

The Planning Inspectorate

DoggerBankSouth@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Our ref: 20050175

Your ref: EN010125

Date: 23 May 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms Project: Environment Agency response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action Points (Deadline 5) and Examining Authority's further written questions and requests for further information (ExQ2)

Please find below our responses in relation to action points arising from Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) 4 (9 April 2025) and the subsequent Examining Authority's further written questions and requests for further information ExQ2 (13 May) for the Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms project.

Action Points from ISH4

*11) To comment/ provide an opinion on the assessment of temporary watercourse access crossings and trenched cable crossings method in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 20 [REP1-014] and additional information submitted by the applicants in relation to action point 10 (EA & LLFA TO ANSWER) **Deadline 5***

We are struggling to understand the magnitude of impact assessment, and the answers provided in Action Point 10 (page 21 ad 22 of Doc Ref 14.11) as its not normally something we get involved in, however if there is a particular element you would like us to look at then please let us know.

We have reviewed Chapter 20 as requested, paying particular attention to any mention of temporary watercourse crossings and trenched cable crossings. As far as we are aware **there will be no trenched crossings on main river**, therefore we do not have any comments on this matter.

We are only aware of one temporary crossing on Main River, and that will be a temporary culvert on Meaux and Routh East Drain. For completeness we have included our answer to ISH4 Question 8 here:

*8) To confirm its position on the proposed watercourse crossings Wx-029 and Wx-030 and the associated environmental impacts [REP2-014] **Deadline 4**
WX-029 will be clear span. The only additional requirement we have here is that the*

abutments for the crossing are located away from the embankment such that the clear span encompasses the bank on both sides of the watercourse.

WX-030 – *this will be culverted. In principle we do not object to the culvert crossing, though the culvert must be appropriately sized to pass a flood flow.*

We have let the applicant know that the Meaux and Routh East Drain channel is deep and steep sided so it may be difficult to reinstate the channel when the culvert is removed.

In relation to all watercourse crossings whether clear span or culverted we would expect that the sites are reinstated to the existing conditions once the temporary crossings are removed.

Therefore, we have asked the applicant whether reinstatement and monitoring after the crossings have been removed could be included either in the proposals, or within the requirements of the DCO. We will be meeting with the applicants and our legal team to understand whether this is best secured through the requirements or through the protected provisions.

We note Para 104 of Chapter 20 proposes some temporary culvert design solutions. Para 203 of Section 6.3.2.6 of the Outline Code of Construction practice also commits to a site-specific investigation at detailed design stage. We are satisfied with this, however when we met the applicant we suggested re-wording Requirement 19 of the draft DCO to specifically mention watercourse crossings and crossing methodologies. However, we will be meeting with the applicants and our legal team to understand whether this is best secured through a re-worded requirement or through the protected provisions.

We require this to be clear to enable us to secure discussions ahead of any works taking place, to ensure our satisfaction with the proposals.

Response to Examining Authority's further written questions and requests for further information ExQ2

HF2.4 - Discharge rates (For the EA and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA))

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

We have reviewed the Outline Drainage Strategy (Revision 3) clean dated February 2025, alongside the answer to Action Point 12 in Rep4-096.

From the report submitted there doesn't appear to be any surface water discharging directly to main river. We also note that surface water will be restricted to greenfield runoff rates and SUDs will be installed. Therefore, we have no comments to make on the above question and instead refer to the LLFA or IDB for comments.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information. We look forward to continuing to work with the applicant to resolve any outstanding matters and to ensure the best environmental outcome for this project.

Yours faithfully


Planning Specialist – Sustainable Places Yorkshire

E-mail: sp-yorkshire@environment-agency.gov.uk