

Dogger Bank D Wind Farm

Section 51 Advice Log Version: 20 August 2026

This document comprises a record of the s51 advice that has been given by the Planning Inspectorate to the applicant (Doggerbank Offshore Wind Farm Project 4 Projco Limited) during the pre-application stage. It will be updated by the Planning Inspectorate after every interaction with the applicant within which s51 advice has been given.

The applicant will always be given the opportunity to comment on the Planning Inspectorate's draft record of the s51 advice given before it is published on the relevant project page on the [Find a National Infrastructure Project website](#).

The role of the advice log at the acceptance stage

Section 55(4) of the PA2008 requires the Planning Inspectorate to consider, amongst other things, the extent to which the applicant has had regard to the s51 advice given by the Planning Inspectorate in connection with the application when deciding if the application can be accepted for examination. Section 51 advice includes:

- advice given about applying for an order granting development consent
- advice given about making representations about an application for an order granting development consent

The applicant will use this advice log as the tool for demonstrating:

- regard to the s51 advice given to the applicant by the Planning Inspectorate
- regard to any s51 advice given to others by the Planning Inspectorate

The applicant will submit a final version of this advice log which demonstrates regard to all s51 given by the Planning Inspectorate at the pre-application stage as part of the application.

Dogger Bank D Wind Farm – Applicant meeting index

Date of meeting	Meeting overview
5 August 2022	<u>Inception Meeting:</u> • Project Background • Project Description • Why Green Hydrogen at Dogger Bank D? • Outline Programme • Specific decisions or follow-up required A meeting note is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project website, and this can be viewed at: View meeting note (PDF, 129KB).
16 February 2023	<u>Project Update Meeting:</u> • Programme Update • Draft Scoping Boundary • Site Selection • National Grid update • Consultation • Design • Planning Act 2008 • Administrative process and next steps A meeting note is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project website, and this can be viewed at: View meeting note (PDF, 76KB).
13 March 2023	<u>Project Update Meeting:</u> • Programme Update • Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping • Current Consultation • Any other business A meeting note is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project website, and this can be viewed at: View meeting note (PDF, 76KB).
9 January 2024	<u>Project Update Meeting:</u> • Project Update • HRA derogations • EIA Regulation 32 Transboundary Screening • Planning changes and Implications

	A meeting note is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project website, and this can be viewed at: View meeting note (PDF, 123KB).
24 April 2024	<u>Project Update Meeting:</u> • Programme Update • Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Update • Key Dogger Bank D Programme Milestones • Site Selection Update – Offshore • Other Updates • Lessons and feedback from early adopters programme • Specific decisions/ follow-up required A meeting note is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project website, and this can be viewed at: View meeting note (PDF, 125KB).
21 August 2024	<u>Project Update Meeting:</u> • Introductions • Project Update • Scoping • Stakeholder Engagement Update • Other topics for discussion Coordination Planning Inspectorate (PINS) Expectations / precedent from other projects? Update on approach from the project Good design - PINS expectations • AOB PINS update on approach/timings to Transboundary screening Tier advice update Updated guidance A meeting note is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project website, and this can be viewed at: View meeting note (PDF, 125KB).
4 November 2024	<u>Programme Document Feedback:</u> The Inspectorate provided formal written feedback on the submitted Programme Document on Monday 4 November 2024. This feedback is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project website, and this can be

	viewed at: View feedback on programme document (PDF, 138KB).
13 November 2024	<u>Project Update Meeting:</u> • Introductions • Project Update, including general, derogation and Compensation, onshore and offshore updates • Stakeholder Engagement Update • Other topics for discussion including programme document – Planning Inspectorate comments and next steps, PINS Enhanced service and Transboundary consultation update. • Any other business including updated guidance
22 October 2025	<u>Project Update Meeting:</u> • Introductions • General Project Update • Onshore Update • General Update • Key issues raised in PEIR comments • Offshore Update • General Update • Key issues raised in PEIR comments • Compensation Update • General Update & key issues raised in PEIR comments • Stakeholder Engagement Update • EPP • Other topics for discussion • DCO documents for early PINS review • Any Other Business
29 October 2025	<u>Emailed advice on outcome of review and update to Planning Inspectorate Pre-application Prospectus:</u> The Planning Inspectorate provided a formal update and advice to the applicant on the outcome of a six-month review and update to the Inspectorate's Pre-application Prospectus by email.
20 March 2026	<u>Project Update Meeting:</u> • Introductions • General Project Update- Programme

	• Pre-Application documents • Onshore Update • Onshore Consultation • Land Update • Offshore red-line boundary updates • Offshore project infrastructure • Offshore Update • Derogation and Compensation Updates • Any other business
13 July 2026	<u>Project Update Meeting:</u> • Welcome and introductions • Project update • Discussion and PINS advice on pre-application documents, document register, PINS early review document and approach to consultation and changing regulations, Adequacy of Consultation Milestone Report and RIAA narrative on screening conclusion. • Any other business
16 July 2026	<u>Advice provided by email to the Applicant by the Inspectorate:</u> The Inspectorate provided advice to the applicant in relation to updates to our pre-application services and the legislation governing the development consent application process.
30 July 2026	<u>Advice provided by email to the Applicant by the Inspectorate:</u> The Inspectorate provided advice to the applicant by phone in relation to the submission of an Application Index at the time of the submission of the application.
4 August 2026	<u>Advice provided by email to the Applicant by the Inspectorate:</u> The Inspectorate provided advice to the applicant by email in relation to the Land and Rights Negotiation Tracker, Issues Tracker and Draft Document Register.
20 August 2026	<u>Advice provided by email to the Applicant by the Inspectorate:</u>

