

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

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

**Dogger Bank South Offshore  
Wind Farms**

**East Riding of Yorkshire Council Statement of  
Common Ground (Revision 3)**

**Submission for Deadline 8**


**Document Date: July 2025**


**Document Reference: 9.2**

**Revision Number: 03**

**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:	East Riding of Yorkshire Council Statement of Common Ground (Revision 3)				
Document Number:	005368456-03	Contractor Reference Number:	PC2340-RHD-ZZ-ZZ-RP-Z-0158		
<p><i>COPYRIGHT © RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited, 2025.</i></p> <p><i>All rights reserved.</i></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 prepared.</i></p>					
Rev No.	Date	Status/Reason for Issue	Author	Checked by	Approved by
01	January 2024	Submission for Deadline 1	RHDHV	RWE	RWE
02	April 2025	Submission for Deadline 4	RHDHV	RWE	RWE
03	July 2025	Submission for Deadline 8	Haskoning	RWE	RWE

Signatories	
Signed	
Name	
Position	Principal Planning Officer
On behalf of	East Riding of Yorkshire Council

Signatories	
Signed	
Name	
Position	Senior Consents Manager
On behalf of	RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Ltd and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Ltd

## Contents

1	Introduction .....	10
1.1	Background .....	10
1.2	Approach to SoCG .....	14
2	Consultation and Engagement .....	15
2.1	Introduction .....	15
2.2	Consultation and Engagement Summary .....	15
3	Agreement Log .....	36
3.1	Overview .....	36
3.2	General .....	37
3.3	Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology .....	45
3.4	Geology and Land Quality .....	51
3.5	Flood Risk and Hydrology .....	57
3.6	PRoW and Access .....	66
3.7	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage .....	72
3.8	Landscape and Visual Impacts .....	79
3.9	Traffic and Transport .....	90
3.10	Noise .....	99
3.11	Air Quality .....	107
3.12	Human Health .....	117
3.13	Status of Discussions for Matters 'Not Agreed' .....	123
3.13.1	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage .....	123
4	Summary .....	126
5	References .....	127
	Appendix A – Detailed Comments by 2B Landscape Consultancy on Behalf of East Riding of Yorkshire Council Regarding LVIA Matters .....	128
	Appendix B – Detailed Comments by East Riding of Yorkshire Council Regarding Nature Conservation and Tree Matters .....	133

## Tables

Table 1-1 - Application Documents of Interest to East Riding of Yorkshire Council .....	11
Table 2-1 Summary of pre-application and post-application consultation with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council .....	15
Table 3-1 - Agreement logs position status key.....	36
Table 3-2 - General Topics agreed or not agreed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council .....	37
Table 3-3 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology.....	45
Table 3-4 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Geology and Land Quality	51
Table 3-5 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Flood Risk and Hydrology .	57
Table 3-6 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to PRow and Access .....	66
Table 3-7 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage .....	72
Table 3-8 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Landscape and Visual Impacts .....	79
Table 3-9 Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Traffic and Transport.....	90
Table 3-10 Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Noise .....	99
Table 3-11 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Air Quality.....	107
Table 3-12 Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Human Health .....	117
Table 3-13 - Status of discussions relating to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage .....	123
Table 5-1 Detailed Comments on LVIA Matters Provided on 16/09/2024 by East Riding of Yorkshire Council .....	128
Table 5-2 Detailed Comments on Nature Conservation and Tree Matters Provided on 30/09/2024 by East Riding of Yorkshire Council.....	133

## Glossary

Term	Definition
CITiZAN Dataset	CITiZAN (the Coastal and Intertidal Zone Archaeological Network) is a national archaeological database
Development Consent Order (DCO)	An order made under the Planning Act 2008 granting development consent for one or more Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP).
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	A statutory process by which certain planned projects must be assessed before a formal decision to proceed can be made. It involves the collection and consideration of environmental information, which fulfils the assessment requirements of the EIA Directive and EIA Regulations, including the publication of an Environmental Statement (ES).
Environmental Statement (ES)	A document reporting the findings of the EIA and produced in accordance with the EIA Directive as transposed into UK law by the EIA Regulations.
Expert Topic Group (ETG)	A forum for targeted engagement with regulators and interested stakeholders through the EPP.
Local Authority	The Local Authority is a body empowered by law to exercise various statutory functions for a particular area of the United Kingdom. This includes County Councils, District Councils and the Broads Authority, as set out in Section 43 of the Planning Act 2008. East Riding of Yorkshire Council is the Local Authority for the entirety of the Onshore Development Area.
Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)	Project specific document forming the agreement between the Applicants, the appointed archaeologists, contractors and the relevant stakeholders landward of MHWS. The document sets out the methods to mitigate the effects on all the known and potential archaeological receptors within the Hornsea Four onshore Order Limits.
Planning Inspectorate (PINS)	The agency responsible for operating the planning process for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs).
Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)	Defined in the EIA Regulations as information referred to in part 1, Schedule 4 (information for inclusion in Environmental Statements) which has been compiled by the Applicants and is reasonably required to assess the environmental effects of the development.

Term	Definition
Statutory consultation	The statutory consultation ran in two periods. The first period ran between 6th June and 17th July 2023, with a second period running between 4th August and 15th September 2023 to gather responses from third parties missed during the initial consultation period. The PEIR was presented as part of this consultation.
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).
Traffic and Transport Study Area (TTSA)	Area where potential impacts from the Projects could occur, as defined for the traffic and transport EIA topic.

## Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
AA	Anti-Aircraft
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
BoCC	Birds of Conservation Concern
BoR	Book of Reference
CEA	Cumulative Effects Assessment
CoCP	Code of Construction Practise
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
DAS	Design and Access Statement
DBS	Dogger Bank South
DCO	Development Consent Order
ECow	Ecological Clerk of Works
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPP	Evidence Plan Process
ES	Environmental Statement
ETG	Expert Topic Group
ExA	Examining Authority
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
GCN	Great Crested Newt
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
JNCC	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment



Acronym	Definition
NRMM	Non-Road Mobile Machinery
OLMP	Outline Landscape Management Plan
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PINS	Planning Inspectorate
PPA	Planning Performance Agreement
PRoW	Public Rights of Way
PRoWMP	Public Rights of Way Management Plan
RR	Relevant Representation
SLVIA	Sea Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
SoCC	Statement of Community Consultation
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage Systems
TCC	Temporary Construction Compounds
TTSA	Traffic and Transport Study Area
WER	Water Environment Regulations
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

1. This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared between RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Ltd and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Ltd, ('the Applicants') and East Riding of Yorkshire Council to set out the areas of agreement and disagreement between the two parties in relation to the proposed Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Dogger Bank South (DBS) West Offshore Wind Farm and DBS East Offshore Wind Farm, collectively known as DBS Offshore Wind Farms (herein 'the Projects').
2. The Applicants have applied for development consent to construct and operate the proposed Projects under the Planning Act 2008. Further description of the Projects is available in **Chapter 5 Project Description, Figure 5-1 (Revision 3)** [REP7-034].
3. In drafting this SoCG, the Applicants have had regard to the Planning Act 2008 Guidance: Examination stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, 2024).
4. The need for a SoCG between the Applicants and East Riding of Yorkshire Council is set out within the Rule 6 Letter [PD-002] issued by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) on the 24<sup>th</sup> September 2024 and reiterated in the updated Rule 6 Letter [PD-010] issued on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2024. Humber Archaeology Partnership have been appointed by East Riding of Yorkshire Council as archaeological advisors, and a separate SoCG has been developed with them.
5. This SoCG is intended to provide the Examining Authority (ExA) with a clear summary of discussions between the parties and has been structured to reflect topics which are of interest to East Riding of Yorkshire Council, and which have been raised through the consultation process to date or within East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Relevant Representation (RR) [RR-012] to the Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms DCO that has been submitted to PINS pursuant to the Planning Act 2008.
6. This SoCG covers issues that have been raised throughout the Evidence Plan Process (EPP) through the Expert Topic Groups (ETGs); in addition to direct consultation and engagement on matters including, land discussions, and correspondence with specialist teams such as the Jocks Lodge Improvement Scheme Project team within East Riding of Yorkshire Council, as detailed in section 2.2. It is the intention that this document will facilitate further discussions between the Applicants and East Riding of Yorkshire Council and will provide the ExA with a clear overview of the level of common ground between both parties. This document has been updated throughout the Examination process.

7. Revision 2 of the SoCG, prepared for submission at Deadline 4, was updated with East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Local Impact Report (LIR) [PDC-007] and East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExAQ1) [REP3-037] comments where relevant.
8. The following documents have informed the discussions with East Riding of Yorkshire Council and address the elements of the Projects that may affect the interests of East Riding of Yorkshire Council:

**Table 1-1 - Application Documents of Interest to East Riding of Yorkshire Council**

Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter/ Document	PINS Reference
Draft Development Consent Order superseded by Draft Development Consent Order (Revision 10)	APP-027 superseded by REP7-011
Book of Reference superseded by Book of Reference (Revision 6)	APP-031 superseded by REP4-010
Outline Code of Construction Practice superseded by Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision 5)	APP-234 superseded by REP7-105
Appendix C Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan superseded by Appendix C Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (Revision 5)	APP-234 superseded by REP7-105
The Planning Statement	APP-226
The Policy Compliance Assessment Tables	APP-227
Chapter 2 Need for the Project	APP-065
Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives superseded by Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives (Revision 3)	APP-067 superseded by REP7-028
Chapter 6 Appendix 6-1 Onshore Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodology superseded by Chapter 6 Appendix 6-1 Onshore Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodology (Revision 2)	APP-077 superseded by REP3-009
Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology superseded by Environmental Statement	APP-140 superseded by REP7-064

Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter/ Document	PINS Reference
Chapter 18 - Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology (Revision 6)	
Appendix 18-10 Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy superseded by Appendix 18-10 Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy (Revision 2)	APP-157 superseded by REP5-015
Outline Ecological Management Plan superseded by Outline Ecological Management Plan (Revision 6)	APP-235 superseded by REP7-107
Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality superseded by Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality (Revision 2)	APP-158 superseded by REP6-020
Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology superseded by Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology (Revision 3)	APP-163 superseded by REP5-017
Outline Drainage Strategy superseded by Outline Drainage Strategy (Revision 4)	APP-237 superseded by REP7-109
Appendix 20-3 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment superseded by Appendix 20-3 - Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment (Revision 4)	APP-167 superseded by REP5-020
Appendix 20-4 Flood Risk Assessment (Revision 2)	APP-168 superseded by REP7-072
Chapter 21 Land Use superseded by Chapter 21 - Land Use (Revision 4) – PRow and cycle routes ONLY	APP-169 superseded by REP5-022
Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage superseded by Chapter 22 - Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (Revision 3)	APP-172 superseded by REP7-073
Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation superseded by Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation (Revision 2)	APP-239 superseded by REP4-048
Appendix 22-5 Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment (Revision 2)	APP-178 superseded by REP7-076

Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter/ Document	PINS Reference
Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment superseded by Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Revision 2)	APP-192 superseded by REP7-090
Outline Landscape Management Plan superseded by Outline Landscape Management Plan (Revision 4)	APP-236 superseded by REP4-044
Design and Access Statement superseded by Design and Access Statement (Revision 3)	APP-233 superseded by REP7-103
Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport superseded by Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport (Revision 2)	APP-195 superseded by REP6-025
Appendix 24-2 Transport Assessment superseded by Appendix 24-2 Transport Assessment (Revision 3)	APP-198 superseded by REP7-092 & REP7-094
Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan superseded by Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Revision 4)	APP-238 superseded by REP6-041
Chapter 25 Noise superseded by Chapter 25 Noise (Revision 3)	APP-207 superseded by REP6-028
Chapter 26 Air Quality superseded by Chapter 26 Air Quality (Revision 2)	APP-208 superseded by REP7-096
Chapter 27 Human Health	APP-216
Project Change Request 1 - Offshore and Intertidal Works	AS-141
Project Change Request 2 - Onshore Substation Zone	AS-152
Arboricultural Survey Report, Preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Outline Arboricultural Method Statement (Revision 3)	AS-036 superseded by REP3-017

9. East Riding of Yorkshire Council and the Applicants have been working together to minimise possible impacts of the Projects on the East Riding of Yorkshire Council's operations, and so East Riding of Yorkshire Council may influence and enhance the design of the Projects where appropriate.

## 1.2 Approach to SoCG

10. This SoCG has been developed during the pre-examination and examination phases of the Projects. In accordance with discussions between the Applicants and East Riding of Yorkshire Council, this SoCG is focused on matters of material interest and relevance to East Riding of Yorkshire Council, namely matters covered in the Application Documents outlined in **Table 1-1** and related topics.
11. The structure of this SoCG is as follows:
- **Introduction:** background to the development of the SoCG.
  - **Consultation and Engagement:** a summary of consultation and engagement with East Riding of Yorkshire Council to date.
  - **Agreement Log:** a record of the Applicants' position alongside the East Riding of Yorkshire Council's position. **Table 3-2** to **Table 3-12** set out those areas agreed in relation to the application documents set out in **Table 1-1**. Where a matter is 'not agreed' this is described in further detail in **Table 3-13**.
12. It is agreed that this SoCG is an accurate description of the areas agreed between the parties, and that this SoCG accurately records key meetings and consultation with East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
13. As referenced in **Table 2-1**, the Applicants consulted East Riding of Yorkshire Council on **Project Change Request 1: Offshore and Intertidal Works** [AS-141] and **Project Change Request 2: Onshore Substation Zone** [AS-152] between 15th November and 16th December 2024. East Riding of Yorkshire Council provided consultation comments on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2024 regarding the Change Requests, and these are set out in **Table 3-2**.

## 2 Consultation and Engagement

### 2.1 Introduction

14. East Riding of Yorkshire Council has been consulted on the proposed development throughout the pre-application stage, having engaged in a number of Expert Topic Group (ETG) meetings under the Evidence Plan Process, as well as via non-statutory and statutory consultation under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008.
15. The Applicants entered into a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2023. The aim of the PPA was to ensure that the Applicants and East Riding of Yorkshire Council jointly agree to appropriately resource the Projects, so that key planning issues can be considered and resolved to an agreed timetable.

### 2.2 Consultation and Engagement Summary

16. **Table 2-1** summarises the consultation that the Applicants have undertaken with East Riding of Yorkshire Council as statutory or non-statutory consultation during the pre-application and post-application phases. In addition, a number of draft documents and agreement logs have been issued throughout the pre-application stage of the Projects, for review and comments.

**Table 2-1 Summary of pre-application and post-application consultation with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council**

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
<b>Pre – Application</b>			
14/09/2021	ETG Meeting	Traffic and Access, Onshore Noise and Air Quality - Pre-Scoping	<p>The following topics were discussed during the Pre-Scoping:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project overview;</li> <li>• EPP;</li> <li>• Scoping Report and approach to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA); and</li> <li>• Site selection methodology.</li> </ul>
14/09/2021	ETG Meeting	Onshore Ecology and Ornithology – Pre-Scoping	
15/09/2021	ETG Meeting	Historic Environment -Pre-Scoping	
17/09/2021	ETG Meeting	Water Resources – Pre-Scoping	

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
23/09/2021	ETG Meeting	Sea Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) - Pre-Scoping	
04/05/2022	ETG Meeting	Site Selection ETG	The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update;</li> <li>• Site selection process and methodology;</li> <li>• Landfall site;</li> <li>• Offshore cable corridor;</li> <li>• Onshore substation; and</li> <li>• Onshore cable corridor.</li> </ul>
26/09/2022	ETG Meeting	Geological Sites at Landfall	The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The landfall options; and</li> <li>• Withow Gap Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</li> </ul>
10/11/2022	Meeting	East Riding of Yorkshire Council / DBS: Project Update and Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC).	Meeting to brief East Riding of Yorkshire Council Planning officer on DBS, provide Project Update, and talk through the contents of the SoCC.
23/11/2022	ETG Meeting	Traffic and Access	The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update;</li> <li>• Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) Approach (scope of Traffic and Transport Study Area (TTSA), scoping of impacts);</li> <li>• Construction access strategy; and</li> <li>• Operational access strategy to substation zone.</li> </ul>
13/12/2022	ETG Meeting	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update; and</li> <li>• PEIR Approach.</li> </ul>



Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
19/01/2023	ETG Meeting	Onshore and Offshore Archaeology	The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project update; and</li> <li>PEIR Approach.</li> </ul>
23/03/2023	Meeting	East Riding of Yorkshire Council Jocks Lodge / DBS Meeting	An introduction to the projects, and discussion on potential design interactions between DBS and Jocks Lodge Improvement Scheme.
20/04/2023	ETG Meeting	Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology	The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project update;</li> <li>Site selection update;</li> <li>Scoping Report status;</li> <li>Ecological survey programme;</li> <li>Desk study;</li> <li>Habitat survey;</li> <li>Wildlife surveys;</li> <li>Assessment scenarios;</li> <li>Ecology assessment; and</li> <li>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) strategy.</li> </ul>
22/05/2023	Meeting	East Riding of Yorkshire Council /Minerals Preferred Area	Meeting to discuss the route at Riston Grange minerals extraction area. East Riding of Yorkshire Council expressed a preference to amend the onshore export cable corridor to minimise impacts on the Preferred Area for Sand and Gravel. Amendment was made to the Order Limits.
30/05/2023	Email	Site Investigation Work	Correspondence to inform East Riding of Yorkshire Council of the start of the DBS Site Investigation Works, including a map of site investigation locations.
23/06/2023	ETG Meeting	Traffic and Transport	The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project update;</li> <li>Indicative access; and</li> <li>Design.</li> </ul>

