

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (including Humber Archaeological Partnership and LLFA)
Response to 2nd Written Questions.

ExQ2	Question	ERYC Response
AQ 2.2	<p>Draft SoCG with ERYC</p> <p>The draft SoCG [REP4-059] between you and the applicants suggests that there are no matters of disagreement outstanding between you regarding air quality and health. Confirm whether you consider this to be the case? If not, set out where you consider any disagreements lie.</p>	<p>ERYC confirms we are happy with the amended SoCG</p>
DCO 2.4	<p>Requirement 25</p> <p>The applicants: Requirement 25 in Schedule 2, Part 1 of the draft DCO [REP4-005], deals with the return of land that is temporarily used for construction to be reinstated to its former condition, subject to the approval of the Local Planning Authority (LPA). This approval would be given, depending on the location of the land, following consultation with the MMO and relevant drainage authority. Do you consider that the LPA should also be required to consult with the relevant landowner to ensure that they have all the necessary evidence to enable them to come to an informed decision? If you disagree, please explain why. ERYC: Provide your response on the above</p>	<p>The LPA are of the opinion that they should not be required to consult with landowners. The LPA believe this would be an onerous task and it would not be practical to consult with landowners in order to discharge the condition. It is understood there will be voluntary agreements in place with landowners with provisions for agreeing the restoration of their land, and where agreements are not in place there is a dispute resolution process within the OCoP and draft DCO. A requirement for LPAs to consult with landowners is likely to result in the LPA being seen as the dispute resolution channel, which is not the purpose of the condition. A requirement for the applicants to submit evidence of landowner agreement and to highlight any areas of dispute would be the LPAs preferred mechanism for dealing with the condition.</p>
ENC 2.5	<p>Burton Bushes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and ancient woodland</p> <p>The DL4 submission from Dr Stephen Mounce [REP4-100]</p>	<p>Burton Bushes SSSI is a biological SSSI, specifically its woodland features and undisturbed soil profile. We agree with the applicant that geological effects are not of relevance. The cable</p>

	<p>raises concerns with potential effects on Burton Bushes SSSI and ancient woodland. Confirm your views on the potential effects from the proposed development on Burton Bushes SSSI and ancient woodland. Do you consider the mitigation measures as currently proposed and included in the oEMP [REP4-042] and oLMP [REP4-044] would be sufficient? If not, explain why not and clarify what other measures you would like to see included?</p>	<p>corridor lies outside of the zone of physical damage for trees and other cited features. It also lies outside the zone of influence for dust effects, >50m. Topographically, Burton Bushes SSSI lies above the cable corridor, therefore downstream hydrological impacts are unlikely to influence the interest features. Noise impacts of works are within the zone of influence; however, bird species are not a cited feature, proposed works align with the wider use of the area for farming and use of key road infrastructure routes. There will be no edge effects or fragmentation or impacts to the connectivity of the SSSI related to the proposal.</p>
HE 2.3	<p>Draft SoCG with Humber Archaeology Partnership The draft SoCG between you and the applicants submitted at DL4 [REP4-076] suggests that all matters regarding onshore archaeology which you have been consulted on are agreed. Can you confirm that this is the case? If not, what matters do you consider are still outstanding and how would you suggest that they are resolved?</p>	<p>Following meetings and subsequent correspondence between the Humber Archaeology Partnership and the applicant's archaeological representative in March and April 2025, the remaining matter concerning the use PADs (Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries) was discussed and an agreement was reached on how these would be utilised on the scheme. A draft wording for the PAD strategy that would be included in the Outline WSI was subsequently submitted to Humber Archaeology Partnership on 8th April 2025. The wording for the PAD strategy was approved by Humber Archaeology Partnership on 14th April 2025. Therefore, with the approval of the PAD and its inclusion in the Outline WSI, I can confirm that the Humber Archaeology Partnership on behalf of ERYC consider all onshore archaeological matters that we have been consulted on and that are outlined in the SoCG to be agreed.</p>
HE 2.5	<p>Archaeology Do you have any comments regarding the Phase 2 Archaeological Evaluation Trenching Report [REP4-089 and REP4-090] submitted at DL4?</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership on behalf of ERYC have read through the Phase 2 Archaeological Evaluation Report and have the following comments on the document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report provides a thorough and detailed assessment of the results from the Phase 2 evaluation trial trenching works. The report meets the requirements and standards of the Humber Archaeology