	The Inspectorate provided advice to the applicant by email in relation to the need for a Statutory Undertakers Schedule and Equality Impact Assessment.
--	---

Dogger Bank D Wind Farm – Log of s51 given to the applicant

Meeting date: 5 August 2022

Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Green Hydrogen Production – Engagement with Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	The Inspectorate queried if the Proposed Development would also include distribution pipelines. The applicant stated that this would depend on the outcome of the site selection process. The Inspectorate queried the status of development of safety standards for hydrogen production. The applicant stated that this was in development by the HSE. The Inspectorate recommended that the applicant engage with the HSE regarding this aspect of the Proposed Development.	
Engagement with relevant stakeholders	The applicant explained it is in the early stages of site selection and is starting to prepare scoping. The applicant noted its scoping is expected to be submitted to the Inspectorate towards the end of Quarter 1 2023. The Inspectorate queried when Statutory Consultation is likely to take place. The applicant confirmed that it is likely to be 7 to 8 months prior to the submission of the DCO application.	

	The Inspectorate advised the applicant that early agreements with relevant stakeholders is key as it is will be vital in getting individuals input on the project in this area.	
Evidence Plan Process	The Inspectorate queried if the applicant is following an evidence plan process. The applicant confirmed an evidence plan approach is its intention. The Inspectorate noted it would expect to attend steering group meetings for evidence plans.	
Requirement for a derogation under the Habitats Regulations	The Inspectorate queried if a derogation under the Habitats Regulations would be required for this project. The applicant stated it is very aware of this issue but was not able to comment due to the early stage of the project and the ongoing assessment process. The Inspectorate stated that it might be better to work on the basis that a derogation case would be required and develop 'without prejudice' solutions as early as possible with relevant stakeholders within the preapplication stage to avoid issues arising at acceptance or due to this issue dominating the examination process.	

Meeting date: 16 February 2023

Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Scoping Boundary	The applicant presented a high-level plan showing the proposed project boundary, subject to refinement, which would likely form the basis of the EIA scoping request. The applicant highlighted the novel nature of the hydrogen element of the scheme and the issues with the site selection due to technical and commercial uncertainties at this stage. The Inspectorate advised that any further refinements which can be made around about the design and layout of the Proposed Development prior to submission of the scoping request would improve the ability of the Inspectorate and consultation bodies to provide detailed comments in the Scoping Opinion. Should a high level of uncertainty remain around key design elements of the Proposed Development, this is likely to limit the Inspectorate's ability to agree to scope out aspects/ matters to enable the refinement of the Environmental Statement.	
Consultation - Overlap	The applicant stated that more consultations were due to be undertaken with statutory consultees (Environment Agency, Local Authorities, etc) in the coming weeks. The Inspectorate enquired about	

	the timing of the non-statutory consultations given the timetable for submission of the Scoping Report (end of March 2023). The Inspectorate recommends that any non-statutory consultation avoids any overlap with the Inspectorate's statutory scoping consultation process. The applicant responded that discussion with local communities and councils were due to commence and emphasised that the project wasn't a typical onshore grid connection, but a novel project on a significant scale.	
Design	The Inspectorate advised the applicant to look at the design aspects of the project as set out in the National Infrastructure Commission's design principles.	
Planning Act Section 35 Direction – Green Hydrogen Manufacture	The applicant confirmed that it was seeking a Section 35 direction (Planning Act 2008) from the Secretary of State in relation to the production of green hydrogen. The Inspectorate drew the applicant's attention to two hydrogen-related NSIPs, the Keuper Gas Storage non material change and the Hynet North West Hydrogen Pipeline applications. The applicant confirmed that the offshore windfarm, and the green hydrogen development would be considered under one Development Consent Order (DCO).	

Administrative Process – Shapefile submission	The Inspectorate requested that the GIS shapefile should be submitted about two weeks before the Scoping Report. The specifications for the shapefile are set out in the Inspectorate's Advice Note 7 . A file sharing website can be used to submit the scoping request documents.	
Meeting date: 13 March 2023		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping	The applicant stated that it intends to submit the EIA Scoping Report for the Proposed Development to the Inspectorate at the end of Quarter 1 2023. The applicant explained that the Scoping Report would be a substantial document and will include 27 aspect chapters. The applicant provided an outline of the report structure that had been adopted to accommodate the different geographical coverage and nature of potential impacts associated with the two connection options. The Inspectorate advised that the Scoping Report should clearly and consistently identify aspects/ matters that are proposed to be scoped out from further assessment, with reference to the requirements set out in the Inspectorate's Advice Note Seven (see section 5.11).	

Consultation - Overlap	The Inspectorate asked about the timing of any non-statutory consultation to be undertaken by the applicant, specifically whether there was any potential for overlap with the Planning Inspectorate's statutory scoping consultation process. The applicant responded that only targeted, high-level consultations were planned in the next few months. However, the applicant highlighted its intention to notify bodies of the project generally, including of publication of the Scoping Report. The Inspectorate noted the potential for confusion around the purpose of any such "notification" with that of the formal scoping consultation and notification undertaken by the Planning Inspectorate (on behalf of the Secretary of State) with consultation bodies as defined in the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017. Therefore, the Inspectorate advised the applicant to include text in any such notification it issues to specifically explain that the scoping notification and consultation process under the EIA Regulations 2017 is the Planning Inspectorate's (on behalf of the Secretary of State) and is not an exercise of public consultation. The Inspectorate advised that further explanation was available in Advice Note Three on EIA Notification and Consultation. If any responses to the Inspectorate's scoping consultation from EIA consultation bodies are sent directly to the applicant (rather than the Planning	
-------------------------------	--	--