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
03/07/2023	ETG Meeting	Noise and Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</li> <li>Project update;</li> <li>Approach to Air Quality and Noise PEIR Assessments including baseline, proposed assessment methodology; and</li> <li>Request for agreement on noise criteria for construction and operational noise assessments,</li> </ul>
20/07/2023	Email	Planning Performance Agreement (PPA)	East Riding of Yorkshire Council provided the signed copy of the PPA to the Applicants by email.
20/07/2023	ETG Meeting	Flood Risk and Hydrology / Geology and Land Use	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project update;</li> <li>Surface water Internal Drainage Board drains geomorphology; and</li> <li>PEIR Geology and Land Quality.</li> </ul>
07/08/2023	Meeting	East Riding of Yorkshire Council: s42 Consultation Response	<p>A meeting to discuss East Riding of Yorkshire Council's lack of s42 consultation response. To summarise - East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East Riding of Yorkshire have not provided a S.42 consultation response for the Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farm scheme, and are not planning to.</li> <li>East Riding of Yorkshire Council do not usually provide a response at the s42 consultation stage of a DCO application.</li> <li>Due to resourcing pressures over the summer if a response is required it will likely take approximately eight weeks to prepare.</li> <li>East Riding of Yorkshire Council will be submitting a LIR at the later stage of the project (post submission).</li> <li>Planning officer happy that East Riding of Yorkshire Council are involved in the DBS scheme through direct consultation with ETG groups and have/will continue to</li> </ul>

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
			raise any comments or concerns directly through these groups.
08/09/2023	ETG Meeting	Traffic and Transport	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Update;</li> <li>• Discuss PEIR Comments; and</li> <li>• Agree the proposed approach to assessment for the ES. and seek agreement on.</li> </ul>
21/09/2023	ETG Meeting	Noise	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update; and</li> <li>• ES Assessment Methodology.</li> </ul>
02/11/2023	Email	Letter to East Riding of Yorkshire Council – regarding lack of s42 consultation response and plan for forthcoming engagement	Letter to East Riding of Yorkshire Council – to confirm in writing East Riding of Yorkshire Council’s stated position on S42 consultation, following the meeting on 07/08/2023, and to outline a plan for forthcoming engagement.
21/11/2023	Meeting	East Riding of Yorkshire Council: Planning Officer Briefing Meeting	Meeting with planning officer to provide project briefing / consultation requirements for East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
27/11/2023	ETG Meeting	Noise and Air Quality	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of project design update since PEIR;</li> <li>• Review of PEIR consultation responses; and</li> <li>• Review of Noise and Air Quality draft ES Chapters, including updates since PEIR.</li> </ul>
28/11/2023	Draft Documents	Drainage Strategy and response to comments	Issue of Outline Drainage Strategy and written response to comments provided at Statutory S.42 Consultation ahead of ETG 13/12/2023

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
05/12/2023	ETG Meeting	Onshore Historic Environment	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of PEIR consultation responses, and how they would be addressed in ES; and</li> <li>Discussion on cultural heritage viewpoints – Onshore Substation Zone.</li> </ul>
06/12/2023	Email	Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP)	Draft PRoWMP issued for comment ahead of ETG on the 14/12/2023.
11/12/2023	ETG	Terrestrial Ecology	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project overview;</li> <li>Onshore updates;</li> <li>PEIR responses;</li> <li>Terrestrial Ecology baseline survey results;</li> <li>Priority habitats;</li> <li>ES progress;</li> <li>Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA); and</li> <li>BNG update.</li> </ul>
13/12/2023	Meeting	East Riding of Yorkshire Council Jocks Lodge / DBS: Project Update Meeting	Update meeting to discuss project updates. Potential ducting proposals were discussed.
13/12/2023	ETG Meeting	Flood Risk and Geology	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project design update;</li> <li>Flood risk and hydrology – PEIR comments and ES updates;</li> <li>Outline Drainage Strategy; and</li> <li>Geology and Land Quality– PEIR comments and ES updates.</li> </ul>
14/12/2023	ETG Meeting	Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and Access	The following topics were discussed during the ETG:

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project update;</li> <li>Land Use assessment in relation to PRow;</li> <li>Tourism and Recreation Assessment in relation to PRow;</li> <li>Draft PRowMP (issued in advance); and</li> <li>S42 comments on PRow.</li> </ul>
18/01/2024	Email	Traffic and Transport	Issue of meeting notes from 08/09/2023 and Agreement Log
19/12/2023	ETG Meeting	Human Health	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project update; and</li> <li>Development of agreement with regard to methods, study area, and scope of ES Human Health assessment.</li> </ul>
26/01/2024	ETG Meeting	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project update;</li> <li>LVIA;</li> <li>Photomontages;</li> <li>Landscape Management Plan; and</li> <li>Approach to construction assessment along the cable corridor.</li> </ul>
01/02/2024	Email	LVIA comments from East Riding of Yorkshire Council	Email request from Bill Blackledge following the ETG on the 26/07 requesting further clarification on presented photomontages and earthworks.
07/02/2024	Meeting	East Riding of Yorkshire Council Jocks Lodge / DBS: Project Update Meeting	Presentation of DBS's initial design concepts for a ducted solution to cross the Jocks Lodge Improvement Scheme. Discussion on engineering, environmental and land considerations.
14/02/2024	Email	Onshore Cumulative Impact Assessment	Provision of Onshore CEA Longlist / Figure of Cumulative Schemes, for East Riding of Yorkshire Council feedback and approval.
26/07/2024	Email	LVIA comments from East Riding of Yorkshire Council	Response provided to comments raised on the 01/02/2024 on LVIA to Bill Blackledge.

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
27/02/2024	Email	East Riding of Yorkshire Council Jocks Lodge / DBS	Confirmation via email that DBS has considered the constraints and opportunities around a ducted crossing of the Jocks Lodge Scheme and will not be progressing with the early ducting solution due to potential programme risks.
27/02/2024	ETG Meeting	Traffic and Transport	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update; and</li> <li>• Comments on the draft Traffic and Transport ES Chapter and <b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP)</b> [AS-020] (circulated prior to meeting).</li> </ul>
14/03/2024	ETG Meeting	Noise and Air Quality	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update;</li> <li>• Review of ES Assessments including proposed mitigation; and</li> <li>• Review of Agreement Log.</li> </ul>
14/03/2024	ETG Meeting	Onshore PRow and Access	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update;</li> <li>• Comments on the draft PRow Strategy and agreement of updates to be made;</li> <li>• Details of the proposed permanent diversion; and</li> <li>• Agreement logs.</li> </ul>
15/03/2024	ETG Meeting	LVIA	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update;</li> <li>• Comments on the draft Landscape management plan; and</li> <li>• Agreement logs.</li> </ul>
15/03/2024	Email	Issue of draft Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and draft	Issue of Hydrology and Flood risk draft embedded mitigation for comment and the draft FRA.

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
		embedded mitigation	
15/03/2024	Email	PRoW – permanent diversion	Email from the definitive mapping team confirming the minor PRoW diversion for Walkington Footpath No.4 should be permanent.
19/03/2024	ETG Meeting	Onshore Historic Environment	The meeting covered the Setting Assessment at the Scheduled Butt Farm Heavy Anti-Aircraft Gunsite, survey updates and feedback on ES Chapter and <b>Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)</b> [APP-239].
19/03/2024	Email	LVIA – Jock’s lodge photos	Additional photos received from Bill Blackledge of the Jock’s lodge landscaping works.
19/03/2024	ETG Meeting	Terrestrial Ecology	The following topics were discussed during the ETG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update;</li> <li>• Terrestrial Ecology ES chapter update;</li> <li>• Ecological Mitigation; and</li> <li>• Agreement logs.</li> </ul>
20/03/2024	ETG Meeting	Flood Risk and Geology ETG	The following topics were discussed during the ETG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update;</li> <li>• Flood Risk and Hydrology ES chapter update;</li> <li>• FRA update;</li> <li>• Geology and Land Quality ES chapter update; and</li> <li>• Agreement logs.</li> </ul>
25/03/2024	ETG Meeting	Human Health	The following topics were discussed during the ETG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scope, methodology and findings of the Human Health ES Chapter;</li> <li>• Update of Local Liaison Committee meetings; and</li> <li>• Presentation of Agreement Log.</li> </ul>

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
28/03/2024	Email	Noise	Issue of meeting minutes from ETG 14/03/2024 and agreement log.
28/03/2024	Email	Air Quality	Issue of meeting minutes from ETG 14/03/2024 and agreement log.
28/03/2024	Email	Onshore Historic Environment	Issue of meeting minutes from ETG 19/03/2024 and agreement log.
26/03/2024	Meeting	PRoW – Permanent diversion	<p>The following topics were discussed during the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PRoWMP;</li> <li>• Walkington Footpath No.4 minro permanent diversion; and</li> <li>• What detail should be included in the Draft DCO.</li> </ul>
02/04/2024	Email	Human Health	Issue of meeting minutes from ETG 25/03/2024 and agreement log.
03/04/2024	Email	Terrestrial Ecology	Issue of meeting minutes from ETG 19/03/2024 and agreement log.
03/04/2024	Email	PRoW and Access	Issue of meeting minutes from ETG 14/03/2024 and agreement log.
05/04/2024	Email	LVIA comments	<p>Request to review the Jock's Lodge mitigation proposals and request for additional photomontage.</p> <p>Request for 3D model.</p>
05/04/2024	Email	Flood Risk and Hydrology	Issue of draft Flood Risk & Hydrology and Geology & Land Quality agreement logs and meeting minutes from ETG 20/03/2024.
05/04/2024	Email	LVIA	Issue of draft LVIA agreement logs and meeting minutes from ETG 15/03/2024.
09/04/2024	Email	Draft DCO requirements and ETG agenda	Issue of the Draft DCO requirements for review by East Riding of Yorkshire Council, and proposed agenda for meeting 25/04.
25/04/2024	Meeting	Pre-submission project update meeting	<p>The following topics were discussed during the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Update, and next steps including:</li> </ul>



Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ DCO submission timelines;</li> <li>○ LIR;</li> <li>○ Statement of Common Ground; and</li> <li>○ East Riding of Yorkshire Council feedback on Draft DCO requirements.</li> </ul>
20/05/2024	Email	Draft DCO requirements	Comments received from East Riding of Yorkshire Council on the Draft DCO requirements.
23/05/2024	Email	DCO Documents	Request for plans to be sent for LIR and method of data transfer. The applicant responded the same day to ask if SharePoint would be a suitable method to share files prior to publication on the PINS website. East Riding of Yorkshire Council agreed to test a link.
13/06/2024	Email	Submission of DCO and Draft DCO requirements	Link to SharePoint with early document access issued, however this was not accessed by East Riding of Yorkshire Council and response to comments on the Draft DCO requirements with a request to discuss further as part of the SoCG process.
<b>Post – Application</b>			
01/07/2024	Email	PPA	Request for confirmation that the PPA is sufficient to cover the work going forward through submission/ examination.
12/07/2024	Email	DCO submission	Request for meeting to discuss DCO submission, as in person in Beverley. No response received.
26/07/2024	Email	DCO submission	Request for meeting to discuss DCO submission and PPA.
07/08/2024	Meeting	Project Update - New Planning officer	Meeting with new planning officer [Graham Varley] to introduce the Project and the DCO process.
20/08/2024	Email	RR/SoCG	Request for a meeting to discuss SoCG and early sight of RR, if available

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
09/09/2024	Meeting	SoCG	Meeting with Planning officer to review the likely DCO programme and agree meeting to discuss RR w/c 30/09/2024 or 07/10/2024.
11/09/2024	Phone Call	SoCG	Phone call with Russell Gladstone (RG) to review Flood Risk and Hydrology section of the SoCG and RG confirmed he had no comments or concerns at that stage [no further comments have been received].
16/09/2024	Email	RR	Copy of the RR received from planning officer [not submitted formally to PINS].
16/09/2024	Email	LVIA	RR comments on LVIA received from Bill Blackledge, 2B Landscape Consultancy (on behalf of East Riding of Yorkshire Council). The detailed comments are set out in <b>Table 5-1</b> .
25/09/2024	Email	SoCG	The Applicants issued a draft of the SoCG to East Riding of Yorkshire Council ahead of the SoCG and RR meeting.
30/09/2024	Email	SoCG	RR comments on Terrestrial Ecology received from East Riding of Yorkshire Council. The detailed comments are set out in <b>Table 5-2</b> .
02/10/2024	Meeting	SoCG and RR Meeting	<p>The following topics were discussed during the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DCO Examination Update;</li> <li>• Statement of Common Ground;</li> <li>• Next Steps;</li> <li>• Relevant Representation;</li> <li>• LVIA; and</li> <li>• Nature Conservation.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicants requested that East Riding of Yorkshire Council return comments on the SoCG post this meeting.</p>
03/10/2024	Email	Request for Traffic and Transport Engagement on the SoCG	Email from the Applicants to Jason Shakesby outlining the SoCG process, stating his contact has been given for Traffic and

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
			Transport matters, and requesting a meeting to discuss the SoCG.
11/10/2024	Email	East Riding of Yorkshire Council SoCG Comments	Andrew Chudley confirmed his general agreement with the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [AS-094]</b> , but noted there is no mention of who is responsible for advertising, signing, and consulting with local interested parties for temporary diversions.
14/10/2024	Email	East Riding of Yorkshire Council SoCG Comments	Jonathan Tait confirmed his agreement that all Air Quality and Geology and Land Quality matters are 'agreed' as set out in the draft SoCG and that he had no comments regarding air quality or contaminated land.
16/10/2024	Email	East Riding of Yorkshire Council SoCG Comments	Jonathan Smith confirmed his agreement that all Noise matters are 'agreed' as set out in the draft SoCG.
16/10/2024	Email	East Riding of Yorkshire Council SoCG Comments	Graham Varley confirmed his agreement that all General matters are 'agreed' as set out in the draft SoCG, and that the wording added around Socioeconomics is acceptable.
17/10/2024	Email	East Riding of Yorkshire Council SoCG Comments	Jennifer Woollin confirmed her agreement with the status of Terrestrial Ecology matters as set out in the draft SoCG.
17/10/2024	Email	East Riding of Yorkshire Council SoCG Comments	Bill Blackledge confirmed his agreement with the status of LVIA matters as set out in the draft SoCG.
30/10/2024	Email	Request for Traffic and Transport Engagement on the SoCG	The Applicants requested Jason Shakesby's availability for a meeting on the SoCG to discuss Traffic and Transport matters.
04/11/2024	Email	Traffic and Transport Comments	Jason Shakesby responded to the Applicants' emails that he provided his response to Traffic and Transport matters to Graham Varley on the 21 <sup>st</sup> October 2024.

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
15/11/2024	Email	Examination Update and Change Request	The Applicants informed East Riding of Yorkshire Council making them aware of the Project Change Request 2 – Onshore Substation Zone and that a revised draft Timetable should be published in December.
21/11/2024	Meeting	Change Request 2 Briefing	<p>The following topics were discussed during the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Consent Order Examination;</li> <li>• Project Change Request 1 and 2;</li> <li>• Local Impact Report;</li> <li>• Statement of Common Ground;</li> <li>• Next Steps; and</li> <li>• Traffic and Transport Discussion.</li> </ul>
21/11/2024	Email	Traffic and Transport	The Applicants shared the Traffic and Transport Agreement Log and rev 01 of the SoCG with Jason Shakesby, Mike Brown, and Terry Weaver.
23/11/2024	Email	Traffic and Transport	The Applicants provided .kmz files of the onshore substation access, construction access, and construction crossings to Jason Shakesby at his request.
26/11/2024	Email	Traffic and Transport	The Applicants provided .kmz files of the onshore substation access, construction access, and construction crossings to Mike Brown and Terry Weaver at East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
02/12/2024	Email	Meeting Minutes	The Applicants issued the minutes of the 21/11/2024 meeting and asked Jason Shakesby, Mike Brown, and Terry Weaver to confirm if they have the information they need to comment on the SoCG.
06/12/2024	Email	Traffic and Transport Comments on the SoCG	Jason Shakesby set out that it appears that a way forward on all Traffic and Transport matters was agreed before his involvement, and suggested the SoCG is updated to reflect

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
			who agreed these matters and is circulated to them for agreement.
19/12/2024	Email	SoCG and Hearings	The Applicants issued a revised draft of the SoCG to East Riding of Yorkshire Council, outlined key issues, and requested comments. The new <b>Rule 6 Letter</b> [PD-010] was linked and hearings outlined.
20/12/2024	Email	SoCG and Protective Provisions	The Applicants shared the new <b>Rule 6 Letter</b> [PD-010] with East Riding of Yorkshire Council and asked Russell Gladstone if he could confirm his agreement with the Protective Provisions set out in Schedule 15, Part 4 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] as set out in the SoCG.
02/01/2025	Email	SoCG	Russell Gladstone confirmed he had no further comments or issues to raise on the SoCG and offered the Applicants a phone call. He confirmed neither him nor Howard Johnson would be attending Issue Specific Hearing 2.
07/01/2025	Meeting	DCO Meeting	The Applicants met with East Riding of Yorkshire Council to discuss issues relating to the Preliminary Meeting and the Issue Specific Hearing agenda.
07/01/2025	Email	Local Impact Report	The Applicants requested East Riding of Yorkshire Council's availability to discuss the Applicant's feedback on the Local Impact Report.
09/01/2025	Email	LVIA	East Riding of Yorkshire Council provided comments on the LVIA section of the SoCG.
10/01/2025	Email	SoCG	The Applicants followed up with East Riding of Yorkshire Council to ask for confirmation on whether any further comments were anticipated on the revised draft of the SoCG.