		<p>Partnership and those established by the Chartered Institute of Archaeologists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are particularly happy that radiocarbon dates have been obtained at this stage of the archaeological programme and that the results from these have been utilised to further enhanced the understanding/dating of certain archaeological features. We are also happy that the report has attempted to provide preliminary comments on the research objectives.
HE 2.6	<p>Archaeology</p> <p>The Phase 2 Archaeological Evaluation Trenching Report [REP4-089] makes specific recommendations regarding archaeological mitigation measures in Section 10. Should these be incorporated into the outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation [REP4-048]? If not, why not?</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership on behalf of ERYC acknowledge the archaeological mitigation measures outlined in Section 10 of the Phase 2 Archaeological Evaluation Report and agree that these should be incorporated into the Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation. In particular, we agree that the evaluation has recorded remains of high significance and that mitigation measures through micro-siting/engineering solutions or archaeological mitigation works to ensure preservation of the remains, should be considered. The archaeological mitigation strategies will be further informed by subsequent phases of trial trenching that are due to take place in 2025 and 2026. In particular, the key sites highlighted in paragraph 10.1.2 need to be given specific consideration given their potential archaeological significance. The prospective Mesolithic activity recorded in trenches 162 and 163 have the potential to be of particular interest due to the general lack of sites from this period recorded across East Yorkshire.</p> <p>The recommendations made in Section 10 regarding the artefactual and archaeobotanical assemblages should also be incorporated into the Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation. However, it is acknowledged that these recommendations are currently provisional and could change following an assessment of the results from subsequent phases of trial trenching work.</p>
HE 2.7	<p>Hydrological effects on items of archaeological importance</p>	<p>After examining the available information, Humber Archaeology Partnership on behalf of ERYC do not believe that the draft DCO and supporting documents provide enough</p>

	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership: Do you consider that the draft DCO and supporting documents adequately protect items of archaeological importance inside and outside of the order limits from effects from changes to hydrology as a result of the proposed development? Why, or why not?</p>	<p>information to allow an adequate assessment to be made on whether changes to hydrology would have an impact on archaeological and/or geoarchaeological remains inside and outside the order limits. In order to adequately assess the potential impact changes on hydrology could have on the archaeological resource, a desk-based geoarchaeological exercise should be undertaken and submitted alongside the existing supporting archaeological documents. This exercise should utilise geological, borehole/test pit data, historic mapping and lidar to provide an overview of potential areas of impact from hydrological changes.</p> <p>In areas assessed as having the potential to include archaeological and/or geoarchaeological remains that could be impacted by hydrological changes, further evaluation works should take place to build upon those which have already taken place, such as geophysical survey and test pits. The additional works should include coring, scientific dating and deposit modelling. If archaeological and/or geoarchaeological remains are identified as being at potential risk from hydrological changes, it could be necessary to identify the inputs and outputs of the water environment systems in order to understand the impact the proposed development could have, particularly in areas that fall outside the order limits where remains will be preserved in-situ and not subjected to archaeological investigative works.</p> <p>If it has been concluded that the development will have a negative impact on archaeological and/or geoarchaeological remains, mitigation options should be considered. These should involve preservation by record and/or design changes to the scheme. The applicants should consider the approaches outlined in Historic England guidance, such as 'Preserving Archaeological Remains', 'Deposit Modelling and Archaeology' and 'Environmental Archaeology'.</p>
HE 2.12	<p>Effects on the setting of the anti-aircraft gunsite at Butt Farm</p>	<p>The access road and screening trees, as shown in figure 23-15a4, would run in relatively close proximity to the Scheduled</p>