	Inspectorate) in error, the applicant confirmed that it will forward these on to the Inspectorate. The timing of the applicant's Scoping Report submission and the Planning Inspectorate's consultation was discussed in relation to bank holidays in the April/ May period. The Inspectorate advised that it will be consulting the consultation bodies for a 28 day period on receipt of the Scoping Report. The Planning Inspectorate confirmed that it must adopt a Scoping Opinion within 42 days of receiving a scoping request.	
Geographical Information System (GIS) Shapefile	The applicant made reference to submitting two separate GIS shapefiles to cover the scoping boundary. The Inspectorate requested that, preferably, the entirety of the red line boundary to which the Scoping Report relates should be presented in a single shapefile. Guidance on the technical specification for the shapefile are set out in Advice Note Seven. The Inspectorate requested that the GIS shapefile be submitted at least two weeks prior to submission of the Scoping Report.	
Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)	The applicant stated that a HRA Screening was currently being prepared with a completion target date of Q2 2023.	

	The Inspectorate advised that Advice Note Ten on HRA had been updated to reflect changes in legislation and emerging best practice.	
Meeting date: 9 January 2024		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Design changes – EIA Scoping	The applicant outlined a change in design for the grid connection, explaining that a radial connection design proposal has been developed. The applicant queried how this change should be managed with regards to EIA scoping. Advice from the Inspectorate is as follows: Although requesting a scoping opinion of the Secretary of State is not a statutory requirement, the EIA Regulations require the ES to be based on the most recent scoping opinion adopted (Regulation 14(3) of the EIA Regulations). The Regulation specifies ‘So far as the proposed development remains materially the same as the proposed development which was subject to that opinion’. The adopted Scoping Opinion (dated 1 June 2023) is based on the information available in the Scoping Report (dated 21 April 2023) at that point in time and there is no mechanism by which it can be amended/ updated by the Inspectorate to account for the radial connection design proposal.	

	The applicant could submit a new scoping request under Regulation 10(1) of the EIA Regulations to the Secretary of State, which would need to include a description of the updated Proposed Development and an explanation of the likely significant effects of the development in its entirety. This would need to be accompanied by a new GIS Shapefile and notification under Regulation 8(1)(b) of the EIA Regulations (the applicant would then be provided with a new list of the consultation bodies notified under Regulation 11(1)(a)), as required by Regulation 11(1)(b)). The Inspectorate would notify and consult the consultation bodies again (including any additional bodies identified) and produce a new Scoping Opinion for the entire Proposed Development including the radial connection design proposal. Alternatively, the applicant could seek to define the scope of the assessment of effects arising from the radial connection through engagement with relevant consultation bodies, including as part of the Evidence Plan Process. The applicant should take care to ensure that aspects/ matters included in the EIA Regulations and particularly Schedule 4 (where relevant) are appropriately addressed. In order to demonstrate that aspects/ matters have been appropriately addressed, the ES (and PEIR, where possible) should explain the reasoning for scoping them in/ out and justify the approach taken. The applicant should also consider whether it needs to identify any additional consultation bodies in light of	
--	--	--

	the change to the red line boundary presented at scoping. Having regard to the advice above it is a matter for the applicant to determine whether or not to submit a new scoping request.	
HRA derogations	The applicant is progressing conversations around derogations and compensatory measures, with an aim to identify the compensatory measures as early as possible during the pre-application stage. The Inspectorate advised that the HRA Report should describe the measures and how their delivery would be secured, including as much detail as possible in this regard. The Inspectorate's Advice Note Ten provides further advice regarding compensatory measures. The applicant noted that a number of projects in the area have recently proposed compensatory measures which the competent authority has been satisfied with, which the applicant will use to help define its own compensatory measures. It will be working with relevant stakeholders to gain more information on such compensatory measures. It was noted that The Crown Estate (TCE) are developing Round 4 Strategic Compensation Plans for Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protected Area and Dogger Bank Special Area of Conservation. The applicant will review how this progresses.	

EIA Regulation 32 Transboundary Screening	The applicant asked about the timescales for the transboundary screening and notification exercise undertaken by the Inspectorate (on behalf of the Secretary of State). The Inspectorate advised that it was in the process of drafting the transboundary screening and would shortly be issuing a query to the applicant regarding the potential for significant effects on offshore ornithology in Ireland. Following the meeting the applicant responded to the Inspectorate's query and the Inspectorate undertook the transboundary screening and notification exercise, with eight European Economic Area (EEA) States notified (Denmark, Belgium, Sweden, France, the Netherlands, Norway, Germany and Iceland). The applicant has undertaken limited consultation with relevant parties regarding potential transboundary impacts. The Inspectorate referred the applicant to Advice Note 12 (Section 4.2), which states that where the Inspectorate is of the view that the proposed NSIP is likely to have a significant effect on the environment in an EEA State(s), the applicant may wish to engage with certain appropriate bodies within those EEA State(s) and/ or other relevant states. Any engagement/ consultation may form part of the applicant's statutory or non-statutory consultation under the pre-application stage of the DCO process and should be evidenced in the consultation report submitted with the DCO application.	
--	--	--

Planning changes and Implications	Questions were raised from the applicant regarding the Early Adopters Programme (EAP), focusing on relevant updates and feedback from other projects on the scheme. The Inspectorate highlighted the value of design principle documents, directing the applicant towards the published advice on the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Farm project page.	
Meeting date: 24 April 2024		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Update	An EIA scoping update was provided by the applicant. As a result of the project changes, the applicant will submit a new scoping request under Regulation 10(1) of the Infrastructure Planning EIA Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) to the Secretary of State on 7 June 2024. The applicant queried whether the original EIA scoping report (dated 21 April 2023) and EIA scoping opinion (dated 1 June 2023) will remain on the National Infrastructure website - noting that if so, it may cross-reference to these documents within the new scoping report. The Inspectorate confirms that these documents will remain on the website. Notwithstanding this, the applicant should ensure that the new scoping request contains all the information required by EIA Regulation 10.	

