



Hornsea Project Four

Statement of Common Ground between Hornsea Project Four and East Riding of Yorkshire Council

Deadline: 5, Date: 20 June 2022

Document Reference: F3.1

Revision: 04

Prepared Orsted, June 2022
Checked Orsted, June 2022
Accepted Thomas Watts, Orsted, June 2022
Approved Julian Carolan, Orsted, June 2022

Doc No. F3.1
Ver. C

Revision History

Date	Version	Reason for issue
09/06/2020	i	1 st draft template for East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC)
10/11/2020	ii	2 nd draft template updated to inform DCO deliverable reviews
15/01/2021	iii	3 rd draft template updated and inputted positions for Historic Environment and Air Quality
13/08/2021	iiii	4 th draft for input requests from ERYC and sign off prior to DCO application submission.
24/09/2021	A	Draft version for DCO submission.
08/03/2022	02	Updated draft version submitted at Deadline 1. New agreements added, awaiting positions from ERYC.
21/04/2022	03	Updated version submitted at Deadline 3 with additional agreements.
20/06/2022	04	Updated version submitted at Deadline 5 with additional agreements.

Signatories

Signed	[Insert signature] <i>M.Sunman</i>
Name	Matthew Sunman
Position	Principal Planning Officer – Minerals and Waste
For	East Riding of Yorkshire Council

Signed	[Insert signature]
Name	
Position	
For	Orsted Hornsea Project Four Limited

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	6
1.1	Reason for this document.....	6
1.2	Approach to SoCG.....	6
1.3	Application elements under the ERYC remit	7
1.4	Overview of Hornsea Four	7
2	Consultation	8
2.1	Summary of consultation with ERYC.....	8
3	Onshore Agreement Log.....	15
3.1	Overview	15
3.1.2	General	16
3.1.3	Draft DCO	18
3.1.4	Geology and Ground Conditions.....	19
3.1.5	Hydrology and Flood Risk.....	22
3.1.6	Ecology and Nature Conservation	25
3.1.7	Landscape and Visual	28
3.1.8	Historic Environment	30
3.1.9	Land Use and Agriculture	32
3.1.10	Traffic and Transport	34
3.1.11	Noise and Vibration	37
3.1.12	Air Quality	39
3.1.13	Socio-economics	41
4	Summary.....	43

List of Tables

Table 1: Summary of pre-application consultation with ERYC.	8
Table 2: Position Status Key.	15
Table 3: Agreement Log: General.	16
Table 4: Agreement Log: Draft DCO.	18
Table 5: Agreement Log: Geology and Ground Conditions.	19
Table 6: Agreement Log: Hydrology and Flood Risk.	22
Table 7: Agreement Log: Ecology and Nature Conservation.	25
Table 8: Agreement Log: Landscape and Visual.	28
Table 9: Agreement Log: Historic Environment.	30
Table 10: Agreement Log: Land Use and Agriculture.	32
Table 11: Agreement Log: Traffic and Transport.	34
Table 12: Agreement Log: Noise and Vibration.	37
Table 13: Agreement Log: Air Quality.	39
Table 14: Agreement Log: Socio-economics.	41

Glossary

Term	Definition
Development Consent Order (DCO)	An order made under the Planning Act 2008 granting development consent for one or more Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP).
Hornsea Project Four Offshore Wind Farm	The term covers all elements of the project (i.e. both the offshore and onshore). Hornsea Four infrastructure will include offshore generating stations (wind turbines), electrical export cables to landfall, and connection to the electricity transmission network. Hereafter referred to as Hornsea Four.

Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
CEA	Cumulative Effects Assessment
DCO	Development Consent Order
ECC	Export Cable Corridor
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
HVAC	High Voltage Alternating Current
HVDC	High Voltage Direct Current
LSE	Likely Significant Effect
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs
MLWS	Mean Low Water Springs
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
OnSS	Onshore substation
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
UK	United Kingdom

1 Introduction

1.1 Reason for this document

1.1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared between Orsted Hornsea Project Four Limited ('the Applicant') and East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) 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 Hornsea Project Four offshore wind farm (hereafter referred to as 'Hornsea Four').

