riding of Yorkshire Council on 24/04/2025 by email with six matters outstanding.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement with the SoCG by email on 24/04/2025.	
9.3	Environment Agency	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was shared with the Environment Agency on 23/01/2025 by email with nine matters outstanding.  The Environment Agency's Onshore Ecology specialist confirmed receipt of the SoCG on 23/01/2025 and confirmed their agreement with the Onshore Ecology and Ornithology section.	Final offshore matters agreed with the Environment Agency via email 27/03/2025.  The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was shared with the Environment Agency on 23/04/2025 by email with seven matters outstanding.	
9.4	Historic England	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was shared with Historic England on 18/12/2024 by email with nine matters outstanding.  The Applicants have submitted the <b>Statement of Common Ground with Historic England</b> [document reference 9.4] at Deadline 1 but would like to note that the version submitted is in draft and has not yet been formally approved by Historic England. Comments were received from Historic England on 28/01/2025, were made to the version of the SoCG from September 2024 and therefore did not accurately reflect discussions and progress made between the parties. The Applicants have been and are continuing to actively engage with Historic England and will be updating the SoCG on receiving Historic England's comments on the latest version of the SoCG and taking into consideration their Written Representations, expected to be submitted at Deadline 1. The Applicants plan to submit the updated version of the SoCG with Historic England at Deadline 4.	The Applicants had a meeting with Historic England on 05/03/2025 to discuss outstanding points. The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was shared with Historic England on 15/04/2025 by email with eleven matters outstanding.	
9.5	Hull City Council	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was shared with Hull City Council on 23/01/2025 by email with one matter outstanding.  Hull City Council advised by telephone conversation (22/01/2024) that all matters were agreed with one matter outstanding.	The SoCG was reshared with Hull City Council on 14/03/2025, 24/04/2025, 14/04/2025, and 22/04/2025 by email with one matter outstanding.  At the submission of the SoCG at Deadline 4, the matter remains outstanding, though the Applicants' position is that their amendments to Requirement 14 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [document reference 3.1] and the <b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> [document reference 8.13] sufficiently address Hull City Council's comments.	

Applicants' Document reference	Interested Party	Position at Deadline 1	Position at Deadline 4	Position at Deadline 8
9.6	Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with the MMO on 27/01/2025 by email with some matters still outstanding.	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was agreed with the MMO on 17/04/2025 by email with some matters still outstanding. The MMO notes that a lot of responses were received at Deadline 3 which need to be reviewed, therefore they will be taking a full in-depth review of all submissions post Deadline 4 and will provide more details in Deadline 5.	
9.7	Maritime & Coastguard Agency (MCA)	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with MCA on 23/01/2025 by email with two matters outstanding.	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was agreed with MCA on 03/04/2025 by email with one matter outstanding regarding the draft DCO. The Applicants have amended the text as requested by the MCA in the <b>Draft DCO (Revision 7)</b> [document refence 3.1] submitted at Deadline 4 and await their review.	
9.9	National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with NGET on 13/11/2024 by email with two matters outstanding.	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with NGET on 23/04/2025 by email with two matters outstanding.	
9.10	National Gas Transmission (NGT)	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with NGT on 28/11/2024 by email with one matter outstanding.	The updated SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was agreed with NGT on 15/04/2025 by email with one matter remaining outstanding.	
9.11	Northern Power Grid (NPG)	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with NPG on 14/11/2024 by email with one matter outstanding.	The updated SoCG submitted at Deadline4 was agreed with NPG on 16/04/2025 by email with one matter remaining outstanding.	
9.12	National Highways	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was shared with National Highways on 23/01/2025 by email with one matter outstanding.  National Highways confirmed on 23/01/2025 that the SoCG is an accurate reflection of the status of discussions.	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was shared with National Highways on 23/04/2025 by email with one matter outstanding.	
9.13	National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation (NFFO)	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with the NFFO on 28/01/2025 by email with matters outstanding.	Two meetings were held with the NFFO in April 2025 to discuss the SoCG, where some matters were agreed or the position amended to 'Not Agreed – No Material Impact'. Another meeting will be held on 01/05/25 for further discussions. The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was agreed with the NFFO on 23/04/2025 by email with matters outstanding.	
9.14	Network Rail (NRIL)	A draft SoCG was issued to NRIL on 08/10/2024. Initial comments were received on 05/12/2024 and further updates issued to NRIL on 11/12/2024. Based on initial comments received, there are three matters outstanding.	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was agreed with Network Rail on 24/04/2025 by email with three matters outstanding.	
9.15	RSPB	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with the RSPB on 27/01/2025 by email with matters outstanding.	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was agreed with the RSPB on 17/04/2025 by email with matters outstanding.	
9.16	The Wildlife Trusts	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with The Wildlife Trusts on 23/01/2025 by email with some matters outstanding.	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was agreed with The Wildlife Trusts on 22/04/2025 by email with some matters outstanding. The	

Applicants' Document reference	Interested Party	Position at Deadline 1	Position at Deadline 4	Position at Deadline 8
			Applicants are looking to arrange a meeting with The Wildlife Trusts in May 2025 to discuss the outstanding matters.	
9.17	Trinity House	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with Trinity House on 28/01/2025 by email with one matter outstanding.	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was agreed with Trinity House on 03/04/2025 by email with one matter outstanding. The Applicants were waiting for the MMO and Trinity House to agree on wording in the Draft DCO. This has been confirmed by the MMO on 17/04/25. The Applicants have made amendments to the <b>Draft DCO (Revision 7)</b> [document refence 3.1] submitted at Deadline 4 and await Trinity House's review.	
9.18	UK Chamber of Shipping	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with the Chamber of Shipping on 27/01/2025 by email with one matter outstanding.	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was agreed with the Chamber of Shipping on 27/03/2025 by email with no matters outstanding.	
9.19	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust on 20/01/2025 by email with matters outstanding.	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was agreed with Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust on 10/04/2025 by email with matters outstanding.	
9.20	Humber Archaeology Partnership	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 was agreed with Humber Archaeology Partnership on 18/10/2024 by email with two matters outstanding.	The SoCG submitted at Deadline 4 was shared with Humber Archaeology Partnership on 16/04/2025 with all matters agreed. Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed their agreement with the SoCG on 17/03/2025 by email.	
9.21	Orsted Hornsea 3 and Hornsea 4	The SoCG was issued for review on 24/01/2025. The SoCG will be submitted at Deadline 2.	The SOCG submitted at Deadline 4 was agreed with the Ørsted IPs on 24/04/2025 by email with all matters outstanding. It is unlikely that matters regarding wake effects will be agreed upon.	
9.22	Dogger Bank A, Dogger Bank B, Dogger Bank C	The SoCG was issued for review on 24/01/2025. The SoCG will be submitted at Deadline 2.	The SOCG submitted at Deadline 4 was agreed with the Dogger Bank Projcos on 23/04/2025 by email with matters outstanding. It is unlikely that matters regarding wake effects will be agreed upon.	
9.23	Natural England	The Examining Authority has requested that the Applicants produce a SoCG with Natural England. Natural England have advised that they will instead be producing a Principal Areas of Disagreement document which will form their view of any issues. A SoCG will be submitted at Deadline 8 between the Applicants and Natural England.	No further update.	