The Infrastructure Planning (Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations 2024	The Inspectorate noted that the Infrastructure Planning (Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations 2024 came into force on 30 April 2024 and amend the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. This, together with the red line boundary changes, is likely to result in some changes to the list of consultation bodies notified and consulted by the Inspectorate as part of the 2023 scoping exercise. The applicant would be provided with a new list of the consultation bodies notified under Regulation 11(1)(a)) of the EIA Regulations, as required by Regulation 11(1)(b)), together with the new scoping opinion.	
Compulsory Acquisition – Grid Connection Cable	The Inspectorate enquired about the length of the grid connection cable as this would have an impact on the amount of Compulsory Acquisition included within a future application. The applicant responded that it would approximately be 30km and that the Compulsory Acquisition had been taken into account.	
EIA Regulation 32 Transboundary Screening	The Inspectorate will reconsider the potential for transboundary effects under EIA Regulation 32 further to the adoption of a new scoping opinion. Any European Economic Area (EEA) States identified as having a likely significant effect on their environment, will be notified of the Proposed	

	Development under Regulation 32 of the EIA Regulations (with the exception of those who previously confirmed their intention to participate in the EIA procedure, who will be consulted following acceptance of any DCO application). Within the scoping report, the applicant may wish to provide a completed transboundary screening matrix dealing with the potential effects of the Proposed Development on EEA States.	
Early Adopters Programme	The applicant was keen to gain any insights arising from the Early Adopters Programme. The Inspectorate advised that it was still too early to make or release key lessons and feedback from the programme as some of the outcomes from components tested may be still to be identified now the trial cases are now in Acceptance and Pre-Examination stages. It was noted by the Inspectorate that some feedback, both to and from applicants had already been published as required as section 51 advice and in the news article published on the government's website. The applicant is encouraged to review this advice and take on board points of relevance to its application. The benefits of programme planning in ensuring the Inspectorate and other key stakeholders are kept informed of the programme and any changes in the programming of the Pre-Application stage was emphasised by the Inspectorate as this would	

	assist the management of resources for these stakeholders.	
Meeting date: 21 August 2024		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Stakeholder Engagement	The applicant gave a summary update on the stakeholder engagement to date. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that it will be useful to feed information from these engagements into the Consultation Report.	
Project coordination	Following a query from the applicant on how coordination should be approached and reflected in the Application. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that Five Estuaries and North Falls Offshore Wind Farm proposals were examples of projects which have sort to undertake coordination.	
Good Design	Following a request from the applicant for more information from the Inspectorate on how Good Design should be approached in an Application for Development Consent, the Inspectorate provided some information and signposting to information on good design. The Inspectorate raised the importance of showing the design journey and how feedback and stakeholder engagement has been incorporated into the design. The Inspectorate also advised the	

	applicant to look at the Design Approach Document for the Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind Farm application as a reference point and added that the feedback to this document can be included in this meeting note. The Inspectorate added that further design advice will be published on their website in the next few months, and that the Design Approach Document is a mandatory component of the fast-track tier of the new pre-application service.	
Transboundary	The Inspectorate advised the applicant about the appropriate approach to Transboundary screening, stating that existing screening would stay on the project webpage and a potential re-screening would then be published.	
Pre-Application Service to be introduced from October 2024	The Inspectorate gave the applicant further advice on the pre-application tier service and requested that the applicant attempt to identify dates of any key 'touch points' with the Inspectorate, for example meeting dates or document reviews, to provide the best opportunity to ensure resource could be planned effectively. The Inspectorate confirmed that it will be writing to all applicants by the end of August to confirm tiers. However, at this stage, the Inspectorate could not confirm that the project is suitable to follow the fast track route on the basis of the information provided to date; further discussions in relation to this matter will take place in due course and the applicant was	

	directed to the associated government guidance and the Inspectorate's pre-application prospectus. The Inspectorate advised that if the applicant did subsequently wish to pursue the formal fast track route that it should inform relevant stakeholders of this intention at the earliest opportunity, as outlined in the associated guidance. Irrespective of whether the formal Fast Track route was followed, the Inspectorate advised that there is opportunity to deal with applications quicker than statutory timeframes, for example examination and reporting periods, if the submitted application is of sufficient quality and there are few, if any, change requests or outstanding issues to be resolved.	
Pre-Application Service to be introduced from October 2024 - New approach to the presentation of s51 advice at meetings	The Inspectorate reminded the applicant about upcoming changes to the s51 advice in the context of the new pre-application service.	
Updated guidance	The applicant asked the Inspectorate about updated guidance, to which the Inspectorate replied that all the relevant advice notes are now on their website.	