1.1.1.2 This SoCG covers the following topics:

- General ([Section 3.1.2](#))
- Draft DCO ([Section 3.1.3](#))
- Geology and Ground Conditions ([Section 3.1.4](#))
- Hydrology and Flood Risk ([Section 3.1.5](#))
- Ecology and Nature Conservation ([Section 3.1.6](#))
- Landscape and Visual ([Section 3.1.7](#))
- Historic Environment ([Section 3.1.8](#))
- Land Use and Agriculture ([Section 3.1.9](#))
- Traffic and Transport ([Section 3.1.10](#))
- Noise and Vibration ([Section 3.1.11](#))
- Air Quality ([Section 3.1.12](#))
- Socio-economic ([Section 3.1.13](#))

1.1.1.3 The need for a SoCG between the Applicant and ERYC is set out within the Rule 6 letter issued by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) on 24th January 2022¹.

1.1.1.4 It is the intention that this document will facilitate further discussions between the Applicant and ERYC and will provide PINS with a clear overview of the level of common ground between both parties. This document will be updated throughout the application process.

1.2 Approach to SoCG

1.2.1.1 The Applicant took the decision at an early stage to adopt a proportionate approach to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for Hornsea Four which is detailed and integrated throughout the application for development consent. The Impacts Register ([Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register \(APP-049\)](#)) is a key tool that details all potential impacts identified for Hornsea Four and sets the scope of the EIA at various stages of the project (Scoping, Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and DCO). In line with the Applicants approach to proportionality, only Likely Significant Effects (LSE) are included within the individual topic assessments of the Environmental Statement (ES).

¹ [EN010098-000901-Hornsea 4 Rule 6 letter.pdf \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)

1.2.1.2 The structure of this SoCG is as follows:

- **Section 1:** Introduction;
- **Section 2:** Consultation;
- **Section 3:** Onshore Agreement Log; and
- **Section 4:** Summary.

1.3 Application elements under the ERYC remit

1.3.1.1 The elements of Hornsea Four which may affect the interests of ERYC are work numbers 6 to 10, onshore. These are detailed in Part 1 (Authorised Development) of Schedule 1 (Authorised Project) of the draft DCO (**C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203)**). ERYC is identified as the “relevant planning authority” in the draft DCO and will be responsible for the approval of a number of plans and strategies pre-construction of relevant parts of the connection works for Hornsea Four.

1.4 Overview of Hornsea Four

1.4.1.1 Hornsea Four is an offshore wind farm which will be located approximately 69 km offshore the East Riding of Yorkshire in the Southern North Sea and will be the fourth project to be developed in the former Hornsea Zone. Hornsea Four will include both offshore and onshore infrastructure and consists of:

- **Hornsea Four array area:** This is where the offshore wind generating station will be located which will include the turbines, array cables, offshore accommodation platforms and a range of offshore substations as well as offshore interconnector cables and export cables;
 - **Hornsea Four offshore export cable corridor (ECC):** This is where the permanent offshore electrical infrastructure (offshore export cables, as well as the High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) booster station (if required), will be located;
 - **Hornsea Four intertidal area:** This is the area between Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) and Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS) through which all of the offshore export cables will be installed;
 - **Hornsea Four onshore export cable corridor:** This is where the permanent onshore electrical cable infrastructure will be located; and
 - **Hornsea Four onshore substation (OnSS) including energy balancing infrastructure:** This is where the permanent onshore electrical substation infrastructure (onshore High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) converter/HVAC substation, energy balancing infrastructure and connections to the National Grid) will be located.

2 Consultation

2.1 Summary of consultation with ERYC

2.1.1.1 **Table 1** summarises the consultation that the Applicant has undertaken with ERYC during the pre-application and post-application phases. In addition, a number of Position Statements and draft documents (including the impacts Register (**APP-049**)) have been issued throughout the per-application stage of Hornsea Four, for review and comment.

Table 1: Summary of pre-application consultation with ERYC.

Date	Form of consultation	Statutory/Non Statutory	Summary
25/04/2018	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four – Project Update #1 Meeting to introduce Hornsea Four and the project team from Hornsea Four and ERYC.
22/06/2018	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four – Project Update #2 Meeting to provide a project update, discuss the terms of the planning performance agreement (PPA), draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), local information events, community access points and local interest groups.
07/08/2018	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four - Evidence Plan Steering Group #1
11/09/2018	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four - Historic Environment Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #1 Meeting to introduce Hornsea Four, the consenting programme, evidence plan process and the proportionate approach to EIA. An overview of historic environment work undertaken to date was provided, including scoping and approach to baseline. Assessment methodology, route planning and site selection was also discussed.
12/09/2018	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four - Water and Flood Risk Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #1
12/09/2018	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four - Onshore Ecology Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #1
15/10/2018	Consultation	Statutory	Hornsea Project Four Offshore Wind Farm Scoping Report
21/11/2018	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four – Project Update #3 Meeting to provide project update and summary of informal consultation events. The OnSS site selection process was discussed, identifying 'zones', and access from the A1079.