	<p>With reference to updated figure 23-15a4 Cultural Heritage Viewpoint 2: Anti Aircraft Battery at Butt Farm [REP4-039] showing part of the proposed access road to the converter stations, given the proximity of the access road to the scheduled monument, is the access road and the proposed landscaping either side of it likely to create a sense of enclosure around the gunsite? If so, what effect would this have on the setting of the heritage asset?</p>	<p>Monument, and would be an additional element of infrastructure within the open landscape in which the Scheduled Monument is experienced. It would be in closer proximity to the edge of the designated heritage asset than the buildings themselves, but would be of a scale and intensity that was considerably lesser than these buildings.</p> <p>Taken on its own, the introduction of a road in this location, with associated landscaping, could probably be secured in a manner that had a limited impact on how the Scheduled Monument is experienced- particularly if care was taken with the finish of the road and any associated lighting. The soft landscaping edge would create a very minor sense of enclosure, but if considered sensitively any impact could be kept to a low level. However, the introduction of lighting along this stretch of road, or other associated paraphernalia such as signage, would have a detrimental impact on the significance of this heritage asset, by introducing distracting clutter into the wider setting in which the significance of the asset is understood and experienced, and creating a greater sense of modern development in the historically undeveloped landscape.</p> <p>However, it is important to note that it is difficult to separate out the impact of the road in isolation from the wider development as a whole. As there is an inherent functional interrelationship, and it will visually and physically read as an extension to the impact that the buildings themselves cause. As such, its impact (when considered holistically as part of the wider scheme) will be to marginally increase the impact of the development as a whole on the significance of the Scheduled Monument. However, its impact would be secondary and subsidiary to that created by the buildings themselves. Any assessment of the impact of the road will therefore need to be read along our previous conclusions about the impact of the substation development as a whole.</p>
--	---	--

HF 2.4	<p>Discharge rates</p> <p>What is your position on the proposed increased runoff rates from the proposed development for the 1 in 1 and 1 in 2 year storm events and any effect on local hydrology and flood risk downstream [REP4-096, AP12].</p>	<p>We believe the requested discharge rate from the IDB of 1l/s is acceptable and will not increase flood risk downstream, this is only slightly higher than the greenfield runoff of 1/4l/s/ha.</p>
GD 2.2	<p>Design review process</p> <p>Review the applicants' response to action point 24 [REP4-096] setting out their proposed approach to the detailed design review process for the converter stations and confirm if you agree with the proposed amendments. If you do not, set out what changes you seek to the design review process and why.</p>	<p>ERYC met with the applicants on 15/5/25 and discussed the changes made to the design review process and the consultation arrangements (see also response to GD 2.3 below). It has been noted that since that meeting Historic England have now confirmed their agreement to be included as a consultee.</p> <p>It was agreed that impartiality of the panel could be maintained by including a design champion from within the organisation with experience of designing similar schemes, subject to the other panel members remaining independent. These should include an architect.</p> <p>The inclusion of ERYC and Ward Councillors in the consultation on the recommendations of the Design Review Panel is noted and agreed this should be included. Discussion took place about how they would input into the design development to avoid being consulted on a scheme without any prior involvement, which could lead to conflicting opinions and delays. It was agreed that eryc would be included in the preparation of the Terms of Reference which would set out programmes for submission of review documents, together with pre-submission meetings to explain the design rationale at each stage. It is agreed that this will ensure design options are understood and give ERYC the opportunity to include other relevant technical officers where the design impacts on SUDS or landscape for example. Subject to the inclusion of these elements ERYC are now comfortable with the design review section of the DAS.</p>
GD 2.3	<p>Design review process</p> <p>The ExA notes both the applicants' and ERYC's positions that the Design and</p>	<p>The consultation period for responding to any outputs of the Design Review Panel were discussed on 15/5/25 with the applicants. ERYC recognised the applicants</p>