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
27/01/2025	Meeting	Local Impact Report	The Applicants and East Riding of Yorkshire Council met to discuss the Applicant's feedback on the LIR.
28/01/2025	Email	SoCG	The Applicants shared the version of the SoCG to be submitted at Deadline 1 with East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
29/01/2025	Email	SoCG	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement with the SoCG submitted at Deadline 1.
21/02/2025	Email	LIR Meeting & SoCG	The Applicants shared the minutes from the 27/01 meeting and let East Riding of Yorkshire Council know they would be in touch soon regarding the SoCG.
03/03/2025	Email	OCocP wording – construction working hours	The Applicants contacted East Riding of Yorkshire Council to discuss their Deadline 3 Response [REP3-037] regarding working hours (NV1.1) and to suggest the OCocP is updated with East Riding of Yorkshire Council's preferred wording for Section 5.2
03/03/2025	Email	OCocP wording – construction working hours	East Riding of Yorkshire Council responded to state that the Applicants' proposed wording change to section 5.2 of the OCocP was acceptable and would resolve their concerns.
11/03/2025	Email	Skipsea Drain	The Applicants asked East Riding of Yorkshire Council to ask what Skipsea Drain was designated for and by whom to then be able to classify its sensitivity, and shared relevant mapping.
13/03/2025	Email	Skipsea Drain	Graham Varley let the Applicants know that their policy team believed the Drain had been included erroneously.
17/03/2025	Email	Skipsea Drain	The Applicants confirmed that the society that designated the Regionally Important Geodiversity Sites agree that they have never designated Skipsea Drain.

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
20/03/2025	Email	Onshore Archaeology Meeting	The Applicants requested a meeting with East Riding of Yorkshire Council to discuss the outstanding matters in the SoCG regarding Onshore Archaeology.
24/03/2025	Email	Onshore Archaeology Meeting	A meeting invitation was sent by the Applicants for the 28/03/2025.
26/03/2025	Email	LVIA Meeting	The Applicants shared the updated SoCG and requested a meeting with East Riding of Yorkshire Council to discuss the outstanding matters in the SoCG regarding LVIA.
28/03/2025	Meeting	Archaeology Meeting	The Applicants met with Humber Archaeology Partnership and East Riding of Yorkshire Council to discuss the respective parties SoCGs.
03/04/2025	Meeting	LVIA Meeting	The Applicants met with East Riding of Yorkshire Council to discuss their responses to the ExA's First Written Questions at Deadline 3 and the outstanding matters in the SoCG regarding LVIA.
04/04/2025	Email	LVIA Meeting	Email issued with links to key application documents discussed at the meeting on the 03/04/2025 and signposting to sections which had been updated during the examination, ahead of the Issue Specific Hearing on the 8 <sup>th</sup> April.
04/04/2025	Email	SoCG Issue for LVIA Matters	The Applicants issued a draft revision 02 of the SoCG to the East Riding of Yorkshire Council LVIA team for their comments.
08/04/2025	Email	Design and Access Statement Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicants received an email from the East Riding of Yorkshire Council Planning Officer with comments on the wording of the DAS ahead of ISH 4. Comments included:</li> <li>Need for the design champion and panel to be independent</li> </ul>

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that East Riding of Yorkshire Council are included in drawing up of the terms of reference for the review (or have membership in the panel)</li> <li>Without confirmation that the panel is independent concern that no Design Council Review is proposed.</li> </ul>
08/04/2025	Email	Traffic and Transport	The Applicants emailed Jason Shakesby to confirm that he agrees that a Travel Plan separate to the OCTMP is not required.
15/04/2025	Email	SoCG	The Applicants issued the SoCG and requested comments or confirmation of agreement by 22/04/2025.
22/04/2025	Email	SoCG	The Applicants reminded East Riding of Yorkshire Council they required their comments by close of play.
22/04/2025	Email	SoCG	East Riding of Yorkshire Council returned comments on the SoCG.
24/04/2025	Email	SoCG	The Applicants returned the SoCG and let East Riding of Yorkshire Council know this would be the version submitted at Deadline 4.
24/04/2025	Email	SoCG	Bill Blackledge confirmed his agreement with the SoCG and noted he would prefer to see a ring of planting all around the substation as a matter of principle, agreed that that no obvious receptor would benefit in that direction.
30/04/2025	Email	Traffic and Transport	The Applicants followed up from their 8 <sup>th</sup> April 2025 email regarding the Travel Plan.
14/05/2025	Email	Traffic and Transport	The Applicants followed up from their 8 <sup>th</sup> April and 14 <sup>th</sup> May 2025 emails regarding the Travel Plan.



Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
15/05/2025	Meeting	Second Written Questions	The Applicants met to discuss their responses to Second Written Questions with East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
15/05/2025	Email	Traffic and Transport	Scott Richardson responded to the Applicants' previous emails and confirmed a meeting.
19/05/2025	Email	Meeting Minutes	The Applicants issued the minutes from the 15 <sup>th</sup> May 2025 meeting.
23/05/2025	Email	ExQ2s	East Riding of Yorkshire Council let the Applicants know that they were sending their responses to ExQ2s that say, and that these were based on the meeting of the 15 <sup>th</sup> May 2025, for which the minutes were agreed.
27/05/2025	Meeting	Traffic and Transport	The Applicants and East Riding of Yorkshire Council met to discuss the Travel Plan and Outline Traffic Management Plan.
03/06/2025	Meeting	Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	<p>The Applicants met with East Riding of Yorkshire Council to discuss ISH6 action points relating to heritage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects of vibration on heritage assets;</li> <li>• Recommendations of the Phase 2 Archaeological trial trenching report;</li> <li>• Effects of potential hydrological change on archaeological heritage assets;</li> <li>• Onshore Converter Station Access</li> </ul> <p>The Applicants and East Riding of Yorkshire Council also discussed the assessed magnitude of harm to the significance of the scheduled Heay AA gun site at Butt Farm.</p>
05/06/2025	Email	Traffic and Transport	The Applicants shared the updated section regarding the Travel Plan of the <b>OCTMP (Revision 4)</b> [REP6-041] with tracked changes. Scott Richards at East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed the updated wording satisfied his comments.

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
10/06/2025	Email	Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	The Applicants requested feedback on R17.16 from Issue Specific Hearing 6. Feedback was provided from East Riding of Yorkshire Council on 10 <sup>th</sup> May 2025.
10/06/2025	Email	R17 .47 response	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement of the protective provisions for Drainage Authorities.
12/06/2025	Email	Meeting Request	The Applicants requested a meeting to close the remaining under discussion matters in the SoCG.
12/06/2025	Email	SoCG Sign-off Process	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed that the case officer will sign the SoCG.
12/06/2025	Email	R17.13 response	Query from East Riding of Yorkshire Council on the 28 day review period wording in the DAS. The Applicants responded to confirm the wording requested would be added to the DAS and shared with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council and could be agreed in the SoCG at DL8.
18/06/2025	Meeting	SoCG	The Applicants and East Riding of Yorkshire Council met to discuss the final outstanding matters in the SoCG.
19/06/2025	Email	LVIA	Bil Blackledge confirmed his agreement with the location of Viewpoint 6 and confirmed that a visualisation is not required from this viewpoint.
24/06/2025	Email	SoCG	The Applicants issued Revision 3 of the SoCG alongside the updated Chapter 23 (Revision 2) and Design and Access Statement (Revision 3).
01/07/2025	Email	SoCG	East Riding of Yorkshire Council returned minor comments on the heritage section of the SoCG and asked for some clarifying information on the Onshore Converter Station access road.

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
01/07/2025	Email	SoCG	The Applicants returned the SoCG with the minor amendment to the heritage section and answered East Riding of Yorkshire Council's query regarding the Onshore Converter Station access road.
02/07/2025	Email	SoCG	East Riding of Yorkshire Council returned the signed SoCG with two not agreed matters remaining.

## 3 Agreement Log

### 3.1 Overview

17. The following sections of this SoCG summarise the level of agreement between the parties for each relevant onshore and offshore topic.
18. To easily identify whether a matter is 'agreed', 'not agreed' or 'under discussion', a colour coding system of, red, amber, green, is used respectively within the 'position status colour' column as set out in **Table 3-1**.
19. Where a matter is 'not agreed' or 'under discussion' further detail is provided in section 3.13.

**Table 3-1 - Agreement logs position status key**

Position Status	Position Status Colour
The matter is considered to be agreed between the parties.	Agreed
The matter is neither 'agreed' or 'not agreed' and is a matter where further discussion is required between the parties, for example where relevant documents are being prepared or reviewed.	Under discussion
The matter is not agreed between the parties, however the outcome of the approach taken by either the Applicants or East Riding of Yorkshire Council is not considered to result in a material impact to the assessment conclusions. Discussions have concluded.	Not agreed – No material impact
The matter is not agreed between the parties and the outcome of the approach taken by either the Applicants or East Riding of Yorkshire Council is considered to result in a materially different outcome on the assessment conclusions.	Not agreed – Material impact

## 3.2 General

Table 3-2 - General Topics agreed or not agreed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
Consultation			
1.	<p>The Applicants have adequately consulted with East Riding of Yorkshire Council throughout all stages of the Projects to date and the summary of Consultation (section 2.2 of this SoCG) is a fair and accurate record of pre-application consultation.</p> <p>Section 2 of this document evidences the engagement and consultation process between the Parties. It is the Applicants' position that East Riding of Yorkshire Council have been appropriately engaged throughout the Application process by the Applicants.</p>	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (16/10/2024) that this matter is agreed.	
2.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council have been adequately consulted on the Project Change Request 2 – Onshore Substation Zone which was provided to East Riding of Yorkshire Council as part of a targeted non-statutory consultation exercise on 14 <sup>th</sup> November 2024 by the Applicants.	Project Change Request 2 was accepted by the ExA on 21/01/2025.	
Planning Policy			
3.	The <b>Planning Statement</b> [APP-226] and <b>Policy Compliance Assessment Tables</b> [APP-227] have considered the relevant planning policy for the Projects.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (16/10/2024) that this matter is agreed.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
Need for the Project			
4.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council agree that the need case for the Projects set out in <b>Chapter 2 Need for the Project</b> [APP-065] is adequate and appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (16/10/2024) that this matter is agreed.	
Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives			
5.	The site selection and route refinement outlined in <b>Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives</b> [AS-017] has properly considered the alternatives for the relevant elements of the Projects.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Onshore Ecology and Ornithology – Pre-Scoping (14/09/2021) and Onshore Historic Environment (05/12/2023) ETGs that they agree with the approach taken to site selection.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in an email (16/10/2024) that this matter is agreed.</p>	
6.	The rationale for the placement of the Onshore Substation Zone as set out in <b>Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives</b> [AS-017] is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they agree with the rationale behind the Onshore Substation Zone placement.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in an email (16/10/2024) that this matter is agreed.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
DCO			
7.	The draft Requirements No's. 1, 8 to 30 and 32 to 35 are agreed in <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120], Schedule 2, Part 1. Please note, those specific to topics are listed in the relevant sections.	<p>Comments were provided by East Riding of Yorkshire Council on the 20/05/2024, minor updates to the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] were made prior to submission.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed by email on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2025 and in the meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> June 2025 that no further updates were made. East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed their agreement with the draft DCO protective provisions at the 20<sup>th</sup> June 2025 meeting.</p>	
	<p>Requirement 9 - Detailed design parameters onshore (p.61).</p> <p>This requirement means the Applicants must provide all of the information listed in requirement 9 to the East Riding of Yorkshire Council prior to construction, we have not specified the document structure but are happy to discuss the practicalities of this.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council queried in an email 13/06/2024 "<i>Does this need to be within an overall framework?</i>"</p> <p>Agreed with Graham Varley by email on the 16/10/2024.</p>	
	<p>Requirement 20 - Construction hours for the onshore work</p> <p>This Requirement has been updated to state 'public holidays'.</p> <p>This matter was discussed during the 27/01/2025 meeting. The construction working hours of 7am to 7pm were discussed at the Noise, Air Quality and Traffic and Transport ETGs. Measures are</p>	<p>This matter was raised in East Riding of Yorkshire Council's <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007] (7.76) and further discussed during the 27/01/2025 meeting, where East Riding of Yorkshire Council agreed with the 7am-7pm working hours. It was agreed a Section 61 agreement</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	included in the <b>Outline CTMP</b> [AS-020] and the <b>Outline CoCP</b> [AS-094] to manage construction works so that there are no significant effects on local residents during these working hours. Any comments from East Riding of Yorkshire Council attendees have been incorporated into these documents, where possible.	would be sought for more sensitive areas, and potentially extended working hours in areas where no impact can be demonstrated on residents (subject to agreement with East Riding of Yorkshire Council).	
	Requirement 27 - Onshore decommissioning (p.67).  The DCO ensures that the Applicants have a legal obligation to submit an onshore decommissioning plan, within 6 months of the end of operations.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council queried in an email 13/06/2024 <i>"I am not sure the timescales work here. Once work has ceased, what interest would the developer have as they will have walked away."</i>  Agreed with Graham Varley by email on the 16/10/2024.	
	Requirement 29 - Contaminated land and groundwater scheme (p.68).  This requirement ensures a contaminated land and groundwater scheme is undertaken prior to the commencement of works. The detail of the scheme would need to be agreed with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council prior to construction and will be determined by the detailed design.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council queried in an email 13/06/2024 <i>"I am not sure that this is clear in terms of assessing what is required?"</i>  Agreed with Graham Varley by email on the 16/10/2024.	
	Requirement 33 - Onshore monitoring plan (p.69).  This is currently envisaged be limited to potential groundwater, ground gas and flood defence monitoring, as detailed in section 6.2.2.7 and 6.3.2.7 of the <b>Outline CoCP</b> [AS-094]. If any further	East Riding of Yorkshire Council queried in an email 13/06/2024 <i>"In terms of public protection it was considered that the hours of operation were overly generous with a 7 to 7 start. Also,</i>	



SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	monitoring is identified as being required following construction, we (the Applicants) would need to agree a plan with East Riding of Yorkshire Council.	<i>being pedantic it excludes bank holidays but not public holidays."</i> Agreed with Graham Varley by email on the 16/10/2024.	
	Requirement 34 - Amendments to approved details (p.69) This only covers, any future amendments to the DCO. Post consent.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council queried in an email 13/06/2024 <i>"I don't understand what this is to cover?"</i> Agreed with Graham Varley by email on the 16/10/2024.	
<b>Compulsory Acquisition</b>			
8.	<p>The information in <b>Book of Reference (BoR)</b> [AS-043] in relation to the interests of East Riding of Yorkshire Council is correct, and East Riding of Yorkshire Council have no additional interests in the Order land.</p> <p>The Applicants are in discussion with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council and seeking voluntary commercial agreements for land identified in the BoR, there is one area of land owned by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council that the Applicants are seeking clarity on in relation to the A164 &amp; Jocks Lodge Improvement Scheme development and its current ownership status.</p>	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (16/10/2024) that this matter is agreed.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
Project Design – Crossing of newly aligned A164 and Jocks Lodge Junction			
9.	The Projects' interaction with the A164 & Jocks Lodge Improvement Scheme has been discussed with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council Jocks Lodge team at a number of meetings as outlined in <b>Table 2-1</b> . The meetings have covered project interactions such as project design, drainage, utilities, landscaping, potential construction and operational accesses. Options to install ducts for the Projects, whilst the Jocks Lodge construction works were under way, were considered before ultimately being discounted due to potential programming risks. A good working relationship is in place and a mutually agreeable crossing of the newly aligned A164 and Jocks Lodge Improvement Scheme is expected to be agreed.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (16/10/2024) that this matter is agreed.	
Chapter 21 – Land Use			
10.	The outcomes of the Land Use assessment and the relevant mitigation have been reviewed East Riding of Yorkshire Council, as required by the Examining Authority (ExA) are agreed including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The only significant impact is on the permanent loss of agricultural at the Substation Zone (major adverse).</li> <li>Residual impacts to changes in land use and agri-environmental schemes during operation have been assessed as potentially major adverse (significant), at the Substation Zone as the total permanent land take associated with the Substation Zone for the Projects is approximately 33ha (based on two Onshore</li> </ul>	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (16/10/2024) that this matter is agreed.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	Converter Stations, landscaped areas, access route and drainage requirements). The significance of effect in relation to the loss of agricultural land during the operation of the Projects cannot be reduced as the land would be unavailable for use in the medium to long-term. However, it should be noted, that following completion of construction, land within the Onshore Substation Zone will be returned to agriculture, as shown in the <b>Outline Landscape Management Plan</b> [AS-096].		
<b>Chapter 28 - Socioeconomics</b>			
11.	The outcomes of the Socioeconomics assessment and the relevant mitigation have been reviewed East Riding of Yorkshire Council, as required by the ExA and are agreed.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (16/10/2024) that this matter is agreed.	
<b>Project Change Request 2 – Onshore Substation Zone</b>			
12.	<b>Project Change Request 2: Onshore Substation Zone</b> [AS-152] is appropriate and acceptable.	In their response to the Applicants' request for comments on Project Change Request 2, East Riding of Yorkshire Council commented: " <i>The initial assessment in the Project Change Request 2, at 3.6. 99, that there would be "no new or different Landscape and Visual related likely significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposed change", is noted. We concur with this general view.</i> "	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		After discussion on East Riding of Yorkshire Council's landscape comments at the 28/03/2025 and 03/04/2025 meetings, East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement on this matter in an email 22/04/2025.	