Advice date: 4 November 2024		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Feedback on Programme Document	The Inspectorate provided formal written feedback on the submitted Programme Document on Monday 4 November 2024. This feedback is available on the Find a National Infrastructure project website and this can be viewed at: View feedback on programme document (PDF, 138KB).	
Meeting date: 13 November 2024		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Assessment of Alternatives in the ES	Regarding the description of reasonable alternatives in the ES, the Inspectorate advised that the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations 2017) require an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects.	
Multi-Party Meetings	The Inspectorate reminded the applicant that it could request a multi-party meeting with the Inspectorate and Natural England (NE), if the applicant felt that such a meeting would be useful	

	and support the progression of discussions around derogations/ compensation.	
The required standard of information relating to derogations/ compensation	The applicant noted the delay to the start of the Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms (OWF) Examination and asked the Inspectorate how it could avoid such delays. The Inspectorate was clear that it is unable to discuss a live application but could provide advice relating more broadly to the HRA process for OWFs, as follows: The Inspectorate advised that an Examining Authority (ExA) requires sufficient information to meaningfully examine a proposed NSIP in six months. The applicant explained that NE is not able to advise on compensation requirements for the Proposed Development at the current time. The Inspectorate advised that it can't compel NE to engage in these discussions, but (as above) the Inspectorate could participate in a multi-party meeting, or engage with NE directly. The applicant was advised to continue to keep the Inspectorate informed of progress on this matter. The applicant was advised to work towards agreeing the baseline data and the conclusions of the assessments of effects on integrity as far as possible with the Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies, noting that the conclusions of those assessments are likely to relate to the levels of compensation required. The Inspectorate noted that cases where there is engagement with an Evidence Plan Process during pre-application (with regular	

	Steering Group and Expert Topic Group meetings) tend to be more effective in achieving this. The applicant was advised to make use of the Inspectorate's draft documents review service for the draft HRA Report and to carefully consider the best time to provide the draft. The more complete the documents are when provided to us, the more thorough our advice can be. The applicant was advised to review the requests for further information issued by the ExA for Dogger Bank South OWFs and that it may be helpful to maintain an overview of progress of that application.	
Provision of project update information to the Inspectorate	The Inspectorate encouraged the applicant to share the slide deck of the project update points for meetings going forward with us in advance, to assist us in providing the best service and providing the most appropriate comment and feedback. In line with the Pre-Application Prospectus, the agenda should be provided at least 10 working days in advance and it would be helpful to all attendees to have access to supporting information such as the slide deck in a similar timeframe.	
Programme Document Feedback – Future feedback on amended versions of the programme document.	The applicant was advised that if it submits another version of the Programme Document the Inspectorate may undertake a review, but any comments would be limited. The Inspectorate advised that the Programme Document should	

	outline the proposed meeting schedule including the dates of proposed meetings, so that it can provide the most effective service to the applicant.	
Evidence Plan process	As part of the enhanced service, the Inspectorate can attend up to eight meetings per annum for the Evidence Plan. This can be a mix of steering group, Expert Topic Group and (where related to Evidence Plan matters) any multi-party meetings. The limit of up to eight meetings per annum related to the Evidence Plan process is in addition to nine project update or non-Evidence Plan multiparty meetings per year of service. The Inspectorate advised that it requires a minimum of six weeks' notice to participate.	
Programme Document – Publication	The Inspectorate indicated that the applicant may wish to publish the original programme document, an updated version following our feedback and then updated versions as the pre-application stage progresses. The reason for this is to assist stakeholders in understanding comments made and published under the Inspectorate's s51 advice duty.	
Updated guidance and advice	The Inspectorate advised that on the 23 October 2024 they had released new advice on design and technical matters in relation to Good Design. The updated guidance is available at https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-infrastructure-planning-advice-notes. The	

	Inspectorate expects the applicant to have regard to this new and updated advice. A further Advice Page is anticipated to be released shortly on design and technical matters in relation to advice on linear schemes. The applicant was advised that they may wish to have regard to this advice once published.	
Regulation 32 transboundary screening	The Inspectorate advised that to date, it had received a response to the transboundary re-notification exercise from Belgium, confirming it wishes to participate in the procedure under Regulation 32 of the EIA Regulations 2017. Germany had confirmed it would respond by the deadline (20 November 2024). A full update will be provided to the applicant as soon as practicable after the deadline and the responses will be published on the project page.	
Meeting date: 22 October 2025		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Pre meeting	The applicant sought clarification from the Inspectorate on the information which would be published following the meeting. The Inspectorate explained that the information to be shared as standard would be that relating to the duty under section 51 of the Planning Act. It was also confirmed that the information shared by the	

	applicant in advance of this meeting was not intended to be published alongside the advice log. The Inspectorate also highlighted that materials shared with it could be subject to a Freedom of Information request.	
General Updates - submission dates	The applicant provided an update on this case and indicated that the indicative submission timetable may be subject to change. The Inspectorate requested that once the new submission date was confirmed by the applicant this is provided to the Inspectorate Case Team. This is required in order to inform resource planning and ensure that all stakeholders can plan in accordance with the latest date.	
Delays to the submission date – Impact on validity of surveys	The Inspectorate advised that consideration should be given to the validity of existing survey work in light of delays to the submission date to ensure that the survey results will remain valid for the purposes of examination. The applicant noted that any re-assessment or validation surveys may need to account for changes to the baseline conditions.	
Land rights and issues tracker	The Inspectorate asked the applicant to provide an issues tracker either before or shortly after the next meeting to help monitor and manage the issues effectively.	