Date	Form of consultation	Statutory/Non Statutory	Summary
			Discussion held regarding A63 Castle Street Improvement scheme and A164/Jock's Lodge Improvement scheme.
12/12/2018	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four - Evidence Plan Steering Group #2
07/01/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p data-bbox="751 499 1358 562">Hornsea Project Four - Human Environment Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #1</p> <p data-bbox="751 607 1358 813">Meeting to introduce Hornsea Four, the consenting programme, route planning and site selection. The foundations of the traffic and transport (including non-motorised users and public rights of way (PRoW)), noise and vibration and air quality assessments were discussed, including scope, assessment methodology</p>
08/01/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four - Onshore Ecology Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #2
15/01/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p data-bbox="751 965 1374 1028">Hornsea Project Four – Water and Flood Risk Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #2</p> <p data-bbox="751 1072 1374 1234">Meeting to provide project updates, and an overview of the survey methodology and preliminary results obtained from ongoing surveys. Discussion on Scoping responses received by the project, accompanied by a discussion on the next steps for the PEIR and ES assessments.</p>
16/01/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p data-bbox="751 1256 1358 1319">Hornsea Project Four - Historic Environment Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #2</p> <p data-bbox="751 1364 1358 1731">Meeting to provide Hornsea Four update, recap of the EIA scoping report and approach to EIA proportionality. Route planning and site selection was discussed in relation to historic environment assets. Scoping opinions received were discussed, and necessary next steps, including survey and assessment work. Confirmation of the approach to assessment in respect of temporary logistics compounds, onshore substation ZTVs, and non-designated assets. Discussion regarding the WWII defences within the landfall search area in addition to effects on below-ground assets from changes to drainage patterns.</p>
22/01/2019	Consultation response	Statutory	<p data-bbox="751 1753 1374 1816">Scoping Opinion – Late Scoping Consultation Response from ERYC</p> <p data-bbox="751 1861 1198 1888">Providing comments on the Scoping Report.</p>
02/04/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four Historic Environment Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #3

Date	Form of consultation	Statutory/Non Statutory	Summary
			<p>Meeting to provide a Hornsea Four update (including redline boundary changes since EIA scoping and OnSS site selection) and an overview of the consultation process. Survey methodology, baseline characterisation and locally significant historic environment receptors were discussed. Land access difficulties was raised that had prevented Geophysical survey effort.</p>
05/04/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four Water and Flood Risk Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #3</p> <p>Meeting to provide project updates, Hornsea Fours proportionate EIA, further evidence base to scope out impacts where consensus had not been reached with stakeholders, as well as the next steps to seeking consensus with stakeholders on the approach to the PEIR.</p>
08/04/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four Onshore Ecology Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #3</p> <p>Meeting to provide project updates, Hornsea Fours proportionate EIA, further evidence base to scope out impacts where consensus had not been reached with stakeholders, as well as the next steps to seeking consensus with stakeholders on the approach to the PEIR.</p>
01/05/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four – EIA Proportionality Roadshow</p> <p>Meeting to discuss the approach to EIA proportionality. The meeting also covered ERYC's and the Applicant's prior experience of community benefit funds.</p>
01/05/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four Human Environment Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #2</p> <p>Meeting to provide a Hornsea Four update (including redline boundary changes since EIA scoping and OnSS site selection) and an overview of the consultation process. The identification of PRoWs and subsequent effects was discussed, including the permanent diversion at the OnSS site and future coast path and landfall. Assessment methodology associated with traffic and transport was discussed and agreed, including the study area, approach to baseline characterisation, origin of HGVs and distribution of employees, and the use of DMRB compliant generic access designs.</p>
05/06/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four – Project Update #4</p>