### 3.3 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology

Table 3-3 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
EIA – Planning and Policy			
13.	All relevant plans and policies have been identified in section 18.4.1 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] and these have been appropriately considered in the assessment.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
EIA – Baseline Environment			
14.	The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in of the Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology risks as detailed in section 18.5 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109]. Discussed and agreed in the Onshore Ecology and Ornithology – Pre-Scoping (14/09/2021) and Terrestrial Ecology (11/12/2023) ETGs.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Onshore Ecology and Ornithology – Pre-Scoping (14/09/2021) and Terrestrial Ecology (11/12/2023) ETGs they agree with the approach to categorising the baseline.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
15.	The approach to data collection detailed in section 18.4.2 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] appropriate and sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within section 18.6 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109].	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Onshore Ecology and Ornithology – Pre-Scoping ETG (14/09/2021) they agree with the data sources and approach to data collection used to characterise the baseline.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
16.	The impacts scoped in for further assessment at PEIR stage are acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Onshore Ecology and Ornithology – Pre-Scoping ETG (14/09/2021) they agree with the impacts scoped in for assessment at PEIR.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
<b>EIA – Assessment Methodology</b>			
17.	The study areas identified in section 18.3.2 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] are appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
18.	The species scoped out of the assessment in section 18.3.1 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] are appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Terrestrial Ecology ETG (19/03/2024) that they agree with the species scoped out of the assessment.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
19.	The realistic worst case scenario presented in the assessment for the development scenarios, as outlined in <b>Table 18-2</b> of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] are appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
20.	The embedded mitigation measures in <b>Table 18-4</b> of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] are appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
21.	The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, as presented in section 18.4.3 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109], provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on the Projects.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Onshore Ecology and Ornithology – Pre-Scoping ETG (14/09/2021) they agree with the approach to the Ecological Impact Assessment.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
22.	The assessment of significance presented in section 18.6 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Terrestrial Ecology ETG (19/03/2024) that they agree with the impacts scoped out that do not require further assessment. As such the impacts scoped in are agreed.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
23.	Section 18.6.1 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during construction.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
24.	Section 18.6.2 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during operation.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
25.	The assessment of cumulative effects, as detailed in section 18.8 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] is consistent with the agreed methodologies.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
<b>EIA - Assessment Conclusions</b>			
26.	The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in in section 18.6 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] are appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
27.	The conclusions and outcomes of the BNG Strategy detailed in <b>Appendix 18-10 BNG Strategy</b> [APP-157] are appropriate and acceptable.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Terrestrial Ecology ETG (19/03/2024) that they agree with the outcomes out the BNG assessment.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	



SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
EIA – Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) Conclusions			
28.	The conclusions of the CEA as detailed in section 18.8 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring			
29.	The <b>Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP)</b> [AS-114] includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Projects on ecological receptors.  Requirement 12 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit a EMP to the planning authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.	Comments were provided on the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] requirements by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council on this on the 20/05/2024 and detailed in <b>Table 3-14</b> .  This matter was discussed and agreed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council at the 02/10/2024 meeting.	
30.	The additional mitigation set out in section 18.6 of <b>Chapter 18 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</b> [AS-109] regarding bats is acceptable and appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology ETG (19/03/2024) that they agree with the proposed mitigation for bats.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
31.	Requirement 23 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] that states no phase of the onshore works may commence until final pre-construction survey work for protected species has been carried out and a European protected species licence has been granted by the relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Body (SNCB) [Natural England] is acceptable and appropriate.	Comments were provided on the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] requirements by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council on this on the 20/05/2024.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the 27/01/2025 meeting that they are satisfied that the wording the Applicants updated the <b>Draft Development Consent Order (Revision 3)</b> [AS-121] with, and that this matter is agreed.	
32.	The outcomes of the biodiversity assessment set out in <b>Appendix 18-10 BNG Strategy</b> [APP-157] are agreed and Requirement 32 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit a revised BNG strategy, based on the final design to the planning authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.  This will be developed as part of the detailed BNG strategy. We will be developing options for onsite and offsite BNG units. As the Projects are a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, they are not legally required to achieve a +10% net gain. We are looking at options to achieve no net loss and a net gain, where possible. As detailed in <b>Appendix 18-10 BNG Strategy</b> [APP-157].	Comments were provided on the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] requirements by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council on this on the 20/05/2024.  This matter was discussed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council in the 02/10/2024 meeting and agreed.  Jennifer Woollin further confirmed in the 18 <sup>th</sup> June 2025 SoCG meeting that she agreed with the <b>Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy (Revision 2)</b> [REP5-015].	

## 3.4 Geology and Land Quality

Table 3-4 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Geology and Land Quality

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
EIA – Planning and Policy			
33.	All relevant plans and policies have been identified in section 19.4.1 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158] and these have been appropriately considered in the assessment.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
EIA – Baseline Environment			
34.	The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in of the Geology and Land Quality risks as detailed in section 19.6 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158]. Discussed and agreed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETG (13/12/2023).	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETG (13/12/2023) that they agree with the characterisation and coverage of the baseline environment.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
35.	Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within section 19.6 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158].	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
<b>EIA – Assessment Methodology</b>			
36.	The study areas identified in section 19.3.2 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158] are appropriate.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETG (13/12/2023) that they agree with the study area coverage.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
37.	The realistic worst case scenario presented in the assessment for the development scenarios, as outlined in Table 19-1 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158] are appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
38.	The embedded mitigation measures in Table 19-3 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158] are appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
39.	The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, as presented in section 19.4.3 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158], provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on the Projects.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETG (13/12/2023) that they agree with the assessment methodologies, including the scope of the Hydrogeological Risk Assessment.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
40.	The assessment of significance presented in section 19.6 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158] is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p> <p>At a meeting on 15/05/2025 a meeting was held to discuss mineral resources, particularly the 'Preferred Area of Sand and Gravel' to the South of Catwick. At this meeting East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement the significance of effect should be increased to 'moderate' adverse, as no further mitigation could be committed to and the land would effectively be sterilised for the duration of the Projects operation.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
41.	Section 19.6.1 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during construction.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETGs (13/12/2023 and 20/03/2024) that they agree with the potential effects during construction.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
42.	Section 19.6.2 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during operation.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETGs (13/12/2023 and 20/03/2024) that they agree with the potential effects during construction.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
43.	The assessment of cumulative effects, as detailed in section 19.8 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158] is consistent with the agreed methodologies.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
<b>EIA - Assessment Conclusions</b>			
44.	The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in in section 19.6 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
<b>EIA – Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) Conclusions</b>			
45.	The conclusions of the CEA as detailed in section 19.8 of <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETGs (13/12/2023 and 20/03/2024) that they agree with the approach and results of the CEA.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>			
46.	The <b>Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCoCP)</b> [AS-094] includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 19 Geology and Land Quality</b> [APP-158] and is appropriate for	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	<p>managing construction impacts from the Projects on geological receptors.</p> <p>Requirement 19 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit a CoCP to the planning authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.</p>	<p>'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
47.	<p>Requirement 25 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] for the restoration of land used temporarily for construction to be approved by the planning authority post-consent is appropriate.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Geology and Land Quality are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	



## 3.5 Flood Risk and Hydrology

Table 3-5 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Flood Risk and Hydrology

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
EIA – Planning and Policy			
48.	All relevant plans and policies have been identified in section 20.4.1 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] and these have been appropriately considered in the assessment.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
EIA – Baseline Environment			
49.	The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in of the Flood Risk and Hydrology risks as detailed in section 20.5 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163]. Discussed and agreed in the Water Resources – Pre -Scoping (17/09/2021) ETG.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Water Resources – Pre-Scoping (17/09/2021) and Flood Risk and Geology (13/12/2023) ETGs that they agree with the approach to characterising the baseline.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
50.	Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within section 20.6 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163].	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Water Resources – Pre-Scoping (17/09/2021) ETG they agree with the approach to data collection and data sources used.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.</p>	
51.	The impacts scoped in for further assessment detailed in section 20.3.1 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] are appropriate.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Water Resources – Pre-Scoping (17/09/2021) ETG they agree with the impacts scoped in for further assessment.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.</p>	
<b>EIA – Assessment Methodology</b>			
52.	The study areas identified in section 20.3.2 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] are appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology (13/12/2023) ETG that they agree with the study areas identified.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
53.	The realistic worst case scenario presented in the assessment for the development scenarios, as outlined in Table 20-1 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] are appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
54.	The embedded mitigation measures in Table 20-3 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] are appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
55.	The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, as presented in section 20.4.3 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163], provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on the Projects.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Water Resources – Pre-Scoping (17/09/2021) and Flood Risk and Geology (13/12/2023) ETGs that they agree with the approach to the impact assessment methodologies.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
56.	The assessment of significance presented in section 20.6 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
57.	Section 20.6.1 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during construction.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
58.	Section 20.6.2 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during operation.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
59.	The assessment of cumulative effects, as detailed in section 20.8 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] is consistent with the agreed methodologies.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
60.	The Crossing methodology for Flood Risk and Hydrology assets detailed in the <b>Obstacle Crossing Register</b> [APP-074] is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETGs (13/12/2023 &amp; 20/03/2024) that they agree with the Crossing methodology.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.</p>	
<b>EIA - Assessment Conclusions</b>			
61.	The Receptors identified in section 20.6 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] are appropriate.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETG (13/12/2023) that they agree with the Receptors identified.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.</p>	
62.	The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in in section 20.6 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in a phone conversation with the Applicants (11/09/2024) that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
63.	The additional mitigation set out in section 20.6.1 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETG (20/03/2024) that they agree with the proposed mitigation.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.</p>	
<b>EIA – CEA Conclusions</b>			
64.	The conclusions of the CEA as detailed in section 20.8 of <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETG (13/12/2023) that they agree with the outcomes of the CEA.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.</p>	
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>			
65.	The Protective Provisions set out in Schedule 15, Part 4 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] for the protection of the drainage of the authorities are considered appropriate and that they agree to	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	the disapplication of the parts of the Land Drainage Act 1991 specified in Article 6 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120].	no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.  This was also confirmed by the ERYC by email on the 10 <sup>th</sup> June 2025.	
66.	The <b>Outline CoCP</b> [AS-094] includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 20 Flood Risk and Hydrology</b> [APP-163] and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Projects on flood risk and hydrology receptors.  Requirement 19 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit a CoCP to the planning authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETG (13/12/2023) that they agree with the proposed mitigation measures.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
67.	The <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> [AS-098] includes sufficient clarification regarding Greenfield run-off rates and is appropriate and acceptable.  Requirement 9 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] that requires approval by the planning authority, post-consent of detailed design parameters onshore, including drainage is appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETG (20/03/2024) they agree with the Outline Drainage Strategy.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
68.	Requirement 16 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] that requires approval by the planning authority of the operational drainage strategy is appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
69.	Requirement 17 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] that requires approval by the planning authority of the Foul water drainage strategy is appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
70.	Requirement 29 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] that requires approval by the planning authority of the contaminated land and ground water scheme is appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.	
71.	The outcomes of the <b>Appendix 20-4 Flood Risk Assessment</b> [APP-168] are acceptable.	<p>The draft FRA was discussed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council in the Flood Risk and Geology ETG (20/03/2024) and no points of discussion were raised regarding the document.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.</p>	



SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
72.	The outcomes of the <b>Appendix 20-3 Water Environment Regulations Compliance Assessment (WER)</b> [AS-074] are acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETG (13/12/2023) they agree with the WER.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.</p>	
Other Matters as Required			
73.	The Works proposed to be undertaken in Flood Zones 2 and 3 are appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Flood Risk and Geology ETG (13/12/2023) that they agree with the proposed Works.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed by phone (11/09/2024) and email (02/01/2025) correspondence with the Applicants that they had no comments or concerns regarding Flood Risk and Hydrology matters.</p>	

## 3.6 PRow and Access

Table 3-6 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to PRow and Access

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
<b>EIA – Planning and Policy</b>			
74.	<p>All relevant plans and policies have been identified in section 21.4.1 of <b>Chapter 21 Land Use</b> [AS-111] in relation to PRow and cycle routes and these have been appropriately considered in the assessment.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
<b>EIA – Baseline Environment</b>			
75.	<p>The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in relation to the PRow and Access risks as detailed in section 21.5.2.3 of <b>Chapter 21 Land Use</b> [AS-111]. Discussed and agreed in the PRow and Access (14/12/2023) and Onshore PRow and Access (14/03/2024) ETGs.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the PRow and Access (14/12/2023) ETG where the baseline environment was presented that they agreed with the progress of the ES.</p>	
<b>EIA – Assessment Methodology</b>			
76.	<p>The study areas identified in section 21.3.2 of <b>Chapter 21 Land Use</b> [AS-111] are appropriate for PRow and cycle routes.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the PRow and Access (14/12/2023) and Onshore PRow</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.	and Access (14/03/2024) ETGs where the study areas were presented that they agreed with the progress of the ES.	
77.	<p>The realistic worst case scenario presented in the assessment for the development scenarios, as outlined in Table 21-1 of <b>Chapter 21 Land Use</b> [AS-111] are appropriate.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
78.	<p>The embedded mitigation measures in Table 21-3 of <b>Chapter 21 Land Use</b> [AS-111] are appropriate for PRoW and cycle routes.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
79.	The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, as presented in section 21.4.3 of <b>Chapter 21 Land Use</b> [AS-111] for PRoW and cycle routes (under Land Use), provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on the Projects.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the PRoW and Access (14/12/2023) and Onshore PRoW and Access (14/03/2024) ETGs where the assessment methodologies were presented that they agreed with the progress of the ES.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
80.	<p>The assessment of significance presented in section 21.6.1.6 of <b>Chapter 21 Land Use</b> [AS-111] for PRoW and cycle routes (Impact 6) and section 21.6.2.5 (Impact 5) are consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
81.	<p>The assessment of cumulative effects, as detailed in section 21.8 of <b>Chapter 21 Land Use</b> [AS-111] is consistent with the agreed methodologies for PRoW and cycle routes.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
<b>EIA - Assessment Conclusions</b>			
82.	<p>The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in in section 21.6 of <b>Chapter 21 Land Use</b> [AS-111] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms for PRoW and cycle routes.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the</p>		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.		
<b>EIA – CEA Conclusions</b>			
83.	The conclusions of the CEA as detailed in section 21.8 of <b>Chapter 21 Land Use</b> [AS-111] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms for PRoW and cycle routes.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Onshore PRoW and Access ETG (14/03/2024) that the Applicants are working sufficiently alongside the key scheme that interacts with the Application in relation to PRoW and Access, the Jock's Lodge Junction Improvement Scheme, to reduce impacts on Rowley Bridleway No.13. As such the key cumulative impact conclusions have been agreed.	
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>			
84.	<p>The <b>Appendix C Outline PRoWMP</b> [APP-017] of the <b>Outline CoCP</b> [AS-094] is appropriate for managing impacts to public rights of way.</p> <p>The <b>Outline PRoWMP</b> [APP-017] will be developed into a detailed Plan through agreement with East Riding of Yorkshire Council prior to construction.</p> <p>Requirement 24 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] that requires approval by the planning authority of the public rights of way management plan is appropriate.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Onshore PRoW and Access ETG (14/03/2024) that they agree with the <b>Outline PRoWMP</b> [APP-017], including temporary PRoWMP principles.</p> <p>An additional section on equestrian users and proposed control measures was confirmed by East Riding of Yorkshire Council in the Onshore PRoW and Access ETG (14/03/2024).</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed their agreement with the <b>Outline PRoWMP</b> [APP-017] as a whole in an email (09/10/2024) to the</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	<p>The Applicants have revised Appendix C of the <b>OCoCP</b> [AS-094], the <b>Outline PROWMP</b> [APP-017], submitted to the ExA at the previous Draft Deadline 2, 22<sup>nd</sup> November, to add wording to state '<i>The responsibility of advertising, signage and consulting with local user groups would be with the Principal Contractor.</i>'</p> <p>The matter of signage was agreed in the 27/01/2025 meeting between the Applicants and East Riding of Yorkshire Council.</p>	<p>Applicants but asked the following '<i>who is responsible for advertising, signing and consulting with local user groups/parish councils for the temporary stopping up/local diversions.</i>'</p>	
85.	<p>Article 11 (closure and diversion of PROW) and Schedule 5 – Part I '<i>Public Rights of Way to be temporarily closed or restricted</i>' and Part II '<i>Public Rights of Way to be permanently diverted</i>' of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] are accurate and agreed.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
<b>Other Matters as Required</b>			
86.	<p>Access to Walkington Footpath No.4 as set out in <b>Appendix C Outline PROWMP</b> [APP-017] of the <b>Outline CoCP</b> [AS-094] is appropriate and acceptable.</p> <p>The <b>Outline PROWMP</b> [APP-017] was amended to include an indicative permanent diversion including slopes after East Riding of Yorkshire Council's comments regarding the use of steps at the PROW and Access ETG (13/12/2023).</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Onshore PROW and Access ETG (14/03/2024) that they agree with the proposed access to Walkington Footpath No.4.</p> <p>In an email exchange following the Onshore PROW and Access ETG (14/03/2024) with East Riding of Yorkshire Council and a subsequent phone call on</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		<p>the 26/03/2024 it was agreed with the Definitive Map team that the Walkington Footpath No.4 proposed diversion, presented in the <b>Outline PProWMP</b> [APP-017] is 'permanent'.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed their agreement with the <b>Outline PProWMP</b> [APP-017] in an email 09/10/2024 to the Applicants.</p>	