Interrelationships and interactions with other projects	The Inspectorate raised with the applicant, interrelationships and interactions with other projects located in proximity to the scheme. It was noted that the options for the location of the converter station were near to the Jock's Lodge Improvement Scheme and other current or proposed converter stations. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that, due to the constraints of land for projects, maintaining a relationship with other projects surrounding Dogger Bank D (DBD) is important. The Inspectorate asked if the applicant had considered option of joining other projects. The applicant confirmed it had been considered, but the opportunity had not arisen due to surrounding projects being at different stages however the cumulative effects assessment continues to be updated.	
Consultation Feedback from Local Authority – Call for Sites	The Inspectorate asked about the call for sites put out by East Riding of Yorkshire Council. The applicant confirmed that Zone 4 may be promoted for housing development. The applicant currently believes that the Dogger Bank D (DBD) project could be co-located with housing in Zone 4	
Onshore – Flood risk assessment	The Inspectorate highlighted for the applicant that there were currently some potential inconsistencies in policy. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that they should ensure that their flood risk assessment aligns with the most recent updates to	

	the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), particularly in light of changes to how flood risk is considered. The Inspectorate advised that it's important to note that the PPG has been updated, whereas the National Policy Statement (NPS) has not yet been revised. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to follow the current PPG and monitor live examinations for emerging recommendations.	
Offshore General Update	The applicant provided an update on the interaction of the project with the Department for Environment and Rural Affairs' (DEFRA) potential Special Area of Conservation (SAC) extension. The Inspectorate advised that clarity on the position of DEFRA should be sought. The Inspectorate advised that the applicant should demonstrate proactive efforts with DEFRA in co-locating and co-ordinating the potential SAC extension and the proposed development and the Inspectorate will continue to advise based on the information available during pre-application. The Inspectorate highlighted that showing clear steps on how the proposal is being progressed for the Examination Authority is crucial, as delays could impact the decision timeline.	
Offshore - Key S42 Comments	The Inspectorate advised the applicant to look beyond the Dogger Bank D project and consider how similar issues involving Natural England are being addressed in other offshore wind farm	

	projects. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to review decision letters for guidance on how such matters have been handled. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to clearly demonstrate the steps it has taken to progress these matters, including a clear statement of the issues involved, a summary of the actions already undertaken, and identification of any remaining sticking points. The Inspectorate advised the applicant this level of transparency will be important during the examination and recommendation stages, as any unresolved issues could delay the decision stage.	
Compensation General Update	The applicant set out that it expects to provide comments on compensation measures in future meetings but that detailed information on compensation is still pending and is subject to updates from the Secretary of State and other related projects. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that Natural England remains its statutory adviser and recommended consulting NatureScot on any proposed compensation at Scottish sites. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that early engagement is essential to avoid delays and to ensure that all relevant perspectives are considered.	

Stakeholder Engagement Update	The Inspectorate advised that the applicant should give them a 6-week warning to all for meeting attendance. The applicant proposed multiple Expert Topic Group (ETG) meetings that they would like the Inspectorate to attend, primarily to provide visibility of the ongoing dialogue rather than to advise. Inspectorate has requested details of subsequent ETG meetings as the meetings scheduled for December and January appear more feasible to attend.	
Draft Documents – Submission and review of documents	The Inspectorate advised the applicant to ensure all documents follow the structure advised in the pre-application prospectus and requested that they submit all documents for draft document review in one batch, rather than multiple batches. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to submit queries in advance to allow for timely responses as enhanced cases typically involve more documents, so the applicant should plan accordingly. The Inspectorate only has 6 weeks to review the draft documentation. Therefore, the Inspectorate asked the applicant to consider what they want reviewing, focusing more on things they would consider unique rather than documents that are common within a DCO submission and flag these early.	

Provisional Draft Documents for PINS Review	The Inspectorate advised the applicant to prepare and submit a land rights tracker, a negotiations tracker and an issues tracker to show how far negotiations have progressed. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to obtain and produce these documents early and aim to submit all supporting documents together. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that the wake effect modelling report will not be accepted as part of the draft document review. The Inspectorate advised in general to avoid submitting individual chapters unless there is a particularly complex issue or novel approach. In such cases, a chapter paired with a control document can help focus attention appropriately. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that over the next 12 months the applicant should consider timetabling meetings with the Inspectorate so it can resource effectively. Additionally, the applicant should provide a list of what the Inspectorate could expect to review in advance.	
Programme Document	The Inspectorate advised a new programme document should be provided by the applicant. The Inspectorate informed the applicant that the templates are on the website should the applicant want some guidance on setting out their programme document.	

Advice date: 29 October 2025

Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Outcome of review and update to Inspectorate Pre-application Prospectus	Following a 6-month review of our services, our Pre-application Prospectus has been updated: 2024 Pre-application Prospectus. The update log at the bottom of the page summarises the changes and clarifications that have been applied. As an applicant with a live project at the pre-application stage of the process, please familiarise yourself with the update and consider how it might affect your pre-application programme and interaction with our services. Please note in particular: • the establishment of land and rights negotiations tracking as a primary service feature – this means it is now expected for all applicants to develop and share a land and right negotiations tracker in 1 of 2 available templates, irrespective of the service tier they have subscribed to • clarified expectations of applicants when preparing to interact with the Inspectorate at meetings – including clarified rights for the Inspectorate to delay or refuse service where pre-meeting expectations are not upheld e.g.	