## 4 Commonality

11. This section provides a summary of the principal issues covered in the SoCGs and demonstrates where there is commonality in the topics or matters being discussed with the various parties.
12. **Table 4-1** presents the topics covered within the various SoCGs, and **Table 4-2** presents the Habitats Regulations Assessment topics, which have been separated out for readability. **Table 4-1** and **Table 4-2** indicate each topics relevance to an Interested Party.
13. As requested in the ExA's **Rule 6 Letter** [PD-010], it uses a traffic light system to summarise the status of the various matters that are covered in the Statement of Common Grounds (SoCGs) as shown in **Plate 4-1** (please note this colour-coding is not the same as in the SoCGs).

	Topic not covered in SoCG
	All matters agreed
	Some matters agreed, some matters under discussion
	All matters under discussion
	Some matters under discussion, some matters not agreed
	All matters not agreed
	Some matters agreed, some matters not agreed
	Some matters agreed, some matters under discussion, some matters not agreed

Plate 4-1 – Traffic light system indicating the status of matters covered in the SoCGs

Table 4-1 - Table of Commonality

Doc. Ref	Interested Party	DCO and DMLs	Protective Provisions	Marine Processes	Benthic/ Intertidal Ecology	Fish and Shellfish	Marine Mammals	Offshore Ornithology	Commercial Fisheries	Shipping and Navigation	Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology	Geology and Land Quality	Flood Risk and Hydrology	Land Use	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Landscape and Visual	Traffic and Transport	Noise	Air Quality	Human Health	Socioeconomics	Project Interfaces	Other Offshore Documents
9.2	East Riding of Yorkshire Council																							
9.3	Environment Agency																							
9.4	Historic England																							
9.5	Hull City Council																							
9.6	MMO																							
9.7	Maritime & Coastguard Agency																							
9.9	National Grid Electricity Transmission																							
9.10	National Gas Transmission																							
9.11	Northern Power Grid																							
9.12	National Highways																							
9.13	National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations																							
9.14	Network Rail																							
9.15	RSPB																							
9.16	The Wildlife Trusts																							
9.17	Trinity House																							
9.18	UK Chamber of Shipping																							

Doc. Ref	Interested Party	DCO and DMLs	Protective Provisions	Marine Processes	Benthic/Intertidal Ecology	Fish and Shellfish	Marine Mammals	Offshore Ornithology	Commercial Fisheries	Shipping and Navigation	Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology	Geology and Land Quality	Flood Risk and Hydrology	Land Use	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Landscape and Visual	Traffic and Transport	Noise	Air Quality	Human Health	Socioeconomics	Project Interfaces	Other Offshore Documents
9.19	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust																							
9.20	Humber Archaeology Partnership																							
9.21	Hornsea 3 and Hornsea 4																							
9.22	Dogger Bank A, Dogger Bank B, and Dogger Bank C																							
9.23	Natural England*																							

\* Natural England's position at Deadline 4 is based on their Principal Areas of Disagreement document submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 4-2 - Habitats Regulations Assessment Table of Commonality

Doc. Ref	Interested Party	Introduction and Terrestrial Ecology	Offshore Habitats and Annex II Migratory Fish	Annex II Marine Mammals	Marine Ornithological Features	Dogger Bank Compensation Plan (Benthic Compensation)	Guillemot and Razorbill Compensation Plan	Kittiwake Compensation Plan
9.2	East Riding of Yorkshire Council							
9.4	Historic England							
9.6	MMO							
9.15	RSPB							
9.16	The Wildlife Trusts							
9.19	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust							
9.23	Natural England							

## 5 Examination Tracker

14. The Examination Progress Tracker has been prepared by the Applicants further to the request outlined in the ExA's original **Rule 6 Letter** [PD-002]. For ease of reference, it has been presented in table form and focuses on principle and notable matters which have been raised by Interested Parties in their Relevant Representations and/or through subsequent engagement with stakeholders.
15. The tracker provides the status of those issues and is based on a Red, Amber, Green ('RAG') rating as follows:

	Currently subject to disagreement
	Subject to further/ on-going discussion
	Agree

Plate 5-1 - RAG system indicating the status of matters within the Examination Tracker

16. The RAG status provided is the Applicants' consideration of progress on the issue in question and has not been discussed directly with stakeholders albeit the majority of the issues below formulate discussion elements of Statements of Common Ground.



Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
Aviation and Radar	Objection by Ministry of Defence due to DBS West being within Radar Line of Sight (RLoS) of RRH Staxton Wold	Ministry of Defence	Assessment concludes that the DBS West array area lies within the Line of Sight (LoS) of RRH Staxton Wold. The Interested Party raised objection in September 2024 which will remain until suitable mitigation is agreed.	<p>The Applicants expected the objection received by the Ministry of Defence (MOD). Nominally the Applicants would seek to work towards an agreed Requirement with the MOD restricting generation or turbine movement until a sufficient mitigation has been agreed and installed, as has been done by previous projects.</p> <p>However, the new UK Government has brought forward a new policy on funding and delivery of air defence radar mitigation. The Clean Power 2030 Action Plan (released December 2024), details The Ministry of Defence's Programme Njord (in collaboration with DESNZ, The Crown Estate, Crown Estate Scotland, the devolved governments and the Offshore Wind Industry Council). Programme Njord's objectives are to identify, procure and implement a mitigation to resolve military radar issues. The action plan discloses that:</p> <p><i>"The full costs of the long-term radar mitigation solutions identified by Programme Njord will be funded via an alternative route, delivered by government, and the funding requirement is therefore removed from offshore wind developers."</i></p> <p>This chain of events has occurred within the last couple of months, notably post MOD's submission of their objection. It is expected Programme Njord will deliver Government's enduring air defence radar mitigation solution.</p> <p>The Applicants contacted the MOD in January 2025 to discuss altering Requirement 31 of the <b>Draft DCO (Revision 5)</b> (document ref:3.1) to account for this change in situation and discuss any requirements for mitigation that may still be required for DBS West.</p> <p>The Applicants had an initial meeting with the MOD on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2025 where the Applicants presented draft requirement wording for any impacts caused by DBS West and sought clarification on the extent to which Programme Njord will resolve mitigation required for the impacts of DBS West on Staxton Wold and whether further mitigation discussions need to be held in relation to interim mitigation arrangements in the event that the MOD's long-term radar mitigation solution is not delivered prior to first generation at DBS West.</p> <p>The MOD submitted a position update into Examination on 7<sup>th</sup> April 2025. Within the update, the MOD have provided requirement wording that the MOD deem sufficient to provide a route through which appropriate mitigation could be secured. The Applicants have considered the requirement wording, noting that it is not specific to DBS West and are still awaiting further engagement from the MOD regarding the long term air defence radar mitigation solution that will be delivered through Programme Njord and potential interim mitigation solutions of Staxton Wold.</p>	

Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
Commercial Fisheries	The commercial fisheries baseline	National Federation of Fisheries Organisation (NFFO)	Concerns about the lack of contemporary and site-specific data presented in the fish and shellfish ecology assessments, and a lack of focus on key commercial species that have a range that overlaps with the development area, specifically shellfish.	<p>The Applicants provided response to Relevant Representations made in this regard by NFFO in <b>The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations [PDA-013]</b> in line RR034:3.</p> <p>The NFFO confirmed this matter was agreed with the Applicants in an email dated 27/01/2025. All matters relating to fish and shellfish ecology assessments are marked either 'Agreed' or 'Not Agreed – No Material Impact' in the SoCG.</p>	
Commercial Fisheries	Cumulative assessment of in-combination effects with other projects on fisheries receptors.	National Federation of Fisheries Organisation (NFFO)	Concerns regarding the assumption that that mobile gear vessels can move from the area is an oversimplification and does not evidence how fisheries in the region have been squeezed into smaller and smaller marine space over progressive offshore wind developments, marine legislation and offshore cabling	<p>The Applicants provided response to Relevant Representations made in this regard by NFFO in <b>The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations [PDA-013]</b> in line RR034:4.</p> <p>Since submission of this document, the Applicants have engaged with the NFFO on the 1st October. No further agreement regarding potential effects on Commercial Fisheries was agreed. The current progression of Statements of Common Ground with NFFO is being provided at the same time as this document at Deadline 1 on the 29<sup>th</sup> January [Document ref: 9.13].</p> <p>In addition, the Applicants have subsequent to this Relevant Representation being received submitted <b>Change Request 1: Offshore and Intertidal Works [AS-141]</b> and had this change accepted into examination by the Examining Authority on the 21<sup>st</sup> January 2025. The acceptance of Change Request 1 into examination removes elements of scope of the offshore works to be undertaken by the project, with nominal reductions in impacts on commercial fisheries receptors compared to the submitted application.</p> <p>At the NFFO SoCG meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2025, the NFFO agreed that this could be amended to 'Not Agreed – no material impacts' as per SoCG ID 26.</p>	
Draft DCO	Comment received requesting updates to various draft DCO Requirements and Deemed Marine License (DML) Conditions	MMO Natural England East Riding of Yorkshire Council Environment Agency Hull City Council National Highways Trinity House MCA RSPB	Concerns raised by stakeholders regarding the adequacy of the wording of Draft DCO Requirements, a limited number of suggested amendments to Protective Provisions and Articles, Deemed Marine License Conditions and the timing outlined at which these conditions need to be discharged.	<p>The Applicants submitted a revised <b>Draft DCO (Revision 7)</b> on 25 April 2025. These updates account for the majority of requested edits to from these stakeholders.</p> <p>Where updates have not been made the Applicants have explained in responses to relevant representations why it is not appropriate for the requested changes to be made.</p> <p>The Applicants are aware that East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) have outstanding concerns over a number of DCO articles containing a 28 day deemed consent wording. The Applicants have provided an explanation as to why it is not appropriate for the requested changes to be made in <b>The Applicants Response to Deadline 3 Documents</b>, submitted at Deadline 4.</p> <p>The Applicants are aware that National Highways have concerns regarding the 28 day deemed consent clause within draft DCO Articles 10 and 12, and are continuing to discuss this matter with National Highways, as outlined in the <b>Statement of Common Ground with National Highways</b> (Revision 2) submitted at Deadline 4.</p>	

Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
Ecology and Nature Conservation (Onshore)	Appropriateness of the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Strategy	Environment Agency Natural England East Riding of Yorkshire Council	Concerns raised regarding the lack of River Condition Assessments (RCA) undertaken to inform the assessment of the baseline environment for which Biodiversity Net Gain will be calculated against and minor comments about the inclusion of individual trees identified in the arboricultural assessment and interpretation of the guidance and use of the BNG metric.	<p>As outlined in <b>The Applicants' Responses to Relevant Representations (Revision 1)</b> [PDA-013] the Applicants met with the Environment Agency to discuss this issue in October 2024.</p> <p>The Applicants are currently undertaking RCAs, due to be complete in April 2025. The Applicants have made the commitment to update <b>Appendix 18-10 - Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy</b> [APP-157] at Deadline 5, to address any minor comments, incorporate the <b>Project Change Request 2</b> [AS-152] and include the results of the RCA surveys, when available. The Environment Agency are in agreement with this approach as outlined in the <b>SoCG Environment Agency (Revision 2)</b> [Document ref: 9.3], all matters relating to the BNG Strategy have remained 'under discussion' until <b>Appendix 18-10 - Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy (Revision 2)</b> [document reference: 7.18.18.10] is reviewed by the Environment Agency. Under Requirement 32 of the <b>Draft DCO (Revision 4)</b> [App-130], the Applicants must gain approval of the final Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy from the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body. Calculations of loss of biodiversity will be undertaken at this stage when the Projects have undertaken detailed design and ensure a minimum of no net loss of biodiversity as a result of onshore construction activities.</p> <p>No further comments have been received from the Environment Agency on Ecology and Nature Conservation (Onshore) and there are no outstanding issues on Ecology and Nature Conservation (Onshore) with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council, as detailed in <b>SoCG East Riding of Yorkshire Council (Revision 2)</b> [document reference: 9.2].</p>	
Habitats Regulations Assessment	Auk Compensation	Natural England The Wildlife Trust RSPB	Concerns by stakeholders in Relevant representations regarding sufficient progress in further development of the Guillemot [and Razorbill] Compensation Plan	<p>The Applicants provided updated versions of the <b>Guillemot [and Razorbill] Compensation Plan</b> [APP-056] on the 29<sup>th</sup> October [PDB-004] and the 25<sup>th</sup> November 2024 [AS-089]. These updates demonstrate substantial progress in the development of compensation measures for Guillemot and Razorbill (collectively "auks"). The Applicants have also provided <b>Guillemot and Razorbill Compensation Site Shortlist Refinement Report (Revision 01)</b> [PDB-008] to the ExA to demonstrate progress since DCO submission in the identification of a site for predator eradication.</p> <p>Further discussions with Natural England regarding an update on auk compensation proposals were held on 20/11/24. Whilst Natural England are not actively engaging in the SoCG process as they utilise their Principal Areas of Disagreement to demonstrate progress, the Applicants consider conversations where auk compensation updates have been shared have been received positively.</p> <p>The Applicants provided a brief update on the progress on compensation measures including guillemot [and razorbill], at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) on 15th January, and a more detailed version is provided in the written summary [Document ref: 11.4] at Deadline 1.</p>	

Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				<p>A brief update on the progress of compensation measures was given by the Applicants at Issue Specific Hearing 5, on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2025.</p> <p>The Applicants provided an update on compensation progress to Natural England in a meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2025, following additional surveys at two locations in January and February 2025. These surveys were also reported in the <b>Guillemot and Razorbill Compensation Site Shortlist Refinement Report (Revision 02)</b> [REP3-019].</p> <p>Further updates are provided by the Applicants in the <b>Guillemot [and Razorbill] Compensation Plan (Revision 4)</b> [document reference 6.2.2] highlighting the significant progress that has been made by the Applicants with regards to a project-led compensation measure.</p> <p>The <b>Guillemot [and Razorbill] Compensation Plan (Revision 4)</b> [document reference 6.2.2] also presents the current situation with regards to a strategic auk compensation measure at the Isles of Scilly and the statements and guidance provided by Defra and OWIC which give confidence that a strategic measure will be available to the Applicants. The Applicants have also submitted the <b>Isles of Scilly Guillemot and Razorbill Survey and Habitat Assessment</b> [document reference 14.12] into the Examination to enable interested parties to review, in full, the information collected by the Applicants for this location.</p>	
Habitats Regulations Assessment	Kittiwake Compensation	Natural England RSPB	Concerns by stakeholders in Relevant Representations regarding sufficient progress of the Project Level kittiwake Compensation Plan	<p>The Applicants provided updated versions of the Project-Level Kittiwake Compensation Plan - (Revision 01) [APP-052] on the 29<sup>th</sup> October [PDB-002] and the 25<sup>th</sup> November 2024 [AS-088]. These updates demonstrate substantial progress in the development of compensation measures for kittiwake. The Applicants have also provided Project-Level Kittiwake Artificial Nesting Structure (ANS) Site Selection Report (Revision 01) [PDB-007] to the ExA to demonstrate progress since DCO submission in the development of a site for a project led offshore artificial nesting structure for kittiwake.</p> <p>Further discussions with Natural England regarding an update on ANS Areas of Search (AoS) and site selection work were held on 30/09/24 and 5/12/24, with feedback provided by email on 9/12/24. Whilst Natural England are not actively engaging in the SoCG process as they utilise their Principal Areas of Disagreement to demonstrate progress, the Applicants consider conversations where kittiwake compensation updates have been shared have been received positively.</p> <p>The Applicants provided an brief update on the progress on compensation measures including kittiwake, at ISH1 on 15<sup>th</sup> January, and a more detailed version is provided in the written summary [Document ref: 11.4] at Deadline 1.</p> <p>In summary, through stakeholder engagement and a thorough constraints assessment, the Applicants have shortlisted three candidate sites for the placement of an offshore ANS. Each of these sites is considered ecologically</p>	

Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				<p>suitable for kittiwake and as such, further investigations are focussing on the validity of ground conditions and location from an engineering, logistical and health and safety perspective. Geophysical site investigation surveys are underway, and geotechnical surveys are due to commence imminently to assess ground conditions. Once these have been conducted, a preferred candidate site will be selected and marine licence application submitted to the MMO. The Applicants anticipate that a final site for the offshore ANS will be selected, and the marine licence will be submitted within the examination period. The Applicants are continuing to engage with key stakeholders including the National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation, the MMO and Natural England regarding ANS delivery.</p> <p>Engineering design work will progress from concept to detailed design phase following the acquisition of ground condition data. Following the completion of the foundation and topside detailed design phase, a procurement process will identify a preferred contractor and fabrication of both the foundation and topside structures will commence ahead of an anticipated installation date in Q4 2027. Further details on the offshore ANS delivery programme are provided in <b>Appendix 1 - Project Level Kittiwake Compensation Plan (Revision 5)</b> [application reference 6.2.1], submitted at Deadline 4.</p>	
Historic Environment (onshore)	Effects on Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite scheduled monument at Butt Farm	Historic England East Riding of Yorkshire Council	Concerns outlined in Relevant Representations and in the Local Impact Report regarding impacts on the setting of the Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite scheduled monument at Butt Farm	<p>The Applicants are in discussion with East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) about comments raised within the Local Impact Report [PDC-007], and ERYC's Response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) [REP3-037] with regard to assessment conclusions, and in particular the Onshore Infrastructure settings assessment. A meeting was held on 28/03/2025 to discuss the following outstanding matters to be agreed with ERYC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Setting Assessment approach to the AA Battery at Butt Farm - ERYC have expressed concern over the onsite experience of the monument and the use of vegetation as screening, and their impacts on longer views from the asset. The Applicants have provided further information including OS maps showing historical woodland in the area; however ERYC have responded to say their concerns remain regarding how the proposals alter the land in which the monument is appreciated.</li> <li>Assessment conclusions relating to the AA Battery at Butt Farm. Whilst both parties are now in agreement that the level of harm is 'less than substantial' ERYC conclude that the level of impact would be greater than concluded by the Applicant. It remains the Applicants position that this harm is limited and could readily be mitigated by the proposed landscape design.</li> <li>Assessment conclusions relating to Catfoss Hall and Cobble Hall - ERYC have stated there is a variation in the assessment of effects on Catfoss Hall and Cobble Hall (with ERYC considering there would be</li> </ul>	



Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				<p>a small effect on the assets for a short period of time during construction) however it would not make a significant difference to the weighting.</p> <p>The Applicants are in discussion with Historic England regarding matters raised in their Relevant Representation [RR-022] , Written Representation [REP1-059] and Response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP3-043]. These were discussed at a meeting held on 05/03/2025. Outstanding matters under discussion are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment conclusions with relation to impacts on the setting of the Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite 350m west of Butt Farm. As set out in the SoCG with Historic England, Historic England confirmed in their RR (16/09/2024) that the Onshore Converter Stations represent 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of the Scheduled Monument of 'Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite, 350m west of Butt Farm' but at the high end of this scale, which is greater than assessed in the ES.</li> <li>Mitigation of effects on the Heavy Anti-Aircraft gunsite 350m west of Butt Farm. Historic England stated in their Relevant Representation [RR-022] that "<i>the mitigation planting proposed is not an effective or lasting mitigation measure in this instance</i>" however noted in the ExA's first written questions that they were in general agreement with Requirements 9 and 10 of the draft DCO which secure landscape mitigation and the appearance/materials of the Onshore Converter Station. The Applicants have suggested in the Applicants Response to Written Reps [REP2-057] and in writing to Historic England that Historic England could be engaged with the detailed design of the Onshore Converter Stations via review of the Design Panel Review Report, as set out in the Design and Access Statement (Revision 3) [document ref 8.8] and await Historic England's response.</li> <li>Development of public outreach, community engagement and public benefit proposals for the scheme. The Applicants are addressing Historic England's concerns regarding the level of public benefit provided by the scheme, and discussed these in the meeting on 05/03/25. The Applicants, as requested by Historic England, have brought together the proposals for public outreach, community engagement and enhancement, in a dedicated Appendix in the Outline WSI (Revision 2) [document ref 8.14] submitted at Deadline 4</li> <li>The need for collaboration between offshore wind farm schemes on landscaping. The Applicants have agreed to join an Historic England organised Cross-Project forum with other NSIPs, with a first meeting planned for late May.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				Since Deadline 1, all outstanding matters with Humber Archaeological Partnership have now been agreed, as detailed in 9.20 <b>SOCG with Humber Archaeological Partnership</b> (Revision 2).	
Hydrology, hydrogeology and Flooding	Hydrological impacts associated with the construction of the Cable Corridor	Beverley & North Holderness Internal Drainage Board Environment Agency East Riding of Yorkshire Council	Protective Provisions relating to the disapplication of the Land Drainage Act 1991 in the DCO Impacts of crossing (EA) Main Rivers with a trenchless technique Impacts of crossings of ordinary water courses with non-trenchless methods How Main Rivers and ordinary water courses will be crossed with the temporary haul road Discharge Rates	<p>Concerns were raised by the Environment Agency in the Relevant Representation [RR-039] about how Main Rivers would be temporarily crossed by the haul road during construction. The Applicants have provided a response to the Relevant Representations [PDA-013] and made a number of updates to the <b>Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision 2)</b> [AS-094] and <b>Appendix 5-2 - Obstacle Crossing Register (Revision 2)</b> [AS-053] to commit to clear span bridges in November 2024. However, this was not possible at one location and a culvert crossing will be required. The Applicants met with the Environment Agency on the 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2025. Although this item is still 'under discussion' in the <b>Environment Agency SoCG (Revision 2)</b> [Document reference 9.3]. The Environment Agency are agreed that a temporary culvert crossing can be constructed for the Meaux and Routh East Drain (WX-030) Main River. The mitigation measures in the <b>Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCoCP) (Revision 4)</b> [document reference: 8.9] are being reviewed and a further query has been raised about how crossing method statements are secured in the <b>Draft DCO</b> (Revision 7) [document reference: 3.1]. The Applicants have provided a response, to confirm they are secured through Requirement 19 in the <b>Draft DCO</b> (Revision 7) [document reference: 3.1] and protective provisions. The Environment Agency is considering this response.</p> <p>The Environment Agency have also raised a number of issues around how the crossing of Main Rivers using a trenchless technique will be undertaken e.g. depth of ducts. These issues remain open until the point about how crossing method statements are secured is resolved. The concerns over vibration impacts on flood defences and permanent culvert crossings have been agreed. The Environment Agency have also stated they may not agree to the protective provisions in the <b>Draft DCO</b> (Revision 7) [document reference: 3.1]. The Environment Agency have now shared their preferred protective provisions, the Applicants have provided comments to the Environment Agency and are seeking a meeting with their legal team in May 2025.</p> <p>The Beverley &amp; North Holderness Internal Drainage Board (BNH IDB) and ERYC, in their Local Impact Report raised an issue with the use of the 'open cut' method to cross ordinary water courses (drains). The Applicants met with the Beverley &amp; North Holderness Internal Drainage Board on the 8<sup>th</sup> April and agreed that a number ordinary watercourse crossings maintained by BNH IDB would be committed to a trenchless crossing unless an agreement could be reached at the detailed design stage through agreement of a crossing method statement. Agreement was reached that the open cut method could be agreed for other ordinary water course crossing if a suitable design was proposed in the crossing method statements and the minimum depth below bed level was 1.5m. Minor queries on the protective provisions and discharge</p>	

Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				<p>rates were discussed and agreed at the meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> April. The option to upgrade existing ordinary water crossings to permanent culverts have been removed to address the BNH IDB concerns about future maintenance. The Applicants have provided a detailed response to comments received at Deadline 3 as set out in the <b>The Applicants' Comments on the Responses to ExQ1</b> [document reference: 14.3] and made a number of amendments to the <b>Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision 4)</b> [document reference: 8.9], submitted at Deadline 4 in response to the BNH IDB comments. These measures would also apply to ordinary watercourses in the areas managed by the LLFA, ERYC.</p> <p>There are no outstanding issues on Hydrology, hydrogeology and Flooding with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council, as detailed in <b>SoCG East Riding of Yorkshire Council (Revision 2)</b> [Document ref: 9.2].</p>	
Landscape and Visual (Onshore)	Visual impacts of construction and operation from works in the Onshore Substation Zone	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council</p> <p>Rowley Parish Council [RR-048]</p> <p>Public Relevant Reps: RR-060, RR-050, RR-063</p>	<p>Request for additional photomontages of the Substation Zone Temporary Construction Compounds, construction lighting plan details and views from the south of the Substation Zone where vegetation has been removed by the Jocks Lodge Development along the A164</p> <p>Queries on the LVIA construction assessment methodology</p> <p>Objection to the Projects based on visual impact from Rowley Parish Council</p>	<p>A photomontage showing the outline of the Substation Zone temporary construction compounds from View Point (VP) 3, where they would be most was previously issued to ERYC and has been updated at Deadline 1 to include a fence, 2.4m in height. <b>Chapter 5 Project Description</b> [APP-071] has also been updated to at Deadline 1 to provide further description of the key equipment and temporary offices (portacabins) that could be located within the Substation Zone Temporary compounds and a photo of an indicative construction compound layout has been included in Appendix C of the Applicants Response to Action Points [<b>Document reference 11.6</b>]. It has been agreed with the ERYC that a construction lighting plan cannot be provided by the Applicants prior to detailed design. The Applicants have added further detail to the <b>Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision 2)</b> [As-094] to explain what would be included in a construction lighting plan at the detailed design stage. This is in addition to the mitigation measures already included both the <b>Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision 2)</b> [As-094] and <b>Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision 3)</b> [AS-114] to control the impacts of construction lighting. Additional photomontages were submitted by the Applicants from the A164 to consider changes in vegetation as a result of the Jock's Lodge Development at Deadline 2, taking account of <b>Project Change Request 2</b> [AS-152].</p> <p>ERYC have also provided comments on the construction assessment methodology in <b>ES Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192]. The Applicants have clarified that significant construction effects have been identified for those visual receptors located closest to the Substation Zone and that construction mitigation relates to the reinstatement of the temporary construction compounds. Following this, the construction effects would be superseded by those identified for the operational phase.</p> <p>These updates and responses have been reviewed, discussed and agreed with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council at a meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2025 as detailed in the <b>SoCG East Riding of Yorkshire Council (Revision 2)</b></p>	



Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				[Document ref: 9.2]. The Applicants have provided a response to Rowley Parish Council and the Public Relevant Reps received in the <b>Applicants Response to Relevant Representations</b> [PDA-013 ] in November, providing further detail on the LVIA undertaken and the proposed mitigation. No further comments have been received.	
Landscape and Visual (Onshore)	Development of Landscape mitigation post consent	East Riding of Yorkshire Council	SuDs design Adequacy of landscape planting to the North of the Substation Zone	<p>The East Riding of Yorkshire Council have now agreed the SuDs Design based on the updates provided in the Design and Access Statement (Revision 2 ) [REP2-027] , at Deadline 2 and there are no outstanding issued related to SuDS in the <b>SoCG East Riding of Yorkshire Council (Revision 2)</b> [Document ref: 9.2].</p> <p>Comments have also been raised on the screening plating to the North of the Substation Zone and that this is not providing an adequate level of screening in the VP3 photomontage. This was discussed further at ISH 4 .The Applicants agreed on the 27<sup>th</sup> January to review again. However, there is no further space within the Order Limits to add more planting, due to exiting constraints. The Applicants have also stated that this would not provide additional benefit due to the topography of the land between VP3 and the Substation Zone. At a meeting with Graham Varley and Bill Blackledge (landscape advisor) at the East Riding of Yorkshire Council on the 03/04/2025 the Applicants agreed to seek to provide additional planting wherever possible in this location at the detailed design stage, when the Contractor is appointed. The Applicants have added wording to the <b>outline Landscape Management Plan</b> (oLMP) [REP2-031] at Deadline 4, to respond to the ISH4 Action point 20. Therefore, this matter will remain under discussion until the OLMP has been reviewed by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council. As detailed in <b>SoCG East Riding of Yorkshire Council (Revision 2)</b> [Document ref: 9.2].</p>	
Landscape and Visual (onshore)	Design and Access Statement	East Riding of Yorkshire Council Rowley Parish Council	Request for consultation of the detailed design and outputs of the Design Panel	<p>The East Riding of Yorkshire Council requested that both themselves and Ward Councillors are consulted on the outputs of the Design Pannel Review and this was included in the <b>Design and Access Statement (Revision 2 )</b> [REP2-027] , at Deadline 2. In addition, it was raised at ISH 4 if English Heritage could also be consulted, the Applicants have provided a response to Action point 24 on this in <b>The Applicants' Responses to April 2025 Hearing Action Points</b> [document reference: 14.11] and are awaiting confirmation from Historic England.</p> <p>The East Riding of Yorkshire Council also raised on the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2025 and at ISH 4 that they several points on the design review process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for the design champion and panel to be independent</li> <li>Request that ERYC are included in drawing up of the terms of reference for the review (or have membership in the panel)</li> </ul> <p>In addition to these points, at ISH 4 the East Riding of Yorkshire Council said they would require more than 28 days to provide comments on the Design Review Pannel report. The Applicants have provided a detailed response to Action point 24 on these points in <b>The Applicants' Responses to April 2025</b></p>	

Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				<p><b>Hearing Action Points</b> [document reference: 14.11]. Based relevant guidance the Applicants consider that the Design Champion needs to be appointed from within their organisation, at board level. The Applicants have also not proposed the Design Review Panel is entirely independent as it is intended that at least one suitably qualified professional who has worked on other Offshore Wind Farm projects within the Applicants organisation, would form part of the Design Review Panel. However, a commitment has been made to an independent architect to also be appointed to the Design Review Panel, in addition to the independent landscape architect already committed to. It is crucial that the design panel has a member(s) with <i>'suitable experience in the design and build of electrical infrastructure'</i> so they can provide constructive feedback on Projects of this scale and type. The Applicants have also agreed to consult the ERYC on the terms of reference guide. The Applicants will update the <b>DAS (Revision 2) [REP2-027]</b> at Deadline 7, if ERYC are in agreement with this approach. This will be discussed further with ERYC as detailed in the <b>SoCG East Riding of Yorkshire Council (Revision 2)</b> [Document ref: 9.2].</p>	
Landscape and Visual (onshore)	Viewpoints from Butt Farm Caravan and Campsite	Butt Farm Caravan and Campsite East Riding of Yorkshire Council.	Seeking an additional view point from Butt Farm Caravan and Campsite Winter leaf cover on VP1	<p>The request for an additional viewpoint and photomontage from Butt Farm Caravan and Campsite, will be discussed with the tenant. However, this would be for information only as View point 1 is already included in the LVIA assessment and is publicly accessible, representative and has been agreed with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council.</p> <p>The leaf coverage within <b>Figure 23-7e (Viewpoint 1: Butt Farm)</b> [document reference: 7.23.1] has been reduced to be more representative of winter tree cover following comments from Butt Farm Caravan and Campsite at ISH 4 and the East Riding of Yorkshire Council at Deadline 3. An updated visualisation has been submitted at Deadline 4.</p>	
Land Use (onshore)	Minimum cable burial depth below agricultural land	East Yorkshire Concrete Products Limited and Mr Alexander Douglas Robinson	Seeking a commitment to a minimum burial depth	<p>The minimum depth, below agricultural land would be 1.1m between the restored surface and the uppermost part of the proposed cable duct and 0.9m between the restored surface and the protective tile to align with the wording in the Deed of Grant. The Applicants therefore propose to update the <b>DAS (Revision 2) [REP2-027]</b> and <b>Chapter 5 Project Description (Revision 3) [REP1-009]</b> to include this detail at Deadline 7, which would be how the minimum depth is secured by the DCO as these documents are certified. This would only be for agricultural land as there may be some, limited land uses where a shallower depth is more appropriate.</p> <p>Land interests will be provided with as built drawings of the Project(s) final design once all construction works are complete to accompany the Deed of Grant. Discussions with Mr. Oliver Stones the land agent acting on behalf of East Yorkshire Concrete Products Limited and Mr Alexander Douglas Robinson are ongoing.</p> <p>This will remain open until the documents have been updated.</p>	

Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
Land Use (onshore)	Temporary Construction Impacts (agricultural land use)	East Yorkshire Concrete Products Limited and Mr Alexander Douglas Robinson	Length of Occupation of the Onshore Export Cable Corridor/Easement Corridor and Management of Corridor during occupation and works;  Damage to Soil Quality/Health and Poor Reinstatement of Land to former agricultural condition; and  Impact of the Project on the businesses of the Interested Parties.	Comments were received in written representations from East Yorkshire Concrete Products Limited and Mr Alexander Douglas Robinson. The Applicants responded at Deadline 2 and discussed the points raised by Mr.Stones (the land agent representing East Yorkshire Concrete Products Limited) at ISH4. Further clarification has been provided in section 4 of the <b>The Applicants' Responses to April 2025 Hearing Action Points</b> [document reference: 14.11]., at Deadline 4.  Discussions are ongoing concerning the land agreement.	
Land Use (onshore)	Temporary Construction Impacts (agricultural land use)	Albanwise Limited Albanwise Synergy Limited	Efficient use of the land; and  Impact on farming operations	Comments were received in written representations from Albanwise Limited an Albanwise Synergy Limited. The Applicants responded at Deadline 2 and discussions are ongoing concerning the land agreement. No further comments were made by Albanwise at ISH 4.	
Geology and Ground Conditions (onshore)	Mineral Safeguarding	Mr Oliver Stones	Mineral Safeguarding and future planning applications for extraction in the vicinity of the Projects	Mr Oliver Stones raised the issue of Mineral Safeguarding and potential future planning applications for extraction at ISH4. The Applicants accept that the land owned by Mr Stones client may have some mineral potential and that the Projects may sterilise its extraction. So the Applicants are in discussions with the appointed agent for a Mines and Minerals Clause to be included in the legally binding Option and Deed of Grant, allowing for the loss in mineral value to be recovered once planning consent has been granted for mineral extraction in the future and a reasonable prospect of intent to excavate established.	
Infrastructure and Other Users	Potential for wake effects upon existing offshore wind farms	The Projects (Dogger Bank A, Dogger Bank B, Dogger Bank C)  Hornsea 3 Limited Hornsea 4 Limited	Interested Parties have raised the potential for Wake Effects to arise from the operation of the Dogger Bank South Projects and have requested wake effects assessments to be undertaken to understand the impacts of the Projects to their Annual Energy Production (AEP)	The Applicants provided response to Relevant Representations made in this regard by The Projects, Hornsea 3 Limited, and Hornsea 4 Limited in <b>The Applicants' Response to Relevant Representations</b> [PDA-013].  The Applicants provided an updated position at ISH2 on 15 <sup>th</sup> January as they consider that neither NPS nor the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 require an assessment of wake effects.  A more detailed version is provided in the written summary (document ref: 11.4) at Deadline 1.  During ISH3, the Applicants maintained the position that neither NPS nor the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 require an assessment of wake effects and that wake effects are not a matter that should be dealt with in the planning system. The Applicants were requested to provide further information by the Examining Authority during ISH3 in respect of the Applicants' withdrawn wake assessment conclusion previously referred to in Chapter 16 in relation to Dogger Bank A. At the strong indication of the risk of further delay to the Examination by the ExA, the Applicants agree to provide a response to the questions raised by the ExA	

Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				<p>at ISH3 in respect of the Applicants' withdrawn wake assessment at Deadline 4. This will be done on a "without prejudice" basis. The Applicants' proposed submission will refer to the results of the withdrawn wake assessment and respond to ExA's questions taking into account the commercially confidential nature of the assessment.</p> <p>The Applicants will also submit a sensitivity analysis of the GHG assessment at Deadline 4 which concludes that the impact of wake loss on other existing or emerging projects would still be marginal in the context of total energy generation and emissions displacement and that the Projects will make a significant contribution to reducing UK GHG emissions.</p> <p>The Applicants consider the resolution to this issue is for the Interested Parties to accept that the question of wake effects was resolved through TCE's Round 4 leasing process and the 7.5km buffer which was fixed. This approach has been generally accepted by the offshore wind sector, until the wholly unexpected outcome of the Awel y Mor decision. New projects should continue to be designed to achieve the maximum AEP, if they have respected TCE's buffer.</p> <p>It is the Applicants' position that a requirement would be unnecessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, and wholly unreasonable. The Applicants do not consider there are any acceptable design solutions which would resolve the concerns regarding wake loss or mitigate for any potential impacts. Any theoretical mitigation options would reduce the overall AEP in aggregate, therefore any mitigation imposed would have a significantly more detrimental impact on the energy generation from the Projects than any benefit that may be accrued by the Projcos, leading to an overall net reduction in AEP.</p>	
Marine Ecology	Effects on benthic habitats at Dogger Bank SAC	Natural England	Concerns raised that assessment of construction effects in the RIAA concludes disturbance as a temporary effect.	<p>While the Applicants RIAA [AS-051] concludes no adverse effects on integrity (AEIOI) for disturbance impacts due to the temporary nature of such effects on the Dogger Bank SAC, impact figures for this pressure are provided on a without-prejudice basis in <b>Appendix 3 - Project Level Dogger Bank SAC Compensation Plan (Revision 3)</b> [document reference 6.2.3]. The compensatory measure being progressed by the Applicants is strategic designation or extension of a new or existing MPA, to be delivered via the Marine Recovery Fund (MRF). The Applicants have responded to a call for information in relation to this strategic measure, and provided impacts related to both habitat loss and disturbance. While the Applicants do not agree with the conclusions of the Round 4 Plan Level RIAA, they are confident that this compensatory measure can sufficiently offset the impacts as decided by the Secretary of State where necessary.</p> <p>The Applicants have submitted a document entitled <b>Review of Evidence on Recovery of Sandbank Habitat Following Habitat Damage</b> [AS-025] which addresses several comments raised by Natural England in their Relevant Representations [RR-039] by providing site specific evidence of habitat</p>	

Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				<p>recovery within Dogger Bank SAC and provides evidence towards DBS proposals for compensation quantum currently outlined in the <b>Project Level Dogger Bank Compensation Plan</b> [APP-059] . This document has been updated and was re-submitted at Deadline 3 [REP3-21]. The Applicants await further feedback from Natural England.</p> <p>A number of other matters remain under discussion including, but not limited to the use and location of remedial cable protection and the future licensing there-of, disturbance of the SAC and the need for compensation and the disposal of dredged material within and out with the SAC.</p>	
Fish and Shellfish Ecology	Data used to inform assessment	Marine Management Organisation Natural England	Concerns that data used to inform the assessment of the impact of the development on sandeel and herring was not the most appropriate dataset to use for assessment.	The <b>Heat Mapping Report (revision 1)</b> [AS-105] was submitted on the 28th November which included an update from the Latta <i>et al.</i> (2013) methodology to the Reach <i>et al.</i> (2024) methodology for sandeel; and the Reach <i>et al.</i> (2013) methodology to the Kyle-Henney <i>et al.</i> (2024) methodology for Atlantic herring as requested. This report was prepared in response to relevant representations received from MMO and Natural England. Feedback was received from Natural England at Deadline 3 welcoming this document and deferring to Cefas for their comments on the technical adequacy of the document. Feedback has been received from MMO (Cefas). The Applicants are seeking a meeting with MMO (Cefas) to discuss the points they have raised.	
Fish and Shellfish Ecology and Marine Mammals	Potential effects on marine ecology from underwater noise during construction	Marine Management Organisation Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust Natural England The Wildlife Trusts	<p>Concern raised by stakeholders regarding potential noise impacts on Herring spawning grounds near Flamborough Head and requests for additional seasonal restrictions upon certain construction activities.</p> <p>Concerns raised by stakeholders regarding potential impacts on marine mammals from underwater noise during piling. Stakeholders advise that noise abatement systems are committed to as a mitigation measure at this stage to minimise the impacts from piling.</p>	<p>Change Request 1 will greatly reduce the geographical footprint of impacts as a result of the removal of the platform from the Export Cable Corridor. The impacts of noise on herring have been assessed as minor adverse and not significant in Environmental Impact Assessment terms. Thus, no further mitigation is proposed. The Applicants are awaiting stakeholder feedback relating to the impacts of the Projects following the acceptance of Change Request 1 and the supporting information submitted into Examination associated with this change request.</p> <p>The Applicants are considering the use of Noise Abatement Systems (NAS) as mitigation for underwater noise, and the use of it will be dependent on the final project design and determined at the post-consent stage. NAS is being included within the Projects' procurement strategy as an optional element to allow it to be called upon should it be required based on the final design parameters, rather than not including it all. The Applicants have included the potential use of noise abatement systems in the <b>Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) (Revision 2)</b> [AS-100] and <b>In Principle Site Integrity Plan (SIP) for the Southern North Sea SAC</b> [AS-102]. Final mitigation measures must be agreed in writing with the MMO and relevant statutory nature conservation bodies through submission of a final MMMP and final SIP post-consent.</p> <p>In January 2025, Defra released its marine noise policy package which states that '<i>all offshore wind pile driving activity across all English waters will be required to demonstrate that they have utilised best endeavours to deliver noise</i></p>	



Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				<p><i>reductions through the use of primary and/or secondary noise reduction methods in the first instance'. As a result, the Applicants have committed to utilise best endeavours to deliver noise reductions, where applicable, through the use of primary and/or secondary noise reduction based on the final project design within the <b>Outline MMMP (Revision 3)</b> [REP2-047] and <b>In Principle SIP (Revision 3)</b> [REP2-049]. The Applicants have submitted an <b>Illustrative Underwater Noise Technical Note</b> [document reference: 14.6] at Deadline 4 in support of this statement which illustrates the potential reductions to impacts of underwater noise for marine mammals and fish with a 10dB noise reduction applied which could be achieved with primary and/or secondary noise reduction measures through the MMMP post consent.</i></p> <p>Natural England and MMO have requested a seasonal restriction is imposed on piling at the DBS Array Areas from the beginning of August to the end of October as a result of behavioural impacts predicted to be devolved upon herring during their spawning season. The Applicants do not believe this request is warranted given the questionable nature of the behavioural impacts that are purported. Further, the Applicants have submitted an <b>Illustrative Underwater Noise Technical Note</b> [document reference: 14.6] at Deadline 4 which provides a demonstration of the reduction in noise impacts that could be made should a 10 dB reduction in noise impacts be achieved through the MMMP post consent. The Applicants look forward discussing these issues further in the near future.</p>	
Offshore Ornithology	Assessment methodology for offshore ornithology receptors	Natural England RSPB	Concerns from stakeholders that the assessment of offshore ornithology in the ES and Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) at application stage did not capture the latest NE Guidance (March 2024), or other methodology requests.	<p>In response to a request from Natural England in Relevant Representations [RR-039] [Document reference 10.18] the ornithological assessment was updated in line with revised guidance from Natural England (March 2024) on impact calculations. As a result a - 6.1 <b>Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment Habitats Regulations Assessment - Part 4 of 4 – Marine Ornithological Features (Revision 3)</b> [As-085] and <b>Environmental Statement Chapter 12 – Offshore Ornithology (Revision 2)</b> [AS-058] were provided to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) on 25/11/24 and 22/11/24 respectively. Kittiwake, guillemot and razorbill compensation quantum figures were updated and provided to PINS in the <b>Project Level Kittiwake Compensation Plan (Revision 3)</b> [AS-088] and <b>Guillemot [and Razorbill] Compensation Plan</b> [AS-089], on 25 November 2024. Both these documents [reference 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 respectively] have been updated at deadline 4 to provide the compensation figures at the ratios specifically requested by Natural England for both species.</p> <p>Natural England welcomed the significant efforts made by the Applicants to address concerns raised by Natural England in their Relevant Representation, with a large proportion of issues now resolved. The Applicants are submitted an updated <b>Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment Habitats Regulations Assessment - Part 4 of 4 – Marine Ornithological Features (Revision 4)</b> [document reference: 6.1] and <b>Chapter 12 Offshore</b></p>	

Topic	Sub-topic	Interested Party(ies)	Description of Issue	Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				<p><b>Ornithology (Revision 3)</b> [document reference: 7.12] at Deadline 4 to address outstanding concerns from Natural England.</p> <p>It should be noted that Natural England and RSPB approaches to methodology are not fully aligned, and where there is discrepancy, the Applicants have deferred to the Natural England guidance as the statutory nature conservation body. Despite this, the RSPB's letter of 16/12/24 [AS-128] stated that for the offshore ornithology impact predictions: 'based on the information provided to date, we consider it is probable that sufficient information to assess the effects of the Dogger Bank South offshore wind farm proposal will be available within the 6-month examination period'.</p>	
Traffic and Transport	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan	Hull City Council	Hull City Council have expressed concerns regarding the wording of DCO Requirement 14 (Construction Traffic Management Plan) and that it leaves room for interpretation as to which matters within the CTMP Hull City Council should be consulted upon.	<p>The Applicants have provided an update to the <b>Outline CTMP (Revision 3)</b> [document ref 8.13] at Deadline 4, to address Hull City Council's concerns. The revised OCTMP includes a table clearly setting out which items Hull City Council should be consulted upon. The wording to DCO Requirement 14 has been updated to refer to this change.</p> <p>The Applicants have sought Hull City Council's feedback on the revised OCTMP and confirmation that this amendment addresses their concerns. The Applicants received correspondence from Hull City Council (by email 24/04/25 and 25/04/25) regarding this matter, with confirmation that the updates to the OCTMP were acceptable and with proposed amended wording of DCO Requirement 14. Due to the late timing of these comments it was not possible to agree mutually acceptable wording updates to DCO Requirement 14 to include in the Deadline 4 submission, however both parties agreed that this could be resolved by Deadline 5.</p>	

RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank  
South (West) Limited

RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank  
South (East) Limited

Windmill Business Park  
Whitehill Way  
Swindon  
Wiltshire, SN5 6PB