## 3.7 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Table 3-7 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage<sup>1</sup>

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
<b>EIA – Planning and Policy</b>			
87.	<p>All relevant plans and policies have been identified in section 22.4.1 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092] and these have been appropriately considered in the assessment.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
<b>EIA – Baseline Environment</b>			
88.	<p>The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in of the Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage risks as detailed in section 22.5 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092]. Discussed and agreed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023).</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they agree with the baseline scope for the ES Development Boundary including areas that are outside the previous PEIR Development Boundary limits.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> Please note that consultation with Humber Archaeological Partnership (HAP), archaeological advisors to East Riding of Yorkshire Council, is detailed in a separate SoCG with HAP.



SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
EIA – Assessment Methodology			
89.	<p>The study areas identified in section 22.3.2 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092] are appropriate.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
90.	<p>The realistic worst case scenario presented in the assessment for the development scenarios as outlined in Table 22-1 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092] are appropriate.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
91.	<p>The embedded mitigation measures in Table 22-3 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092] are appropriate.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the</p>		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.		
92.	The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, as presented in section 22.4.3 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092], provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts of the Projects.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Historic Environment – Pre-Scoping (14/09/2021) that they agree with the approach to the EIA methodology.	
93.	The assessment of significance presented in section 22.6 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092] is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.		
94.	Section 22.6.1 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during construction, including any indirect effects arising through vibration or change to hydrology.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. East Riding of Yorkshire Council indicated their agreement at the SoCG		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	meeting on 03/06/2025. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.		
95.	<p>Section 22.6.2 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during operation, including any indirect effects arising through vibration or change to hydrology.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. East Riding of Yorkshire Council indicated their agreement at the SoCG meeting on 03/06/2025. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
96.	<p>The assessment of cumulative effects, as detailed in section 22.8 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092] is consistent with the agreed methodologies.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
97.	The impacts scoped in and assessed in section 22.6 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092] are acceptable and appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Historic Environment – Pre-Scoping ETG	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		(14/09/2021) that they agree with the impacts scoped in for assessment.	
EIA - Assessment Conclusions			
98.	The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in in section 22.6 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council commented on this matter within their <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007], detailed in <b>Table 3-13</b>.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council set out at the SoCG meeting of 18<sup>th</sup> June 2025 that effects on designated heritage assets at Catfoss Hall and Cobble Hall during construction would be of a very limited magnitude and duration, and that the only substantive area of disagreement remaining was over the magnitude of the effect on the Butt Farm gun site.</p>	
	The Applicants believe that any harm to the significance of the Butt Farm Gun site would be of less than substantial magnitude.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council provided comments on this matter in their <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007] that were discussed in the 28/03/2025 meeting.</p> <p>In this meeting it was determined that East Riding of Yorkshire Council's response to the ExA's First Written Questions [REP3-037] supplies their updated position since <b>Project Change Request 2: Onshore Substation Zone</b> [AS-152],</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		which is that they believe there is harm, but that it is not substantial.	
<b>EIA – CEA Conclusions</b>			
99.	<p>The conclusions of the CEA as detailed in section 22.8 of <b>Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [AS-092] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>			
100.	The approach to the <b>Appendix 22-5 Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment</b> [APP-178] regarding the Anti-Aircraft (AA) Battery at Butt Farm is appropriate and acceptable.	See <b>Table 3-13</b> .	
101.	The approach to the <b>Appendix 22-5 Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment</b> [APP-178] regarding the Beverley Minster is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they agree with the approach the Settings Assessment takes to Beverley Minster.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council made comments on this subject in their <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007]. These were discussed at the 28/03/2025 meeting where East</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their position that whilst there might be some visibility, given the intervening landscape the Converter Stations would likely not affect its significance. The matter is therefore considered agreed.	
102.	<p>The mitigation of effects arising through change to setting of the AA Battery at Butt Farm are appropriate and acceptable.</p> <p>The Applicants disagree with East Riding of Yorkshire Council's assessment of harm to the significance of the Butt Farm scheduled monument but acknowledges East Riding of Yorkshire Council's view that effects on Butt Farm can be adequately mitigated regarding deferring detailed comments to Historic England expertise and will continue to engage with Historic England on this matter.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council provided comments on this matter in their <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007] that were discussed in the 28/03/2025 meeting.</p> <p>At the SoCG meeting of 18/06/2025, East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed that both parties agreed that harm in the absence of mitigation would be less than substantial.</p> <p><i>ERYC's view that the Applicants' assessment afforded greater weight to the proposed mitigation than the Council is considered in SoCG ID 100.</i></p>	

## 3.8 Landscape and Visual Impacts

Table 3-8 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Landscape and Visual Impacts

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
EIA – Planning and Policy			
103.	All relevant plans and policies have been identified in section 23.4.1 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] and these have been appropriately considered in the assessment.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
EIA – Baseline Environment			
104.	The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in of the Landscape and Visual Impact risks as detailed in section 23.5 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192]. Discussed and agreed in the ETG.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Landscape and Visual Impact (15/03/2024) ETG that the characterisation of the baseline is acceptable.	
105.	Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within section 23.6 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192].	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email 09/01/2024 and in their <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007] that the viewpoint locations provided by the Applicants are acceptable.  After further discussion at the 03/04/2025 meeting, East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement on this matter.	
EIA – Assessment Methodology			

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
106.	The study areas identified in section 23.3.2 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] are appropriate.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Landscape and Visual Impact ETG (15/03/2024) they agree with the study areas identified.</p> <p>It was also agreed in this ETG that the landscape and visual viewpoints scoped out (such as the Hull-Beverley railway line) and scoped in are acceptable.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
107.	The realistic worst case scenario presented in the assessment for the development scenarios, as outlined in Table 23-1 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] are appropriate.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
108.	<p>The embedded mitigation measures in Table 23-3 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] are appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicants also acknowledge that the photomontage at Viewpoint 10 may not fully represent the experience of the convertor station when travelling north on the A164, however it was discussed and agreed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council</p>	<p>After discussion at the 27/01/2025 and 03/04/2025 meetings, East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement on mitigation measures except those relating to the mitigation planting at Viewpoint 3, detailed in <b>Table 3-16</b>, in an 22/04/2025 email.</p> <p>Following submission of the updated <b>Outline Landscape Management Plan (OLMP)</b> [REP4-044], East Riding of Yorkshire Council's response</p>	



SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	that the photomontage provides a sufficient representative visualisation for the purposes of the Examination.	to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP5-044] confirmed that " <i>East Riding of Yorkshire Council has no outstanding concerns regarding mitigation measures.</i> " (LVI.2.7).	
109.	The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, as presented in section 23.4.3 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192], provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on the Projects.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Landscape and Visual Impact ETG (15/03/2024) that they agree with the EIA methodology. However, additional comments on the methodology for the assessment of construction effects were issued by Graham Varley on behalf of Bill Blackledge on the 16/09/2024.  After discussion at the 03/04/2025 meeting, East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement on this matter in a 22/04/2025 email.	
110.	The assessment of significance presented in section 23.6 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.	Comments on construction effects were issued by Graham Varley on behalf of Bill Blackledge on the 16/09/2024. Full details can be found in Appendix A, <b>Table 5-1</b> .  After discussion at the 03/04/2025 meeting, East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement on this matter in a 22/04/2025 email.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
111.	<p>Section 23.6.1 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during operation.</p>	<p>Comments in relation to views from the A164 were issued by Graham Varley on behalf of Bill Blackledge on the 16/09/2024. Full details can be found in Appendix A, <b>Table 5-1</b>.</p> <p>After discussion at the 03/04/2025 meeting, East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement on this matter in a 22/04/2025 email.</p>	
112.	<p>Section 23.6.1 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during construction.</p> <p>Section 5.11 of the <b>OCoCP</b> [AS-094] was discussed in the 02/10/2024 meeting and that a Construction Lighting Plan will be produced once a contractor has been agreed.</p> <p>The <b>OCoCP</b> (Revision 2) [AS-094] was revised at Deadline 1 to include further details of construction lighting in Section 5.11 (p.47).</p> <p>This matter was confirmed as agreed via email (22/04/2025).</p>	<p>Comments on construction effects issued by Graham Varley on behalf of Bill Blackledge on the 16/09/2024 stated '<i>The extent of construction lighting, whilst being designed to minimise light spillage etc (<b>Outline CoCP</b> [AS-094], section 5.11 Construction Site Lighting) is not clearly described or illustrated, for example with an indicative plan</i>'.</p> <p>After discussion at the 02/10/2024 meeting, this matter was confirmed as agreed.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council raised further comments on effects during construction in their <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007] (7.80).</p> <p>After discussion at the 03/04/2025 meeting, East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement on this matter in a 22/04/2025 email.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
113.	The assessment of cumulative effects, as detailed in section 23.8 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] is consistent with the agreed methodologies.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
114.	Seascape is scoped out of the EIA and is not assessed in <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192].	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the SLVIA – Pre-Scoping ETG (23/09/2021) that they agree with scoping out the operational effect of the arrays.</p> <p>In the Landscape and Visual ETG (16/01/2024) East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed they agreed with the effects of offshore infrastructure being scoped out of the assessment.</p> <p>In the Landscape and Visual Impact ETG (15/03/2024) East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed they agree that the earth's curvature has been considered when assessing the offshore wind farm's visibility from the shore.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
115.	The impacts scoped into the ES as set out in section 23.6 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] are acceptable and appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Landscape and Visual Impact ETG (15/03/2024) that they agree with the impacts scoped into the ES.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
116.	The scoping out of operational effects of the Onshore Cable Corridor in section 23.3.1 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Landscape and Visual Impact ETG (15/03/2024) that they agree with operational effects being scoped out.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
<b>EIA - Assessment Conclusions</b>			
117.	The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in in section 20.6 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] are appropriate.	<p>Comments in relation to views from the A164 and VP3, were issued by Graham Varley on behalf of Bill Blackledge on the 16/09/2024. Full details can be found in Appendix A, <b>Table 5-1</b>.</p> <p>After discussion at the 03/04/2025 meeting, East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement on this matter in a 22/04/2025 email.</p>	
118.	Viewpoint 6 provides a representative view of the impact of the Onshore Converter Stations on views from the Beverley 20	East Riding of Yorkshire Council stated in their Response to The Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP5-044] that they would	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	<p>footpath. Providing a relocated viewpoint 6 would not change the assessed significance of this viewpoint.</p> <p>The ExA queried the choice of location of Viewpoint 6 in <b>The Applicants' Responses to April 2025 Hearing Action Points</b> [REP4-096] and requested that the Applicants considered providing an updated visualization further along the Beverley 20 footpath where wider views of the proposed Onshore Converter Station site is visible. The Applicants responded to state that providing an additional visualization along from VP6 Beverley 20 footpath would not alter the assessed significance and would remain minor and not significant.</p>	<p>comment on the new site photography once available.</p> <p>The Applicants provided the new photography from Viewpoint 6 in an email to East Riding of Yorkshire Council on 18<sup>th</sup> June, and East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement that the new photography does not alter the assessed significance at the 18<sup>th</sup> June 2025 SoCG meeting. The matter is considered agreed by both parties.</p>	
<b>EIA – Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) Conclusions</b>			
119.	<p>The conclusions of the CEA as detailed in section 20.8 of <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>			
120.	<p>The <b>Outline Landscape Management Plan (OLMP)</b> [AS-096] includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</b> [APP-192] and is appropriate for managing Landscape and Visual impacts.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Landscape and Visual Impact ETG (15/03/2024) that they agree with the <b>OLMP</b> [AS-096] and the mitigation measures within it.</p> <p>The full details of comments issued by Graham Varley on behalf of Bill Blackledge on the</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		<p>16/09/2024 can be found in Appendix A, <b>Table 5-1</b>.</p> <p>After discussion at the 03/04/2025 meeting, East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement on this matter in a 22/04/2025 email.</p>	
121.	Requirement 10 and 11 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] that requires approval by the planning authority post-consent of the Landscape Management Plan, and the implementation and maintenance of that planting, are acceptable and appropriate.	<p>Comments in relation to Requirement 10 were made on the 20/05/2024 and the DCO has been updated to address this.</p> <p>After discussion at the 03/04/2025 meeting, East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement on this matter in a 22/04/2025 email.</p>	
122.	The scope of the <b>Design and Access Statement (DAS)</b> [APP-233] has acceptable design solutions and is acceptable and appropriate.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Landscape and Visual Impact ETG (15/03/2024) that they agree the <b>DAS</b> [APP-233] scope is acceptable.</p> <p>The full details of comments issued by Graham Varley on behalf of Bill Blackledge on the 16/09/2024 can be found in Appendix A, <b>Table 5-1</b>.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirm they agree the <b>DAS (Revision 3)</b> [document reference: 8.8] scope, submitted at Deadline 7 is acceptable. Issued for review on the 24/06/2025.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
123.	<p>Requirement 9 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] that requires approval by the planning authority, post-consent of detailed design parameters onshore, including the onshore converter station is appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicants have updated requirement 9 in the <b>Draft DCO</b> (Revision 6) [REP3-004] to secure the maximum height and footprint of the Onshore Converter Stations, which is 24 metres and 32,208 m<sup>2</sup>, for each Onshore Converter Station as detailed in Table 2-1 of the <b>Project Change Request 2</b> [AS-152]. The <b>Design and Access Statement</b> [APP-233] was also updated with <b>Project Change Request 2</b> [AS-152] details at Deadline 2.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p> <p>In their LIR [PDC-007] (7.15) East Riding of Yorkshire Council stated that given the sensitivities of the size and height of the building(s) in the landscape they would suggest that those parameters are embedded in the condition.</p>	
124.	<p>Requirement 13 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit a plan for permanent fencing and enclosure to the planning authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in an email (17/10/2024) and the meeting held 02/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
125.	<p>Requirement 22 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit a scheme for the management and mitigation of artificial lighting at the onshore converter stations to the planning authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.</p> <p>Further detail on operational lighting design in relation to ecological receptors is provided in the <b>DAS</b> [APP-233], which is secured through <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] Requirement 9 (Detailed design parameters onshore).</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council provided comment on this on the 20/05/2024.</p> <p>This matter was discussed at the 02/10/2024 meeting and agreed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council.</p> <p>This matter was raised again in East Riding of Yorkshire Council's <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007] (7.81),</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		discussed further at the 31/01/2025 meeting, and agreed.	
126.	The design review process as set out in section 5 of the <b>Design and Access Statement (Revision 3)</b> [document reference 8.8] is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council agreed at the 15<sup>th</sup> May 2025 meeting, and then in their Response to The Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP5-044] that this matter is agreed subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the inclusion of East Riding of Yorkshire Council and Ward Councillors in the consultation on the recommendations of the Design Review Panel</li> <li>East Riding of Yorkshire Council being included in the preparation of the Terms of Reference</li> <li>An independent architect being included on the design review panel; and</li> <li>That the 28 day review process will commence after a meeting to present the outputs of the design review panel to all stakeholders and the relevant reports has been received for review.</li> </ul> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirm they agree the <b>DAS (Revision 3)</b> [document reference: 8.8] wording in section 8, submitted at</p>	



SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		Deadline 7 is acceptable. Issued for review on the 24/06/2025.	