	<p>Access Statement [REP2-027] should refer to a maximum 56 day or 28 day period for provision of comments on any outputs of any Design Panel review respectively. Consider whether a 42-day consultation period would allow sufficient time for ERYC to respond, whilst ensuring a timely response. If you do not agree, set out why this timeframe would not be suitable. If you do consider this to be a suitable consultation period, liaise with each other to seek agreement on this matter and update the Design and Access Statement accordingly.</p>	<p>concerns that a 56 day period could delay the development of the scheme but remained concerned that in some instances 28 days would not provide sufficient time for ERYC to consult with technical officers where that was required, to carry out potential site visits, clarify reasons for design decisions with the applicants, and to respond. However, ERYC do accept that 28 days would be sufficient to respond in some cases, for example on materials or colour schemes. It would be matters where more technical advice is needed where there is an impact on SUDS or landscape for example where ERYC are not comfortable responding adequately in 28 days. The applicants suggested that the Terms of Reference and pre-submission meetings could include a requirement to agree where a longer consultation period (beyond 28 days) is required before submission of the details. ERYC are in agreement that this approach would be acceptable. It was also noted that HE will now be consulted and that would be carried out by the applicant. That approach is supported.</p>
GGC 2.1	<p>Mineral resource safeguarding</p> <p>The applicants' updated position is that mineral resources would not be extracted prior to construction and cable ducts are likely to be left in situ post decommissioning, resulting in a likely sterilisation until at least the end of the operational phase [REP4-096, AP51]. This is reported as a moderate adverse effect. Do you have any comments to make in relation to the updated position, the effects to mineral resources and the proposed mitigation?</p>	<p>We broadly accept the applicant's proposed response set out against Action 51 (REP4-096), though we would want to highlight a couple of matters that could be incorporated into a revised response.</p> <p>First, as the cable route crosses a part of a SG-A Preferred Area for Sand and Gravel, it may be useful to quantify the potential total land take/tonnage in the context of all the Preferred Areas identified in the Joint Minerals Local Plan (5 in total), rather than just rely on the calculation for the take up of Minerals Safeguarding Areas. This is because these areas are in proximity to existing extraction sites and are where applications for extraction are more likely to be submitted. As such, extraction is more probable in the Preferred Areas.</p> <p>Second, the council has recorded a supply of sand and gravel of 3.58 years as set out in the 2024 Annual Monitoring Report. This is below the NPPF requirement for a 7-year supply of sand and gravel. As such, the</p>

		<p>potential loss of area is an important factor. A recent application was approved on the existing operation to extend the timeframe for working the quarry from 2024 to 2039 (23/03254/CME). This included an area to the north of the existing extraction area, which is currently in agricultural use, and away from the cable route.</p> <p>The loss/sterilisation of land for potential mineral extraction needs to be seen in the context of the above. However, we do not necessarily anticipate that the conclusion of a moderate adverse effect would be changed.</p>
LVI 2.1	<p>Trees and hedgerows Do you have any outstanding concerns regarding tree or hedgerow removals, or proposed mitigation measures relating to retained trees and hedgerows? The ExA notes that you previously raised concerns [REP1-055] regarding the loss of T246 sycamore tree as a result of Works No. 16A/ B – do you still remain concerned regarding this tree?</p>	<p>We would have liked to have seen its retention, where possible. The applicant's recent revision to the wider design to allow for retention of category A trees; T012 oak and T019 oak in the OCS zone is fully welcomed. The extent of avoidance of losses of category A and B trees on the scheme as a whole is noted.</p>
LVI 2.3	<p>Ancient woodland The applicants have updated the oEMP [REP4-042] to state that ancient woodland in the onshore converter station zone would be avoided via the use of trenchless crossing techniques such as horizontal directional drilling at a minimum depth of 5 metres, unless the applicants are able to demonstrate that a shallower depth is acceptable due to other constraints. Do you consider this wording to be acceptable and do you have any outstanding concerns regarding the protection of ancient woodland in any other regards? If so, set out what these are, and how the</p>	<p>We consider that oEMP [REP4-042] adequately ensures that adverse impacts on the ancient woodland would be avoided. The applicants must demonstrate that a depth less than 5m is acceptable in terms of impacts on the ancient woodland, otherwise trenchless crossing must be at a depth greater than 5m.</p> <p>Tree protection and construction exclusion zones for the ancient woodland follow best practice.</p>