	an updated programme document or issues tracker is not provided, on time, to inform a meeting agenda As discussed at the recent project update meeting, it would be helpful to have an updated programme document provided to the Inspectorate and for a version of this Programme Document to be published on the applicant's website for the Dogger Bank D Wind Farm. Updates to the pre-application programme document should be communicated by the applicant proactively, with a clear description of the potential impacts on the requested services of the Inspectorate, relevant statutory bodies, local authorities, and other stakeholders provided. As a minimum, it is expected for an updated programme document to be provided to the Inspectorate at least 10 working days before each programmed interaction. As outlined in the pre-application prospectus the production and maintenance of the programme document is a primary service feature. The expectation is that the applicant will share a copy of the issues tracker with the Inspectorate at least 10 working days before each programmed interaction to help our team to understand the project issues, review progress, and target advice. As outlined in the pre-application prospectus the production and maintenance of an issues tracker is a primary service feature.	
--	--	--

	This communication has been recorded as section 51 advice in the project's advice log.	
Meeting date: 20 March 2026		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Issues Tracker	The Inspectorate advised that matters should be marked as amber until the matters are considered agreed by relevant stakeholders involved in the discussions. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that the RAG status being used requires refinement and noted that the descriptions for the RAG status should be updated to show the position at project submission rather than indicating the expected position at examination. The Inspectorate stated that other projects have experienced issues relating to commercial fisheries which has caused long discussions in the examination in terms of navigational routes, which required significant Examining Authority time. The Inspectorate advised that the applicant should consider how they engage with the relevant bodies to resolve any potential concerns in the pre-	

	application stage in order to reduce the need for examination time to be spent resolving issues.	
Lands and Rights Negotiation Tracker	The Inspectorate advised that plot numbers could be included in the tracker along with references to land plans and works plans. This could be reflected via additional columns including this information as it can assist Examining Authorities in cross checking and referencing. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that it would be useful to understand how many special category land plots and crown land plots are contained within the proposed order limits. The Inspectorate advised that it cannot set a figure on how many heads of terms agreements should be signed prior to project submission. The Inspectorate stated that an Examining Authority would want to see clear demonstration of the applicant engaging as much as possible with landowners.	
Programme Document	The applicant was advised to check the document referencing to ensure no error messages appeared. The Inspectorate reminded the applicant that an up-to-date version of the programme document should be made available on the applicant's website.	

	The Inspectorate advised the applicant that the PINS draft document review should aim to be completed within one period rather than staggering the review. The Inspectorate reminded the applicant that they should consider what they want reviewing, focusing more on things they would consider unique rather than documents that are common within a DCO submission and flag these early. The Inspectorate reminded the applicant that they should ensure materials produced for project update meetings should clearly outline questions they wish the Inspectorate to advise on to ensure that the applicant can get the most out of the project update meetings.	
Scoped out methodologies	The Inspectorate advised that the applicant's proposed approach of providing a summary within the Impacts Register of scoped out ES Assessments which have been agreed with the relevant stakeholders was considered suitable. The Inspectorate stated that it assists to have a high-level summary within each ES aspect chapter of the scope of the assessment with cross-references where relevant to the Impacts Register.	

Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC)	The Inspectorate advised that it is preferred that the REAC is submitted as standalone document and not as an appendix to any document. This is because it is a standalone document which cross refers across the application and is often updated throughout the examination. The applicant is reminded that during examination the statements of common ground will be frequently revised and therefore the applicant should consider submitting the outline management plans and statements of common ground as standalone documents. The Inspectorate stated that it would be helpful to see a full list of application documents to see how the applicant proposes to set out the suite of application documents.	
Offshore update	The Inspectorate advised that assurances should be included in the application documents regarding the interactions with Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms particularly regarding the proposed approach to the landfall for both schemes to limit the impact on the Holderness Inshore Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ).	
Principal areas of disagreement summary statements (PADSS)	The Inspectorate advised that PADSS are not a mandatory component unless a project is seeking to pursue the fast-track procedure.	

	The Inspectorate advised that PADSS supplement and do not replace the preparation of statements of common ground.	
Adequacy of consultation milestone (AoCM)	The Inspectorate advised that the AoCM should summarise the applicant's approach to consultation however it should not be a full consultation report. The Inspectorate further advised that the submission should establish the consultation undertaken to date, confirm the approaches set out in the statement of community consultation, and summarises the consultation responses and the way in which they are shaping the application. The Inspectorate further advised that it should include the views and any relevant supporting material from all relevant local authorities if available. The Inspectorate confirmed that the written submission will be published on the relevant project page on the Find a National Infrastructure Project website.	
Inter-relationships with other projects	The Inspectorate advised that the creation of Inter-relationship with other project reports assist Examining Authorities in understanding how the proposed project interacts with other projects either consented, proposed or expected to be delivered in the vicinity of Dogger Bank D Offshore Wind Farm. The Inspectorate advised that the creation of such	

	reports have become useful tools in Examinations particularly in Lincolnshire and in the Irish Sea.	
Meeting date: 13 July 2026		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Draft documents review	The applicant was requested by the Inspectorate to submit its draft documents for review together (and not in two stages as set out in the applicant's Programme Document). This allows the Inspectorate to cross-reference relevant documents. Additionally, the more complete the draft documents are, the more likely the Inspectorate will be able to provide detailed advice.	
Draft Document Register	Follow a review of the applicant's draft document register, the Inspectorate advised that there did not appear to be a cable statement listed, which may be required for this type of project under Regulation 6 of the APFP Regulations. The applicant needs to review whether the relevant regulations in the APFP Regulations have been met when submitting its application and ensure all the required documentation is included.	
Consultation	The Inspectorate advised the applicant that the government's new guidance (dated 3 July and coming into effect from 24 July 2026) was now	