## 3.9 Traffic and Transport

Table 3-9 Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Traffic and Transport

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
EIA – Planning and Policy			
127.	<p>All relevant plans and policies have been identified in section 24.4.1 of <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195] and these have been appropriately considered in the assessment.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
EIA – Baseline Environment			
128.	<p>The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in of the Traffic and Transport risks as detailed in section 24.5 of <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195].</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
129.	Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within section 24.6 of <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195].	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed at the Traffic and Transport - Project Update and PEIR Comments (08/09/2023) that they agree with the approach to collecting Baseline Traffic Flow data.	
<b>EIA – Assessment Methodology</b>			
130.	The study areas identified in section 24.3.2 of <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195] are appropriate.	The extents of the study area were agreed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council at the Traffic and Access – PEIR Approach and Access ETG (23/11/2022).	
131.	The realistic worst case scenario presented in the assessment for the development scenarios, as outlined in Table 24-2 of <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195] are appropriate.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.		
132.	The embedded mitigation measures in Table 24-3 of <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195] are appropriate.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
133.	<p>The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, as presented in section 24.4.3 of <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195], provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on the Projects.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
134.	<p>The assessment of significance presented in section 24.6 of <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195] is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
135.	<p>Section 24.6.1 of <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during construction.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Traffic and Access – PEIR Approach and Access ETG (23/11/2022) they agree with the list of effects to be assessed within the EIA.</p>	
136.	<p>Operational effects relating to Traffic and Transport have been scoped out of the assessment as set out in <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195].</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Traffic and Access – PEIR Approach and Access ETG (23/11/2022) that they agree with the</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		scoping out of operational effects relating to Traffic and Transport.	
137.	<p>The assessment of cumulative effects, as detailed in section 24.8 of <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195] is consistent with the agreed methodologies.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
138.	<p>The Road Safety as set out in <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195] includes a review of collision clusters and links with collision rates higher than the national average.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Traffic and Access – PEIR Approach and Access ETG (23/11/2022) that they agree the Road Safety Assessment should include a review of collision clusters and links with collision rates higher than the national average.</p>	
139.	<p>Table 24-11 in the <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195] provides a comprehensive list of junctions that required assessment in relation to driver delay.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Traffic and Transport – Project Update and PEIR Comments (08/09/2023) that they agree with the list of junctions that required an assessment of driver delay.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
<b>EIA - Assessment Conclusions</b>			
140.	<p>The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in in section 24.6 of <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
<b>EIA – CEA Conclusions</b>			
141.	<p>The conclusions of the CEA as detailed in section 24.8 of <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>			
142.	<p>The approach to management of construction traffic as set out in <b>Outline CTMP</b> [AS-020] is appropriate and acceptable.</p> <p>The <b>Outline CTMP</b> [AS-020] was circulated to East Riding of Yorkshire Council for comment prior to the ETG Meeting</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in their <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007] that the <b>Outline CTMP</b> [AS-020] is acceptable.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	27/02/24. Minor edits were requested by East Riding of Yorkshire Council, and these were accommodated in the <b>Outline CTMP</b> [AS-020] as submitted with the DCO application. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.		
143.	<p>Requirement 14 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit a CTMP, in accordance with the <b>Outline CTMP</b> [AS-020] to the highways authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in their <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007] that the <b>Outline CTMP</b> [AS-020] is acceptable.	
144.	<p>Requirement 15 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit access plans to the highways authority for approval post-consent and prior to construction of any new permanent or temporary means of access to a highway is appropriate.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
145.	Requirement 30 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit a port construction traffic management plan and travel plan to the highways authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.		
146.	<p>Requirement 9 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] that requires approval by the planning authority, post-consent of detailed design parameters onshore, including the vehicular and pedestrian access is appropriate.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
147.	<p>Articles 8 and 13 and Schedule 3 (streets subject to street works) – Part I '<i>Streets subject to permanent street works</i>' and Part II '<i>Streets subject to temporary street works</i>' of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] and Part 4 (Streets to be temporarily closed or restricted) are accurate and agreed.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 21/11/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
148.	The inclusion of the <b>Appendix 24-2 Transport Assessment</b> [AS-019] and the <b>Outline CTMP</b> [AS-020] within the DCO Application	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Traffic and Access – PEIR Approach and Access ETG (23/11/2022) that they agree the application	



SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	sufficiently cover the relevant Traffic and Transport related issues alongside the <b>Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport</b> [APP-195].	would be sufficiently supported by a Transport Assessment and <b>Outline CTMP</b> [AS-020].  East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in their <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007] that <b>Appendix 24-2 Transport Assessment</b> [AS-019] and <b>Outline CTMP</b> [AS-020] are acceptable.	
149.	Table 3-1 of the <b>Outline CTMP</b> [AS-020] sufficiently sets out the Travel Plan measures for Personnel.  The Travel Plan measures within the <b>OCTMP (Revision 3)</b> [REP4-046] were discussed at the 27 <sup>th</sup> May 2025 meeting in which the Applicants agreed to update the wording in the <b>OCTMP (Revision 4)</b> (document reference 8.13). The updated wording was shared with East Riding of Yorkshire Council and agreed via email on 5 <sup>th</sup> June 2025.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in their <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007] that the <b>OCTMP</b> [AS-020] is acceptable.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement with the updated Travel Plan wording on 5 <sup>th</sup> June 2025 via email.	
<b>Other Matters as Required</b>			
150.	The design of access and crossings is appropriate and acceptable.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Traffic and Access – PEIR Approach and Access (23/11/2022) and the Traffic and Transport – Project Update and PEIR Comments (08/09/2023) ETGs, and a further technical meeting (23/06/2023) that they agree with the outline design of all access and crossings.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		This matter was discussed in the 21/11/2024 meeting. East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues regarding crossings in this meeting.	
151.	The approach to deriving and assigning employee and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) demand as set out in <b>Appendix 24-2 Transport Assessment</b> [AS-019] is appropriate and acceptable.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed at the Traffic and Transport – Project Update and PEIR Comments ETG (08/09/2023) that they agree with the approach to deriving and assigning employee and HGV traffic to the highway network. East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed in their <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007] that <b>Appendix 24-2 Transport Assessment</b> [AS-019] is acceptable.	

## 3.10 Noise

Table 3-10 Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Noise

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
EIA – Planning and Policy			
152.	All relevant plans and policies have been identified in section 25.4.1 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] and these have been appropriately considered in the assessment.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
EIA – Baseline Environment			
153.	The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in of the Noise risks as detailed in section 25.5 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201].  The baseline noise monitoring locations are appropriate and acceptable.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Traffic and Access Onshore Noise and Air Quality – Pre-Scoping (14/09/2021), the Noise and Air Quality – PEIR Assessments (03/07/2023), Noise – ES Assessment Methodology (21/09/2023), Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) and Noise and Air Quality (14/03/2024) ETGs that they agree with the characterisation of the baseline, the baseline noise monitoring approach, and the noise monitoring locations.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
154.	<p>Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within section 25.6 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201].</p> <p>In the ETG meeting of 14/03/24 the ES Noise Chapter assessment methodologies and findings were presented to East Riding of Yorkshire Council including proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The ETG were in agreement that the proposed approaches to assessments were acceptable, including baseline monitoring, construction noise and vibration, construction road traffic noise and operational noise.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
<b>EIA – Assessment Methodology</b>			
155.	<p>The study areas identified in section 25.3.2 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] are appropriate.</p> <p>In the ETG meeting of 14/03/24 the ES Noise Chapter assessment methodologies and findings were presented to East Riding of Yorkshire Council including proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The ETG were in agreement that the proposed approaches to assessments were acceptable, including baseline monitoring, construction noise and vibration, construction road traffic noise and operational noise.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
156.	The realistic worst case scenario presented in the assessment for the development scenarios, as outlined in Table 25-1 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] are appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
157.	<p>The embedded mitigation measures in Table 25-3 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] are appropriate.</p> <p>In the ETG meeting of 14/03/24 the ES Noise Chapter assessment methodologies and findings were presented to East Riding of Yorkshire Council including proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The ETG were in agreement that the proposed approaches to assessments were acceptable, including baseline monitoring, construction noise and vibration, construction road traffic noise and operational noise.</p>	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
158.	<p>The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, as presented in section 25.4.3 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201], provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on the Projects.</p> <p>In the ETG meeting of 14/03/24 the ES Noise Chapter assessment methodologies and findings were presented to East Riding of Yorkshire Council including proposed mitigation measures.</p>	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	The ETG were in agreement that the proposed approaches to assessments were acceptable, including baseline monitoring, construction noise and vibration, construction road traffic noise and operational noise.		
159.	<p>The assessment of significance presented in section 25.6 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.</p> <p>In the ETG meeting of 14/03/24 the ES Noise Chapter assessment methodologies and findings were presented to East Riding of Yorkshire Council including proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The ETG were in agreement that the proposed approaches to assessments were acceptable, including baseline monitoring, construction noise and vibration, construction road traffic noise and operational noise.</p>	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
160.	Section 25.6.1 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during construction.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) and Noise and Air Quality (14/03/2024) ETGs that they agree with the assessment criteria and approach to construction noise and vibration and construction road traffic.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
161.	Section 25.6.2 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during operation.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) and Noise and Air Quality (14/03/2024) ETGs they agree with the criteria and approach to operational noise.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
162.	The assessment of cumulative effects, as detailed in section 25.8 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] is consistent with the agreed methodologies.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
163.	The assessment criteria and approach relating to construction noise and vibration as set out in section 25.4.3 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) and Noise and Air Quality (14/03/2024) ETGs that they agree with the assessment criteria and approach to construction noise and vibration.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
164.	The assessment criteria and approach relating to construction road traffic noise as set out in section 25.4.3 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) and Noise and Air Quality (14/03/2024) ETGs that they agree with the assessment criteria and approach to construction road traffic noise.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
165.	The assessment criteria and approach relating to operational noise as set out in section 25.4.3 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) and Noise and Air Quality (14/03/2024) ETGs they agree with the criteria and approach to operational noise.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	



SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
EIA - Assessment Conclusions			
166.	The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in in section 25.6 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
EIA – CEA Conclusions			
167.	The conclusions of the CEA as detailed in section 25.8 of <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring			
168.	<p>The <b>Outline CoCP</b> [AS-094] includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 25 Noise</b> [APP-201] and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Projects.</p> <p>Minor changes to the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision 4) [REP-040] were made at Deadline 4, to address concerns ERYC raised about wording relating to construction</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (16/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Noise are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their agreement on revised text in the <b>Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision 4)</b> [REP-040] regarding working hours, in the Response to the</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	<p>working hours (in response NV1.1 in Response to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) [REP3-037].)</p> <p>Requirement 19 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit a CoCP to the planning authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.</p> <p>Requirement 20 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] (Construction hours for the onshore works) is appropriate.</p> <p>Requirement 21 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] (Control of noise during operational phase) is appropriate.</p>	Examining Authorities' Second Written Questions [REP5- 044].	

## 3.11 Air Quality

Table 3-11 - Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Air Quality

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
EIA – Planning and Policy			
169.	All relevant plans and policies have been identified in section 26.4.1 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] and these have been appropriately considered in the assessment.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
EIA – Baseline Environment			
170.	The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in of the Air Quality risks as detailed in section 26.5 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208].	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
171.	Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within section 26.6 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208].	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed at the Noise and Air Quality ETG (03/07/2024) that they	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		<p>agree with the sources for air quality monitoring data.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
<b>EIA – Assessment Methodology</b>			
172.	The study areas identified in section 26.3.2 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] are appropriate.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed at the Noise and Air Quality ETG (03/07/2024) they agree with the approach to determining the Air Quality study areas.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
173.	The realistic worst case scenario presented in the assessment for the development scenarios, as outlined in Table 26-1 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] are appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
174.	The embedded mitigation measures in Table 26-3 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] are appropriate.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
175.	The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, as presented in section 26.5.3 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208], provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on the Projects.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in email correspondence (09/12/2022) that they agree with the PEIR Air Quality assessment methodology.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality ETG (27/11/2023) that they agree with the Air Quality assessment methodology for the ES.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
176.	The assessment of significance presented in section 26.6 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
177.	Section 26.6.1 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during construction.  The scope of the air quality ES assessment was agreed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council at the ETG meeting on 03/11/23.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
178.	Operational effects relating to Air Quality have been scoped out of the assessment as set out in <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208].  The scope of the air quality ES assessment was agreed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council at the ETG meeting on 03/11/23.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed at the Noise and Air Quality ETG (27/11/2023) they agree with the scoping out of operational effects relating to Air Quality.  East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
179.	The assessment of cumulative effects, as detailed in section 26.7 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] is consistent with the agreed methodologies.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed at the ETG meeting of 14/03/24 that they were content with the results of the ES Assessment.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
180.	The Air Quality impacts scoped into section 26.6 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] are appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Traffic and Access, Onshore Noise and Air Quality – Pre-Scoping (14/09/2021) and East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) ETGs they agree with the impacts scoped in for assessment in the Air Quality ES chapter.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
181.	Construction and operation emissions from vessels and onshore traffic emissions have been scoped out of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208].	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) ETG they agree that vessel and onshore traffic emissions can be scoped out of the ES.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
182.	Operational vehicular traffic emissions have been scoped out of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208].	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) ETG they agree that operational vehicular traffic emissions can be scoped out of the ES.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
183.	There is no requirement for a detailed assessment of the Burton Bushes SSSI if there is no exceedance of the critical load and critical level.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in Noise and Air Quality ETG (27/11/2023) they agree that there is no requirement for a detailed assessment of the Burton Bushes SSSI if there is	



SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		<p>no exceedance of the critical load and critical level.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
184.	The use of the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) approach in section 26.6 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] supplemented by a sensitivity study to support the use of the JNCC guidance over Natural England's guidance is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) ETG they agree that the use of JNCC's guidance over Nature England's is appropriate and acceptable.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
185.	The model verification factors for PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> are considered appropriate.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) ETG they agree the model verification factors for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> are considered appropriate.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
<b>EIA - Assessment Conclusions</b>			
186.	The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in section 26.6 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality ETG (14/03/2024) that they agree with the results of the ES chapter.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
<b>EIA – CEA Conclusions</b>			
187.	The conclusions of the CEA as detailed in section 26.7 of <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed at the Noise and Air Quality – PEIR Assessments (03/07/2024) and the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) ETGs they agree with the cumulative impact of other projects on Air Quality.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
		and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.	
Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring			
188.	<p>The <b>Outline CoCP</b> [AS-094] includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Projects.</p> <p>Requirement 14 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit a CTMP to the planning authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.</p> <p>Requirement 19 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit a CoCP to the planning authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	
189.	<p>The qualitative assessment for Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) emissions during construction set out in <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208] is appropriate and acceptable.</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) ETG they agree with the qualitative assessment for NRMM emissions during construction.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
Other Matters as Required			
190.	A junction assessment is not required as part of the Application and is not included in <b>Chapter 26 Air Quality</b> [APP-208]. A junction assessment will be carried out post-consent.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Noise and Air Quality (27/11/2023) they agree that a junction assessment is not required as part of the Application.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council further confirmed via email (14/10/2024) that they agree the status of all matters relating to Air Quality and Contaminated Land are 'agreed' at present, and that no items are currently 'under discussion' or 'not agreed'.</p>	

## 3.12 Human Health

Table 3-12 Topics agreed or not agreed in relation to Human Health<sup>2</sup>

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
<b>EIA – Planning and Policy</b>			
191.	<p>All relevant plans and policies have been identified in section 27.4.1 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] and these have been appropriately considered in the assessment.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
<b>EIA – Baseline Environment</b>			
192.	<p>The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in of the Human Health risks as detailed in section 27.5 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214].</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the</p>		

<sup>2</sup> East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on Human Health throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG, which the Deputy Director of Public Health attended. No comments or issues relating to Human Health were raised post this meeting, and no comments have been made on the Human Health section of the SoCG. All Human Health matters are therefore considered agreed. Where agreements were made during the ETG process, this has been noted in East Riding of Yorkshire Council's position.