	applicants could overcome them.	
LVI 2.4	<p>Visualisations</p> <p>Whilst the ExA notes the applicants' response to ISH4 action point 10 [REP4-096], which states that owing to the distance and presence of intervening vegetation, it is unlikely that the significance of visual effects from relocating Viewpoint 6 would be significant, can you confirm whether you consider that there would be a minor adverse effect if Viewpoint 6 was relocated as discussed during ISH4?</p>	<p>Ref VP6, we understand that the applicant is taking new site photographs and will review upon receipt of those. ERYC would appreciate sight of any photos/visuals and would respond to the applicant's comments accordingly.</p>
LVI 2.5	<p>Visualisations</p> <p>At DL4, ES Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Amenity figure 23-7e (Viewpoint 1: Butt Farm) [REP4-039] was updated to reduce the leaf cover serving the trees, to be more representative of the winter tree cover. A comparison between the version of this visualisation provided at DL2 [REP2-024] and the DL4 submission shows that the converter stations would be more prominent in the winter at year 10 of operation in the updated visualisation. Does this amendment affect the findings of the ES regarding the residual effects from Viewpoint 1 at year 10 of operation? If not, why not? If so, the applicants should update the ES accordingly.</p>	<p>Ref VP1, we understand that the applicant is in the process of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. reviewing the LVIA in the light of the reduced footprint and the most recent winter photomontage, and will consider the assessment of VP1 with that information in mind b. producing a photo/montage from the rear (south) of Butt Farm. <p>The above will assist in reaching an assessment which takes into account the new information and is consistent in its presentation and assessment of effects from the area around Butt Farm.</p>
LVI 2.7	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>Do you have any outstanding concerns regarding the mitigation measures in the outline Landscape Management Plan (oLMP) [REP4-044]? If so, what are</p>	<p>ERYC has no outstanding concerns regarding mitigation measures.</p>

	these and how could the applicants address them?	
MCP 2.15	<p>Coastal change monitoring</p> <p>Your DL1 response [REP1-055] requested that a 'coastal change adaptation plan should be put in place, setting out how the developer will monitor the risk to their assets from coastal erosion, their response should accelerated coastal erosion result in the exposure of the cables and their plans for decommissioning the pipelines at the end of their life. Furthermore, as the Shoreline Management Plan policy for this location is No Active Intervention, it is critical that any works (including the creation of an emergency beach access) do not impact on natural coastal processes. Monitoring should be undertaken to monitor this and action should be undertaken to mitigate any impacts e.g. through the manual relocation of sand.'</p> <p>The applicants responded at DL2 [REP2-058] that 'in relation to the request for a coastal change adaptation plan, as noted above, the Applicants have already considered coastal erosion based on the NCERM data sets, available at the time of the Design Freeze (late 2023) and have now undertaken a further check of the latest NCERM 2 data. This has confirmed the TJB's will be located a sufficient distance from the cliff edge for the operational lifetime of the Projects. The Applicants will monitor all potential risk to their assets over the lifetime of the development and this</p>	Consider the applicants response to be satisfactory

	<p>would include the consideration of coastal erosion at the landfall, should any intervention be required in the future the relevant consents would be applied for at that time in consultation with the ERYC.'</p> <p>Do you consider the response to be satisfactory? If not, please explain any outstanding concerns and requirements.</p>	
NV 2.1	<p>Construction working hours</p> <p>Following discussions at ISH4 in April 2025, the wording in the oCoCP [REP4-040, paragraph 34] has been updated in line with your suggestions. Does the wording now appropriately address your concerns? If not, explain why not.</p>	<p>It is confirmed that the updated wording in Section 5.2 General Site Operations, paragraph 34, page 39 does address previous concerns and is acceptable.</p>
SET 2.2	<p>Local skills and employment</p> <p>The applicants and ERYC: The updated SoCG between the applicants and ERYC [REP4-059] continues to highlight concerns regarding the proposed wording of Requirement 26, Local Skills and Employment. Can you explain the concerns raised, confirm whether this has been resolved and provide the agreed wording?</p> <p>ERYC: In addition, confirm if you are satisfied with the information provided as part of the proposed outline Skills and Employment Strategy [APP-230]? If not, explain any outstanding requirements.</p>	<p>ERYC have agreed that the question of enforceability in the SoCG can be removed.</p> <p>Additional question - ERYC recognise that RWE has a history of delivering a successful programme of education and skills support activities in the Humber region.</p> <p>The business has actively engaged with various stakeholders from across the Humber to gather local intelligence, including East Riding of Yorkshire Council, which has helped to inform the outline Skills and Employment Strategy. We are therefore confident that the strategy identifies how positive outcomes can be achieved by the Project in relation to skills and employment opportunities, and we confirm that we are satisfied with the information provided as part of the proposed outline Skills and Employment Strategy.</p>
SET 2.3	<p>Assessment of effects on tourism</p>	<p>From a wider economic development perspective we would not expect the project to have any major detrimental</p>