	available on the National Infrastructure Planning Guidance Portal. Under changes to legislation, it is for applicants to decide how to undertake their consultation at pre-application, with the government setting out 'principles' of pre-application and for carrying out 'consultation' and 'engagement' activities, to be tailored to the nature, scale and complexity of each proposed development (as set out in the government's 'Planning Act 2008: Guidance on preparing an application: Part 1 - Pre-application steps'). The Inspectorate will decide on behalf of the Secretary of State, once an application has been submitted, as to whether the application should be accepted based on its compliance with relevant statutory requirements and whether it has passed the 'satisfactory test' in relation to the extent and quality of the baseline information provided.	
Document accessibility	The Inspectorate advised that documents should be prepared in accordance with the accessibility regulations and referenced advice provided to the applicant for the North Humber to High Marnham project in relation to s56(6) of the Planning Act, regulation 8 of the APFP Regulations and The Public Sector Bodies (Websites and Mobile Applications (No.2) Accessibility Regulations 2018.	

Compensation Areas	The Inspectorate understands the applicant's approach to optionality for three compensation areas for Kittiwake and advised that should these be located in areas of future windfarm development, a buffer or consideration of interactions between the areas would likely be scrutinised during an examination. The EIA and HRA will therefore have to justify this approach. The Examining Authority / SoS would be unlikely to accept the justification that any windfarm might not be built out to its full extent, noting that any permission would enable full build out, this has been discussed in previous examinations. It is also important to consider whether any compensation measures themselves trigger the need for an HRA to be undertaken. The information presented should justify why this is the best area for compensation in relation to considering alternatives. A lack of certainty on this topic could become an issue for examination and potentially for the decision stage. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to continue its discussions with Natural England and Crown Estate in relation to compensation areas and leasing of the seabed and provide further information on progress at the next meeting. For compensation sites located in Scotland, the applicant is advised to consult NatureScot for its views on the proposals as early as possible to ensure deliverability. The Inspectorate noted that	
---------------------------	---	--

	Nature Scot had previously raised concerns in relation to use of Scottish sites when consulted by the SoS during the decision periods.	
Report to Inform an Appropriate Assessment (RIAA)	During the Project Update Meeting, the Inspectorate expressed that they agreed with DBD's general approach to the RIAA and provided positive feedback on the approach. The Inspectorate stated that the having reviewed information provided by the applicant to date, the level of information provided for screening features and sites in and out of the HRA was really helpful. It is useful for the HRA to fully explain which sites and features have been considered to provide confident that all relevant features have been considered.	
Advice date: 16 July 2026		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Changes to the Planning Act 2008	In light of the amended legislative framework which will be introduced from 24 July 2026 by the Planning and Infrastructure Act 2025, the Planning Inspectorate issued written advice to the applicant on 16 July 2026 requesting for: evidence within the submitted application in relation to duties under s46 and s48 of the PA2008 to be provided as an appendix to any engagement summary document that the applicant may choose to submit or, where the applicant chooses not to submit	

	such a document, as a discrete document titled 'Section 46 and section 48 information' evidence within the submitted application in relation to new s55(4)(e) of the PA2008 to be provided in a submission version of this expanded advice log template.	
Advice date: 30 July 2026		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Application Index	Following the project update meeting held on 13 July 2026 the Inspectorate confirmed to the applicant that it did not expect that an Application Index would be required to accompany submission of the application. This is due to the move to the shortly to be introduced application portal provided through the Apply for and manage your infrastructure project website.	
Advice date: 4 August 2026		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Detailed Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker	The Inspectorate suggests that the applicant may wish to provide this document in a different file format to make it easier to review (as the document text is smaller and harder to read than may be desirable).	

Draft Document Register	The application form as provided in Schedule 2 of the APFP Regulations is required under Reg 5(1) rather than being outlined in Regulation 5 (2) (q) as listed in the Draft Document Register. The application index and section 55 checklist prepared by the applicant are not specifically listed as documents in the APFP regulations due to these being operational documents. The applicant should seek its own legal advice on which regulation each document is intended to satisfy.	
Issue Tracker	The Issues Tracker has been reviewed, and it appears that the applicant has responded to previous feedback from the Inspectorate in relation to the definition of the RAG ratings being used. The Inspectorate considers that this provides a suitably detailed Issues Tracker.	
Advice date: 20 August 2026		
Topic	s51 advice given	Applicant regard to s51 advice given
Statutory Undertakers Schedule	The provision of a Statutory Undertakers Schedule as part of the application would be a decision for the applicant. However, this would depend on the nature and extent of impacts on statutory undertaker assets. For linear schemes, this could be useful and that approach could be taken to make it clear as to the extent of impacts on statutory undertakers and the progression of	

	Protective Provisions. There is no prescribed form for the Land Rights Tracker, only a non-statutory template. The Inspectorate cannot provide a definitive position that could be taken by a future Examining Authority.	
Equality Impact Assessment	The provision of an Equality Impact Assessment may be a decision that the applicant would wish to seek legal advice on and reach its own conclusions about whether this is a required element for an application for development consent. However, the Inspectorate can advise that the pre-application prospectus includes a component (Component 8 of pre-application prospectus) relating to preparation of evidence to support the public sector equality duty. Component 8 would be required for a fast-track application as set out in the annex to the Pre-Application Prospectus. It is not possible for the Inspectorate to comment or pre-judge whether an Examining Authority to a potential future examination will request such information to be provided. Therefore, although an Equality Impact Assessment is not a listed document under The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009, the applicant may wish to provide an Equality Impact Assessment with the application in order to assist the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State in examining the application.	