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.		
193.	<p>Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within section 27.6 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214].</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
<b>EIA – Assessment Methodology</b>			
194.	<p>The study areas identified in section 27.3.2 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] are appropriate.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
195.	<p>The realistic worst case scenario presented in the assessment for the development scenarios, as outlined in Table 27-1 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] are appropriate.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the</p>		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.		
196.	<p>The embedded mitigation measures in Table 27-3 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] are appropriate.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
197.	<p>The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, as presented in section 27.4.3 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214], provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on the Projects.</p>	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Human Health (19/12/2023 and 25/03/2024) ETGs that they agree with the Human Health ES assessment methodology.	
198.	<p>The assessment of significance presented in section 27.6 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
199.	<p>Section 27.6.1 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during construction.</p>	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Human Health (19/12/2023 and 25/03/2024) ETGs that they agree with the construction effects.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
200.	Section 27.6.2 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during operation.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Human Health (19/12/2023 and 25/03/2024) ETGs that they agree with the operational effects.	
201.	Section 27.6.3 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during decommissioning.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Human Health (19/12/2023 and 25/03/2024) ETGs that they agree with the decommissioning effects.	
202.	<p>The assessment of cumulative effects, as detailed in section 27.8 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] is consistent with the agreed methodologies.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the 02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
<b>EIA - Assessment Conclusions</b>			
203.	The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in in section 27.6 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Human Health (19/12/2023 and 25/03/2024) ETGs they agree with the conclusions of the assessment of significance.	
204.	The assessment of significance concludes that the operational effects as set out in section 27.6 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b>	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Human Health ETG (25/03/2024) that they agree that there are significant beneficial population	



SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	[APP-214] that there are significant beneficial population health effects and no significant adverse health effects.	health effects and no significant adverse health effects.	
205.	The assessment of significance concludes that the construction and decommissioning effects as set out in section 27.6 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] would have no significant effects on population health.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Human Health ETG (25/03/2024) that they agree that there would be no significant effects on population health resulting from the construction and decommissioning of the Projects.	
<b>EIA – CEA Conclusions</b>			
206.	The conclusions of the CEA as detailed in section 27.8 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Human Health ETG (25/03/2024) that they agree there would be no significant population health effects.	
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>			
207.	<p>The <b>Outline CoCP</b> [AS-094] includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214] and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Projects.</p> <p>Requirement 19 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> [AS-120] to submit a CoCP to the planning authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.</p> <p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, within their RR, or at the</p>		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Position	Position Status
	02/10/2024 meeting to discuss the SoCG. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.		
Other Matters as Required			
208.	There would be no significant effects on population health due to operational noise, as set out in section 27.6.2 of <b>Chapter 27 Human Health</b> [APP-214].	East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed in the Human Health ETG (25/03/2024) that they agree there would be no significant effects on population health due to operational noise.	

## 3.13 Status of Discussions for Matters ‘Not Agreed’

### 3.13.1 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Table 3-13 - Status of discussions relating to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants’ Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council’s position	Position Status
98	Assessment conclusions relating to Catfoss Hall and Cobble Hall	The Applicants do not believe there will be any harm caused to the assets as a result of the proposed development. Construction works are temporary, and the presence of the Onshore Converter Stations would not affect the viewer’s ability to appreciate the farm buildings in a rural context.	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council made comments on this subject in their <b>LIR</b> [PDC-007]. These were discussed at the 28/03/2025 meeting where East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their position that there is a variation in the assessment of effects between the Applicants and East Riding of Yorkshire Council, but that it would not make a significant difference to the weighting.</p> <p>At the SoCG meeting of 18/06/2025, East Riding of Yorkshire Council noted that while they still considered that harm would arise to the significance of these assets, it would be of a limited magnitude that was experienced for a for a short period of time during construction and while needing to be considered in any balancing exercise, anticipate that harm would hold limited weight in that decision.</p>	

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's position	Position Status
100.	Setting Assessment approach to the AA Battery at Butt Farm	<p>The <b>Appendix 22-5 - Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment</b> [APP-178] provides a clear explanation of the impacts to the onsite experience and the mitigation that the tree and hedgerow screening would provide. The <b>Appendix 22-5 - Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment</b> [APP-178] was shared with East Riding of Yorkshire Council after the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (19/03/2024).</p> <p>At the 28/03/2025 meeting the Applicants set out that there was a woodland in this location whilst the AA battery was in use and was removed around 1970.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>At the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) and in their LIR [PDC-007] East Riding of Yorkshire Council expressed concern over the onsite experience of the monument. East Riding of Yorkshire Council raised concerns over the use of vegetation as screening as it is seasonal and noted that vegetation planting still alters the land in which the monument is appreciated.</p> <p>At the 28/03/2025 meeting East Riding of Yorkshire Council noted their concern was that planting will impact the longer views from the asset, affecting how it is experienced, and causing harm. After the Applicants set out that there was previously a woodland in this area, East Riding of Yorkshire Council agreed to review the OS mapping and return to the Applicants with their position.</p> <p>On 22/04/2025 East Riding of Yorkshire Council commented that following consideration of the additional information provided in relation to the historic siting of the woodland to the south of the AA Battery, East Riding of Yorkshire Council concluded that this information did not meaningfully alter the previous conclusions drawn on this</p>	

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	East Riding of Yorkshire Council's position	Position Status
			<p>point. This is because it is concluded that the screen planting would still be read as part of the wider intensification of the site related to the converter station- in a manner that would not replicate the way in which a historic area of woodland would have been read as part of the historic natural and undeveloped landscape. East Riding of Yorkshire Council would therefore still continue to conclude that it alters the land in which the monument is appreciated'.</p> <p>At the SoCG meeting of 18/06/2025, East Riding of Yorkshire Council confirmed their previous advice to the Examination that they were content with the treatment of the proposed access road landscaping and the use of the process set out in the DAS to secure the most appropriate landscape treatments of the Onshore Converter Station site. The Council's assessment of the effectiveness of the proposed landscaping as mitigation of effects on the Butt Farm gun site, however, remained unchanged.</p>	

## 4 Summary

20. This SoCG has outlined the consultation that has taken place between the Applicants and East Riding of Yorkshire Council during the pre-application and pre-examination phases. The final Agreement Logs issued to East Riding of Yorkshire Council on 21<sup>st</sup> August 2024 present the position reached at the point of DCO application submission between the Projects and East Riding of Yorkshire Council in relation to relevant onshore and offshore matters.
21. This SoCG has been updated throughout the Examination and represents the agreed position and final SoCG between the Applicants and East Riding of Yorkshire Council at Deadline 8.

## 5 References

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2024). Planning Act 2008: Examination stage for Nation-ally Significant Infrastructure Projects. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/planning-act-2008-examination-stage-for-nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects>. [Accessed August 2024].

## Appendix A – Detailed Comments by 2B Landscape Consultancy on Behalf of East Riding of Yorkshire Council Regarding LVIA Matters

- The comments made by 2B Landscape Consultancy on 29/08/2024 and provided to the Applicants on 16/09/2024 by East Riding of Yorkshire Council regarding LVIA matters are detailed in **Table 5-1**.

**Table 5-1 Detailed Comments on LVIA Matters Provided on 16/09/2024 by East Riding of Yorkshire Council**

Document / Subject	Comment
Environmental Statement Volume 7, Appendix 23-1 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Consultation Responses June 2024	These are an accurate reflection of the Expert Topic Group (ETG) meetings. The majority of responses are helpful and accurate.
Section 4.6.5 Viewpoints	<p><i>Viewpoints have been agreed with the members of the Landscape and Visual ETG.</i></p> <p>This is correct for most viewpoints but see <b>Additional view(s) from A164 to south-east</b> below.</p> <p><i>Night-time effects during construction are considered as part of the assessment of effects on visual receptors (section 23.6 in Volume 7, Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (application ref: 7.23)). No permanent lighting is required during operation. Therefore, night-time visualisations have not been prepared as part of the ES.</i></p> <p>It is accepted that night-time visualisations of the operational phase are not required as a result of there being no permanent lighting. However, the extent of construction lighting, whilst being designed to minimise light spillage etc (ref Outline Code of Construction Practice Volume 8, 5.11 Construction Site Lighting) is not clearly described or illustrated, for example with an indicative plan.</p>
Landscape and Visual ETG 15/03/2024: Drainage.	<p><i>RWE confirmed that the SuDS feature is indicative at this stage and will be further refined and developed post consent. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) (Volume 8, application ref: 8.8) sets out additional principles of relevance to the OLMP and LMP, including that it should include ecological and landscape enhancements and may take the form of attenuation ponds, swales and filter drains.</i></p> <p>It remains a matter of concern that the submitted documents, including the Outline Drainage Strategy Volume 8, propose the 'SuDS' as an end-of-pipe</p>



Document / Subject	Comment
	<p>solution. This approach is the least effective in terms of: water quality (source control); biodiversity (the water conveyance is separate from the landscape, rather than being part of it); and size of the attenuation feature, due to lack of distributed attenuation and control points. The drainage strategy concedes that <i>"The extent of treatment required depends on the land use proposed however SuDS components such as swales, filter drains, and pervious surfaces could be used to intercept and treat access roads and other hardstanding areas."</i></p> <p>Whilst the DAS notes:</p> <p><i>18o. Traditional drainage methods such as underground pipes, gullies and controlled outflow will be required within the Onshore Converter Stations boundary to meet design guidance and technical requirements. These traditional drainage methods could connect with any proposed natural drainage systems to create an ecologically sustainable drainage solution, whilst introducing additional biodiversity, habitat opportunities and protect adjacent agricultural land.</i></p> <p>The DAS also describes a number of alternative approaches, such as swales, without making any commitment to them. The helpful contribution in the Landscape Management Plan is noted:</p> <p><i>3o. The landscape plan also seeks to integrate landscape treatment with the proposed drainage attenuation basin to the south-east of the substation. The detail of the landscape treatment in this area will be developed in the final LMP based on the final design of the drainage works. This will help further inform the planting design along the eastern boundary.</i></p> <p>As per my comment in the last ETG meeting, the drainage design should be <u>led</u> by the landscape team, with the drainage engineers facilitating the best landscape-based solutions possible, and not the other way around.</p> <p>Whilst accepting the technical requirements for protection of the sub-station and for attenuation, it would be desirable to see a clear commitment from RWE to move away from a pipe-to-pond solution in the next stage of design. This commitment should direct the next stage proposals, rather than simply suggesting that design change <i>could</i> take place.</p>
Landscape and Visual ETG 15/03/2024: Visualisation.	<p><i>It was agreed that the photomontage for Viewpoint 3 would be updated to illustrate the earthworks along the access track. This visualisation is presented as Figure 23-9 in Volume 7 (application ref: 7.23.1).</i></p> <p>This has been done. However, upon reviewing VP3 and comparing to the plan and LVIA text, two points arise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ten-year view does not indicate any screen planting to the north of the sub-station, which is shown on the Indicative Landscape Plan</li> </ol>

Document / Subject	Comment																
	<p>b. The LVIA (para 233) notes that: <i>A TCC [Temporary Construction Compound] would be located immediately adjacent to the viewpoint throughout the construction works...</i> The Works Plan (Onshore) Page 18 of 19, also shows a Temporary Construction Compound occupying much of the field to the right-middle-ground of Viewpoint 3. This suggests that the construction effects could usefully be illustrated from this viewpoint. It is a matter of concern that the significant effects of this 6-year period are not illustrated through the accessible medium of photomontages.</p>																
Landscape and Visual ETG 15/03/2024:  Offsite/Onsite Planting.	<p>I am pleased to note the following:</p> <p><i>It was confirmed that post consent RWE will seek opportunities to explore working with Humber Forest to deliver offsite planting, noting that East Riding of Yorkshire Council are already heavily involved with this organisation. This commitment is referenced in the Outline Landscape Management Plan (OLMP) (Volume 8, application ref: 8.11). The OLMP sets out commitments to establish the majority of mitigation planting as whips, although there is some potential for larger hedgerow trees to be planted. The OLMP sets out commitments to establish woodland planting as early as possible in the construction phase, to ensure maximum benefit at the start of the operational phase.</i></p>																
LVIA: Construction Phase Effects	<p>It is noted that for all of the Construction Phase effects, assessed for Visual Receptors, notable weight is given to the beneficial effect of mitigation. For example, in Table 23-26 (summary of the LVIA findings)</p> <table><tr><th>Receptor</th><th>Pre-mitigation Effect</th><th>Mitigation Measures Proposed</th><th>Residual Effect</th></tr><tr><td>Landscape Effects (Onshore Substation Zone)</td><td>Moderate, locally (Significant)</td><td>See section 23.3.4</td><td><b>Minor</b> (Not significant) but would be superseded by the operational effects.</td></tr><tr><td>Viewpoint 1: Butt Farm</td><td>Moderate (Significant)</td><td>See section 23.3.4</td><td><b>Minor</b> (Not significant) but would be superseded by the operational effects.</td></tr><tr><td>Viewpoint 2: Coppleflat Lane, Bentley</td><td>Major (Significant)</td><td>See section 23.3.4</td><td><b>Minor</b> (Not significant) but would be superseded by the operational effects.</td></tr></table>	Receptor	Pre-mitigation Effect	Mitigation Measures Proposed	Residual Effect	Landscape Effects (Onshore Substation Zone)	Moderate, locally (Significant)	See section 23.3.4	<b>Minor</b> (Not significant) but would be superseded by the operational effects.	Viewpoint 1: Butt Farm	Moderate (Significant)	See section 23.3.4	<b>Minor</b> (Not significant) but would be superseded by the operational effects.	Viewpoint 2: Coppleflat Lane, Bentley	Major (Significant)	See section 23.3.4	<b>Minor</b> (Not significant) but would be superseded by the operational effects.
Receptor	Pre-mitigation Effect	Mitigation Measures Proposed	Residual Effect														
Landscape Effects (Onshore Substation Zone)	Moderate, locally (Significant)	See section 23.3.4	<b>Minor</b> (Not significant) but would be superseded by the operational effects.														
Viewpoint 1: Butt Farm	Moderate (Significant)	See section 23.3.4	<b>Minor</b> (Not significant) but would be superseded by the operational effects.														
Viewpoint 2: Coppleflat Lane, Bentley	Major (Significant)	See section 23.3.4	<b>Minor</b> (Not significant) but would be superseded by the operational effects.														

Document / Subject	Comment			
	Viewpoint 3: Beverley 20 near Broadgate	Major (Significant)	See section 23.3.4	<b>Minor</b> (Not significant) but would be superseded by the operational effects.
	<p>Note the <b>emphasis</b> on the residual effects – this seems inappropriate.</p> <p>Based on the descriptions in section 23.3.4, it is difficult to see what mitigation effects would come to bear upon landscape and visual effects during the 6-year construction period. It is noted that there is a commitment to plant as early as possible in the Construction Phase (LMP 1.5.3 <i>Early Establishment</i> 34. <i>Where practical, landscape mitigation planting will be established as early as possible in the construction phase. It is proposed that the area of planting along the south boundary of the Onshore Substation Zone will be established at the commencement of construction works. This will ensure that planting delivers effective mitigation for receptors in Bentley as early as possible.</i> 35. <i>Other opportunities for early landscape planting will be subject to the extent and timings of construction works and will be explored and agreed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council before commencement of construction</i>).</p> <p>1-5 year's planting growth may have a limited beneficial effect for some viewpoints, e.g. Viewpoints 1 and 2. There is no clear attempt to quantify the mitigation proposals in relation to the Construction Phase. It is particularly difficult to understand how any mitigation (e.g. around the substation) would benefit Viewpoint 3, with two temporary construction compounds in the fore- and middle-ground, sufficient to drive a change from Major (Significant) to Minor (Not significant) as a result of mitigation measures – not least if they are 'embedded'. It is worth noting that the recently released LITGN-2024-01 (Notes and Clarifications on Aspects of Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third edition (GLVIA3)) makes the following observation:</p> <p><i>There are different points of view on whether significance should be judged before or after mitigation. Some practitioners assess at both stages, to convey the effectiveness of mitigation measures in reducing significant effects to 'not significant'. The Panel emphasises that it is not helpful to do this for measures which are 'designed in' as the effects without mitigation would never arise.</i></p> <p>There is frequent reference in the LVIA to the removal of construction being, in effect, a mitigation benefit. Construction is, by its nature, temporary. Therefore, assessment of construction effects only makes sense for the period of that construction. The fact that it is to be removed, or replaced by operational effects, is not a mitigation measure which influences significance of effect, unless it is somehow measurable within the construction period. Perhaps there is a misunderstanding on my part, but it</p>			

Document / Subject	Comment
	would be helpful for RWE to explain their approach and how mitigation so substantially reduces construction phase effects.
Additional view(s) from A164 to south-east	<p>My email of 05 04 2024 18:58, to the RWE and East Riding of Yorkshire Council teams, stated:</p> <p><i>I had cause to drive from Willerby to Beverley along the A164 last week. Further to James Chatfield's expressed concerns about tree felling, and my photos, which were concentrated on the junction area, I observed that there is significant tree loss on the west side of the A164, south-east of Bentley (I was unable to stop to take photos). This is quite likely to open up views from the highway towards the north-west and the proposed convertor station. Whilst this would be for 'lower-sensitivity' vehicle users, it would apply to significant numbers of north-bound vehicles which would need to be taken into account in any assessment of magnitude. I have not looked in any detail at the Jocks Lodge felling/mitigation proposals but recall that Paul said that he had. It would be worth reviewing tree loss and Jock's Lodge mitigation proposals in relation to the convertor station, and considering whether a photomontage viewpoint from the A164 would be appropriate.</i></p> <p>As far as I can see, this has not received a response and does not appear to be considered within the LVIA. Viewpoint 2 is near the A164 but is not representative of the nearly 2km length of north-bound approach to Jock's Lodge, for which the substation would likely form a notable element of the forward view. I remain of the view that effects from this section of highway should be considered, with the benefit of some 3D visualisation to inform any written statement.</p>

## Appendix B – Detailed Comments by East Riding of Yorkshire Council Regarding Nature Conservation and Tree Matters

2. The comments made by East Riding of Yorkshire Council on 25/09/2024 and provided to the Applicants on 30/09/2024 regarding Nature Conservation and Tree matters are detailed in **Table 5-2**.