	<p>As previously raised in ExQ1 [PD-014], your Local Impact Report (LIR) does not make reference to the appropriateness of the assessment of effects on tourism with particular regard to the close vicinity of the proposed development to the Yorkshire Wolds and various coastal towns, as well as a number of caravan and camping businesses situated along the onshore export cable corridor, near the landfall and onshore converter station. Do you have any comments in relation to the potential effects of the proposed development on tourism as detailed in ES Chapter 29 [APP-219]?</p>	<p>impact on tourism within the area. We assume that robust construction plans will manage any potential traffic flow disruption. The potential that emergency closure of access to areas normally used by visitors, whilst unavoidable, will provide alternatives were available or as a minimum be supported by clear and accurate communications. It is expected that the developer will directly engage with individual businesses operating within the vicinity of the project to thoroughly address any specific issues that may have a negative impact upon their operations.</p>
TT2.4	<p>Outline Travel Plan measures</p> <p>Your response [REP3-037] and the applicants' response [REP3-027] to question ExQ1, TT.1.13 [PD-014] in relation to outline travel plan measures are noted. On the basis of the applicants' response, do you consider the oCTMP [REP4-046] sufficiently captures the required elements of an outline Travel Plan? If not, can you clarify the information you consider is missing? Do you agree that further details could be agreed as part of the final CTMP? If not, explain why not?</p>	<p>ERYC Highway Management have reviewed the OTMP which provides some suggested measures to reduce workers single occupancy travel, however this is not robust enough to ensure that the best practice and measures identified are utilised. The principles of the measures are acceptable and should form the base towards a formal Travel Plan Note which HDM are happy to receive at a later date through a DCO requirement.</p>
TT 2.5	<p>Emergency beach access</p> <p>The proposed emergency beach access was discussed at ISH2, when it was agreed that the applicants would consult with the local authority on the detailed design (such as any ramp, matting or access road as required). No response on this</p>	<p>Discussions took place between ERYC and the applicants on 15/5/25. Previously there was a boat ramp in situ which over time has eroded due to coastal processes and we need to ensure that there can be no interference with the coastal processes at this location, by this we mean holding back sediment or preventing sediment flow along the coast. If hard engineering techniques were required, then they would need to</p>

	<p>matter has been received from ERYC following ExQ1 [PD-014]. Have there been any updates on the discussions? What has been agreed with the applicants?</p> <p>In addition, as explained in the applicants' response to ExQ1, TT.1.15 [REP3-027], do you consider the proposed Drilling Fluid Management Plan, part of the oCoCP [REP4-040], appropriately captures the proposed way forward and requirement for consultation on the emergency beach access? If not, explain why not and any outstanding concerns.</p>	<p>consult with us to minimise any disturbance to coastal processes. During the meeting it was noted that the applicant is preparing a Drilling Fluid Management Plan as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCoCP), which is secured by Requirement 19 of the Draft DCO, and that further wording on emergency beach access have been added to section 5.6.3 of ES Chapter 5. ERYC are reviewing this wording but confirmed that the detailed design could be provided and agreed in the Drilling Fluid Management Plan.</p>
TT2.6	<p>Cumulative effects assessment</p> <p>Following your response [REP3-027] to ExQ1, TT.1.16 [PD-014], the ExA notes that the application for Peartree Hill Solar Farm was accepted for examination on 21 March 2025. Does the additional information now publicly available have any implications in relation to the assessment of traffic and transport cumulative effects? If not, explain why not.</p>	<p>ERYC Highway Management have reviewed the information submitted to date and that of the Peartree solar farm submission and suggest that any cumulative impact assessment could be undertaken at the formal full construction traffic management plan submission. At this time the timeframes for construction are not fully understood, therefore any formal cumulative assessment may not be considered robust. A Full CTMP should form part of the requirements list along with an access management plan, as part of these assessments when a better understanding of timeframes are provided the agreed periods would aim to reduce Cumulative impact on the highway network, if any are apparent.</p>