

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

Action points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 6 (ISH6) on Thursday 5 June 2025

Action No	Directed to:	Action	Deadline
1	The applicants	Provide a written response to the Examining Authority's (ExA) question, would Critical National Priority apply to the proposed development if the ExA/ Secretary of State (SoS) concluded that compliance with the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (NPS EN-3) had not been demonstrated and appropriate application of the mitigation hierarchy had not been followed regarding wake loss.	Deadline 6
2	The applicants, Dogger Bank Offshore Wind Farm Project 1 Projco Limited, Dogger Bank Offshore Wind Farm Project 2 Projco Limited, and Dogger Bank Offshore Wind Farm Project 3 Projco Limited (Projco IPs)	Provide an update from the meeting scheduled on 10 June 2025 between the Projcos and the applicants to discuss matters regarding wake loss, particularly addressing the areas of disagreement.	Deadline 6
3	Projco IPs	Update and provide the Projcos' wake loss assessment [REP5-070] to include the wake effects from the Hornsea offshore wind farm projects.	Deadline 6
4	The applicants	Submit the Greenhouse Gas Sensitivity Analysis of Wake Effects [REP5-034] using predicted wake loss percentages from the Projco IPs in [REP5-070].	Deadline 6
5	Ørsted IPs	Confirm agreement with the findings of applicants' Greenhouse Gas Sensitivity Analysis of Wake Effects [REP5-034].	Deadline 6
6	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)	DIO to provide an update on progress of Programme NJORD including any likely delivery schedules.	Deadline 6
7	DIO	During ISH6 the applicants advised Requirement 31 of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [REP5-002] as worded, would not explicitly prohibit the operation of the proposed west array prior	Deadline 6

		to the implementation of the radar mitigation strategy but are reluctant to update the wording as it has been agreed with the DIO. Would the DIO support a change to Requirement 31(1) as follows: "Where the layout plan for the DBS West Project approved under condition 15 of Deemed Marine Licence 2 would have unacceptable effects on the air defence radar capability of Remote Radar Head (RRH) Staxton Wold, no wind turbine generator forming part of the DBS West Project is permitted to rotate its rotor blades on its horizontal axis until the Secretary of State, having consulted with the Ministry of Defence, confirms satisfaction in writing that appropriate mitigation will be has been implemented and will be maintained for the life of the authorised project".	
8	The applicants	Review Requirement 31 of the draft DCO [REP5-002] to ensure it secures radar mitigation would be in place prior to operation of the wind turbine generators (WTG). Alternatively, explain in writing why this would not be necessary for the proposed development.	Deadline 6
9	The applicants	Give consideration to the wording of Requirement 36 from the Rampion 2 DCO for inclusion in Requirement 31 of the draft DCO [REP5-002] . Explain whether prohibiting the erection of WTGs prior to radar mitigation being in place is appropriate for the proposed DBS development. The response should reflect the acknowledged risk of environmental adverse effects being realised due to the unknown implementation programme for a radar mitigation strategy.	Deadline 6
10	The applicants and DIO	Explain how the proposed development would manage situations where any radar mitigation scheme failed during the operation phase. Provide your opinion on whether the draft DCO should include a method of controlling the adverse effects of the proposed development on military radar capability eg requiring the temporary cessation of WTG operation until a mitigation scheme is reinstated. Similar matters have been considered on Mona, Morgan and Morecambe offshore wind farm projects. For example, the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Ltd, the Defence	Deadline 6

		Infrastructure Organisation and BAE Systems (Operations) Ltd. This can be located in the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets project examination library [REP6-024] .	
11	East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC)	Provide a reference for the 2024 Annual Monitoring Report referred to in your response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) [REP5-044, GGC.2.1] .	Deadline 6
12	ERYC	Provide a response on how significant is the preferred area for sand and gravel to the south of Catwick for ERYC's 7 year supply requirement.	Deadline 6
13	ERYC	Confirm if that there are any allocations in the ERYC Local Plan that are yet to come forward and/ or live applications that will address the 7 year land bank shortfall.	Deadline 6
14	The applicants	Update the Design and Access Statement [REP2-027] to include a commitment to no lighting or signage (other than at the access from the highway) and limit visual clutter along the access road to the converter stations.	Deadline 7
15	The applicants, ERYC	Consider whether not planting hedgerow along the access track and its replacement, for example, with a post and rail fence (or alternative) would reduce the suggested sense of enclosure raised by ERYC [REP5-044] and Historic England [REP5-046] .	Deadline 6
16	The applicants	Provide a response on the verbal submissions from Mr Julian in relation to agricultural land severance.	Deadline 6
17	The applicants	Explore whether best and most versatile (BMV) land used temporarily can be prioritised to being restored and returned within 2-year period. If not, explain your reasons.	Deadline 6
18	The applicants	Signpost where the draft DCO [REP5-002] would require the ~84% of land within the order limits to be restored and returned within the 2-year period stated, or conversely prohibits said land from being acquired for longer than 2 years.	Deadline 6
19	The applicants	Review and update the definition of pre-commencement works in the draft DCO to better align with the intended pre-commencement works, as described during ISH6. Consider how the extent and range of pre-commencement works can be better controlled to address concerns raised by the ExA. Provide justification of the need for	Deadline 6

		and reasonableness of the pre-commencement works, as defined.	
--	--	---	--