**Table 5-2 Detailed Comments on Nature Conservation and Tree Matters Provided on 30/09/2024 by East Riding of Yorkshire Council**

Document / Subject	Comment
Protected Sites	<p>We support the production of a Habitats Regulation Assessment (APP-045) in support of the proposal. The terrestrial sections of the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment: Habitats Regulations Assessment Volume 6 Part 1 of 4 – Introduction and Terrestrial Ecology have been appraised and we welcome the screening in of the Humber Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) in relation to impacts on Functionally Linked Land where the development area lies within 10km of the Humber Estuary. The wintering bird surveys found limited use of the site by SPA species. Whilst survey design deviates from Natural England’s standard guidance given the distance from the SPA/Ramsar, and nature of the majority of impacts being temporary, we are satisfied that the survey effort is sufficient to rule out impacts to functionally linked land.</p> <p>Appendix 26-4 Air Quality Assessment – Construction Phase Road Traffic Emissions Receptor APP-213 Locations identifies that roads within 200m of the Humber Estuary SAC are within the zone of influence for construction traffic and annual average daily traffic triggers the need for further assessment. These areas include 22.9ha of mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide along the River Hull, 200m either side of the A63 trunk road and A15 Humber Bridge.</p> <p>The air quality assessment APP-208 identifies an exceedance of &gt;1% but less than 3.5% of a Critical Load or a Critical Level without any contribution of air emissions (NO<sub>x</sub> or NH<sub>3</sub>) from traffic associated with the Projects. Air emissions from construction vehicles associated with the Projects alone are modelled to be &lt;1% of a Critical Load or a Critical Level and may be screened out from further assessment.</p> <p>We agree that hydrological impacts may be ruled out as trenchless techniques are proposed to avoid disturbance to main rivers clarity should be provided why this is not considered to be design stage mitigation for avoiding hydrological impacts on downstream designated sites. Where watercourses within the Onshore Development Area will be open cut, implementation of the planned embedded mitigation mitigates the risk of pollution impacts locally and is not considered a risk to designated sites.</p> <p>We concur we the wider screening assessment for designated terrestrial sites.</p>

Document / Subject	Comment
Protected Species and Habitats	<p>The response is restricted to consideration of terrestrial and intertidal impacts and we agree with the scope of effects identified. Overall, baseline survey effort for protected species is acceptable. The reports recommended additional surveys including pre-commencement surveys for mobile species. Avoidance of impacts on these species should be prioritised. Where this is not possible the reports set out best practice mitigation measures. It is expected that, as a minimum great crested newt licencing will be required. Design stage mitigation, reasonable avoidance methods and timings of works are secured within the Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP) APP-235 and reinstatement of habitats detailed within a Landscape Management Plan (APP-236). We welcome the commitment to a Decommissioning Plan; this should be supported by relevant ecological surveys.</p>
Bats	<p>A Ground Level Tree Assessment (Peak Ecology, 2023) has been undertaken and has identified 48 trees with features suitable for multiple bats. Of the 19 trees located within the Onshore Development Area, two were found to be of high potential to support roosting bats, eight of moderate potential and eight of low potential. The applicant details that Five of these trees will be avoided by the use of trenchless crossing techniques. The majority of the trees considered to be potential bat roosts will be retained as they are located in and around Bentley Moor Wood, in the Onshore Converter Station area, that will be protected from direct impact as part of the embedded mitigation.</p> <p>Transect and static monitoring surveys have been undertaken, equipment failure is noted and it is agreed that this does not pose a significant constraint to interpretation of the data or understanding the use of the onshore cable corridor by bats. Common and widespread species typical of the region were recorded. Of note is the increased, activity recorded in October at locations T4, T5 and T8. Section 4 of the Bat Surveys: Transects and Static Monitoring, Issue 7(Peak Ecology, 2024) provides guidance on project design and methodology to avoid and mitigate impacts on bats and many of these are secured in para 99 – 106 of APP-235 which is welcomed, however, there is no further narrative on the potential swarming site where APP-146 recommends "Further survey would be required to determine the cause of the increased activity in October. It is recommended that works in these areas do not take place overnight and artificial light is minimised during the autumn months (September to November) to avoid disturbance or disruption of flight lines and foraging features." Para 178 of APP-235 detailed restrictions on night lighting that would benefit bats and this could be extended to November as recommended in APP-146.</p>
Great Crested Newt (GCN)	<p>Great Crested Newt (GCN) Report (Peak Ecology, 2024) details the results of surveys on 126 ponds. Habitat Suitability Assessments and where appropriate eDNA surveys were undertaken. 11 ponds located within the 250m GCN buffer and no ponds within the Development Area were classified as either 'Excellent' or 'Good'. One pond within the Onshore Development Area returned a positive result, and nine ponds within the</p>



Document / Subject	Comment
	250m GCN buffer were found to be positive for GCN. We consider that avoidance measures are unlikely to be sufficient to avoid impacts on GCN and support the recommendations in section 4 of the report. Paragraph 121 of APP-235 details that district level licencing (DLL) will be used; a countersigned Impact Assessment Conservation Payment Certificate (IACPC) issued by NE should be submitted as part of the DCO application to confirm this route is acceptable.
Water Vole and Otter	81 watercourses have been assessed for the presence of water vole and otter. Eight watercourses were found to have evidence of water vole presence. Otter suitability and scats present within the Rive Hull Corridor. The Water Voles and Otters Report provides recommendations with respect to avoiding impacts to watercourses containing water vole. Where this is not possible should be avoided the displacement of water voles from impacted ditches will be required under a licence. Updated surveys for otter and water vole prior to the commencement of works are secured in Table 1-2 of APP-235. The use of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) is supported for major watercourse crossings and this will avoid impacts on water vole and otter (APP-140 385). Additional mitigation is outlined in paragraphs 111-118 of APP-235 and follow standard best practice.
Reptiles	We agree with the approach to reptiles and assumed present (mainly grass snakes) closely associated with boundary features present at relatively low density. They are therefore unlikely to be negatively affected by the proposals, except during construction. Precautionary measures required during construction to prevent the killing or injuring reptiles are outlined in Table 18-4 of APP-140 and para 186 of APP-235.
Other Mammals	Brown Hare and Hedgehog are present within the development area; vegetation clearance outlined to mitigate impacts on reptiles and badger will also ensure impacts are avoided for hedgehog and hare. Pre-commencement checks and reasonable avoidance measures detailed in paras 130-132 of APP-235 are welcomed. We agree that hazel dormouse may be scoped out.
Invertebrates	It is agreed that terrestrial invertebrates may be scoped out. The majority of the onshore development area is low distinctiveness habitat and the arable dominance means that these areas considered unlikely to support a particularly diverse assemblage of invertebrates. Impacts on higher distinctiveness habitats are avoided as far as possible and <i>[sic]</i>
Badger	The Badger Survey Report details the presence of badger within the development area. Section 4 of the Badger Report – Confidential (Peak Ecology, June 2024). We support use of the mitigation hierarchy and impacts should avoided as far as possible. Para 308 of APP-140 details that impacts are unavoidable and main and annex setts located within the Onshore Development Area and will need to be destroyed. We note the need for a licence has not been determined yet by Natural

Document / Subject	Comment
	England, APP-235 para 168. Outlined working and mitigation measures in paras 107 - 110 and 169-180 follow standard best practice.
Other Priority Mammal Species	Hare and hedgehog are present. Impacts are considered temporary. Embedded mitigation with provide sufficient protection for these species.
Fish	Mitigation measures within Table 1-1 APP-235 will ensure impacts to fish are fully mitigated.
Breeding Birds	Completed Breeding bird undertaken between March 2023 and July 2023 confirm a total of 116 species within the study area. Sixty-nine Birds of Conservation Concern (BoCC) species were recorded, consisting of 21 red listed and 48 amber listed species and 11 WCA Schedule 1 species. Best practice precautionary working methods are secured within paragraphs 88-98 and 146-154 of APP-235 and are considered robust. Monitoring of breeding and wintering bird populations will be undertaken and mitigation redressed as required para 321 APP- 235.
Passage and Wintering Birds	<p>The Ornithology Overwintering Report confirms that a total of 104 species were recorded. Sixty BoCC were recorded, 19 red listed and 41 amber listed species. In addition, 12 Schedule 1 species were recorded; with barn owl, brambling, Cetti's warbler, green sandpiper, kingfisher, marsh harrier, peregrine, red kite, redwing, red-throated diver, ruff and whooper swan present.</p> <p>Of the Humber Estuary SPA qualifying features, golden plover, redshank and ruff, were recorded on site, in addition to 11 assemblage species; brent goose, curlew, goldeneye, grey plover, lapwing, mallard, oystercatcher, ringed plover, sanderling, teal and wigeon. It is noted that none of the species were recorded in significant numbers and the bird survey area is not considered potential Functionally Linked Land (FLL) to the SPA. Impacts on arable land will be temporary.</p> <p>The highest diversity of species was recorded at Skipsea Beach (T1) and the River Hull (T4 and T5). Impacts to birds are identified and the best practice precautionary working methods are secured within paragraphs 88-98 and 146-154 of APP-235 and are considered acceptable. Monitoring of breeding and wintering bird populations will be undertaken and mitigation redressed as required para 321 APP- 235.</p>
Invasive Species	The Habitat Survey undertaken recorded four instances of INNS plant outside of the onshore development area; Japanese knotweed, Himalayan balsam, and snowberry. Mink was also recorded. The invasive species management plan detail in paragraphs 120-128 of APP-234 are acceptable and will minimise the risk of introduction and spread of invasive species. Section 129 of APP-235 details if deemed necessary, following pre-commencement surveys, an INNS Management Plan would be developed. This approach is supported.



Document / Subject	Comment
Priority Habitat	<p>Impacts on intertidal habitats are mitigated by design. The Proposed Development is expected to avoid any development on Habitats of Principal Importance (except hedgerow) and this is welcomed.</p> <p>Impacts to Nunkeeling Lane and Beeford – Dunnington Road Verge Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) cannot be fully avoided. The majority of the impacts to the LWS will be avoided by the use of trenchless crossing technique. Small sections, however, will be affected by the construction of a temporary Haul Road crossing. Reinstatement of the LWS will be required and consultation will East Riding of Yorkshire Council is welcomed with respect to this matter.</p> <p>We note that APP-140 details a moderate adverse effect on Bentley Moor Wood LWS but recognise that impacts are temporary and when considered alongside already exceeded background levels of nitrogen deposition the increase to the upper critical load of 1.2% in-combination will not lead to significant degradation in habitat quality. Outlined best practice mitigation to avoid dust impacts, lighting and hydrological pollution prevention measures are welcomed.</p>
BNG	<p>The proposal aims to deliver no net loss of biodiversity and net gain where possible. The applicant has continued an active dialogue with the Local Planning Authority on the BNG process and on-site impacts have been significantly reduced which is very welcomed. Methods are proposed to ensure as so far as possible restoration of agricultural soils to ensure impacts may be recorded as temporary. Hedgerows removed to facilitate the proposal will be replace with species rich lengths. The proposed date for the baseline is acceptable as are proposals to meet any deficit through use of off-site units.</p> <p>Irreplaceable habitats (as defined under The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) recorded within the BNG Study Area include small (below 3ha per habitat block) areas of lowland fen and ancient woodland and these habitats are to be retained and impacts avoided, para 241 APP-140.</p> <p>We seek confirmation that there are no veteran or ancient trees within the onshore development area. We note that a small number of individual trees are shown within the cable corridor route in APP-024 (p14, 16, 24, 33, 34) but these are not included in the metric shown in Annex A of APP-157 presently. APP-146 also indicates there are a number of trees within the study area with rot holes (roost potential).</p> <p>Clarity is requested on the wording within the presented metric on temporary impacts lines 1-13 (user comments) which appear to contradict Defra's guidance on temporary losses. A copy of the excel document would be useful so that we may confirm use of the created in advance function is appropriate.</p> <p>We note that River condition assessments (RCA) were not carried out as part of the baseline habitat surveys and support the survey of watercourses impacted at the detailed design stage (para 58. APP-157).</p>

Document / Subject	Comment						
	<p>It would be useful in future iterations if habitat parcels references could be included on habitat maps. Presently it is not possible to cross-reference the metric to the habitat maps with any degree of certainty for many of the habitats.</p> <p>The iterative approach to reviewing the metric is welcomed and supported.</p>						
Trees and Hedgerows	<p>APP-024 indicates that no trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order will be impacted as a result of the proposal. There will be some losses of an ecological valuable line of trees. It is not clear whether there will be impacts on off-site retained trees at present. Neither a Tree Survey or Arboricultural Impact Assessment is presented as part of the PEIR. The impact on trees cannot be fully assessed. It is noted that section 44 of the OEMP (APP-235) states that "a detailed tree survey is being undertaken in 2024 to inform the Arboriculture Impact Assessment (AIA) prior to construction" and "Any trees that cannot be avoided must be replaced at a minimum of like-for-like." Buffer zones outlined in para 85 of APP235 are acceptable and should be taken through to the final EMP; "Buffer zones surrounding retained areas of woodland and mature broadleaved trees would be at least 15m in width or at least the width of the tree root protection zone (whichever is greater), as advised by an appropriately qualified arboriculturist". We look forward to these details being brought through as part of the detailed design.</p> <p>Important hedgerows are presented in APP-024 breaks and crossings (associated new tracks, and/or cable routes) have been designed to keep the width of any breaches to a minimum. Replacement planting for lost hedgerow is outlined and is acceptable.</p> <p>The commitment to minimising the impact on all trees and trees within hedgerows within the Onshore Development Area para 44 APP-235 is welcomed.</p>						
APP-235 8.10 Outline Ecological Management Plan - Volume 8	<p>The OEMP details the roles and responsibilities of the Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) and this is acceptable. Monitoring and reporting detailing is also secured within the report and provides details of inspection frequencies and monitoring requirements during construction through to implementation of the landscaping scheme. Paragraph 236 of APP-235 details that the "ECoW would be responsible for producing a report to the relevant local planning authority to confirm that all measures have been implemented in accordance with the EMP" and this is welcomed. Procedures for implementing, adapting and monitoring any protected licencing are acceptable.</p>						
APP-236 8.11 Outline Landscape Management Plan - Volume 8	<p>Local Authority planting guidance for hedgerows in the Holderness Character Area is provided below. Ash should be suitably substituted with disease resistant elm; Guelder rose is also acceptable as detailed in Table 1-1 of APP-236 is acceptable.</p> <table><tr><td>Hawthorn</td><td>Crataegus monogyna</td><td>30%</td></tr><tr><td>Blackthorn</td><td>Prunus spinosa</td><td>25%</td></tr></table>	Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	30%	Blackthorn	Prunus spinosa	25%
Hawthorn	Crataegus monogyna	30%					
Blackthorn	Prunus spinosa	25%					

Document / Subject	Comment															
	<table><tr><td>Hazel</td><td>Corylus avellana</td><td>15%</td></tr><tr><td>Field Maple</td><td>Acer campestre</td><td>15%</td></tr><tr><td>Dogwood</td><td>Cornus sanguinea</td><td>5%</td></tr><tr><td>Ash</td><td>Fraxinus excelsior*</td><td>5%</td></tr><tr><td>Oak spp.</td><td>Quercus spp</td><td>5%</td></tr></table> <p>Other planting mixes are considered appropriate to the area. The Indicative Maintenance Schedule is also acceptable.</p> <p>An Outline Soil Management Plan (OSMP) is detailed as presented at Appendix A of APP-234 8.9 Outline Code of Construction Practice - Volume 8 but is not currently available for review. Principles outlined in section 6.6.2.2 are acceptable and will adhere to Defra’s (2009) Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites and guidance from IES (2020) Sustainable, Healthy and Resilient: Practice-Based Approaches to Land and Soil Management.</p>	Hazel	Corylus avellana	15%	Field Maple	Acer campestre	15%	Dogwood	Cornus sanguinea	5%	Ash	Fraxinus excelsior*	5%	Oak spp.	Quercus spp	5%
Hazel	Corylus avellana	15%														
Field Maple	Acer campestre	15%														
Dogwood	Cornus sanguinea	5%														
Ash	Fraxinus excelsior*	5%														
Oak spp.	Quercus spp	5%														

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

**RWE**

MASDAR 