Date	Form of consultation	Statutory/Non Statutory	Summary
			Meeting to coordinate handover of ERYC personnel, discuss project update, overview of PEIR submission documents, overview of the formal consultation process and agreement to hold PEIR drop in session for ERYC technical officers.
25/06/2019	Consultation	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four - Evidence Plan Steering Group #3
27/05/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four – Energy Balancing Infrastructure Meeting to discuss EBI and Grid Systems: background, national and local balancing, Offshore wind and EBI.
27/06/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four – Water and Flood Risk Technical Panel meeting #4 Meeting to provide project updates, further evidence base to scope out impacts where consensus had not been reached with stakeholders, and to present an update on how to read the Hornsea Four proportionate PEIR.
09/07/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four – Ecology Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #4 Meeting to provide project updates, further evidence base to scope out impacts where consensus had not been reached with stakeholders, and to present an update on how to read the Hornsea Four proportionate PEIR.
13/08/2019	Consultation	Statutory	Hornsea Project Four PEIR Published for statutory Section 42 consultation.
03/09/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four – PEIR Drop in Session Attended by core technical staff from ERYC in a 'drop in' format, allowing any questions to be asked about the Hornsea Four PEIR and requirements for Section 42 consultation. The relevant application documents were highlighted for each respective technical attendee, to ensure acknowledgement and awareness prior to completing review.
23/09/2019	Consultation response	Statutory	ERYC letter response to PEIR Providing comments on the PEIR.
24/09/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four – OnSS Workshop #1 Workshop to present and discuss multiple technical topic areas of relevance to the OnSS (traffic and transport, hydrology and flood risk, local heritage, ecology and public

Date	Form of consultation	Statutory/Non Statutory	Summary
			<p>rights of way. Site selection and access to the OnSS site was also discussed</p> <p>ERYC's countryside access team were in attendance.</p>
02/10/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four – Highway Engineer Team Workshop</p> <p>Meeting to provide project update and present and discuss the approach to the traffic and transport assessment presented at PEIR. Additionally, all construction access points were reviewed on an online map to obtain the views and agreement from ERYC that the access locations and strategy was appropriate. The routing of abnormal loads for the OnSS was also discussed.</p>
29/10/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four - Human Environment Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #3</p> <p>Meeting to discuss PRowS and cycle routes with ERYC.</p>
05/11/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four – Water and Flood Risk Technical Panel meeting #5</p> <p>Meeting to provide project updates since the submission of the PEIR and the close of the 2019 Section 42 consultation. Summary and Hornsea Fours initial responses to key Section 42 comments received, and to seek consensus on the approach to the ES.</p>
06/11/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four - Evidence Plan Steering Group #4</p>
04/11/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four - Human Environment Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #4</p> <p>Discussion on core assumptions associated with the Traffic and Transport and the associated impacts upon the Air Quality assessment presented in the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for Hornsea Four.</p>
13/11/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four – Ecology Evidence Plan Technical Panel meeting #5</p> <p>Meeting to provide project updates since the submission of the PEIR and the close of the 2019 Section 42 consultation. Summary and Hornsea Fours initial responses to key Section 42 comments received and to seek consensus on the approach to the ES.</p>
10/12/2019	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four – Draft DCO Meeting</p>

Date	Form of consultation	Statutory/Non Statutory	Summary
			Meeting to run through the draft DCO, identifying the sections of most relevance to ERYC. Discussion around the role and requirements of ERYC to inform the draft DCO, and the programme for how input will be best integrated.
17/02/2020	Consultation	Statutory	Further Statutory Section 42 consultation Published by the Applicant for comments.
16/03/2020	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four - Evidence Plan Steering Group #5
15/04/2020	Draft documents	Non Statutory	Draft Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan issued for review
29/04/2020	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four – Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan Meeting to discuss the previously distributed draft Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan with ERYC.
10/06/2020	Draft documents	Non Statutory	Draft DCO wording issued for review Draft wording for Schedule 1, Part 3 (process of discharging conditions) issued to ERYC for review and comment.
02/10/2020	Draft documents	Non Statutory	Draft Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan issued for review
06/10/2020	Meeting	Non Statutory	Hornsea Project Four - Evidence Plan Steering Group #6
26/10/2020	Meeting	Non Statutory	Catch up to discuss A164/Jocks Lodge Interaction, Locking Parish comments, DCO programme, SoCG and draft document reviews.
30/10/2020	Draft documents	Non Statutory	Draft ES Chapters issued for review The Historic Environment, Noise and Vibration and Air Quality draft ES chapters were issued to ERYC for review and comment (along with accompanying Impacts Register tabs and Commitment Register), to inform individual conference calls to provide an opportunity to ask questions and discuss.
09/11/2020	Email	Non Statutory	Email with updated A1079 access design for review and comment.
19-20/11/2020	Meetings	Non Statutory	Meetings held to discuss and facilitate the review of the Historic Environment, Noise and Vibration and Air Quality draft ES Chapters issued for review.
04/12/2020	Draft documents	Non Statutory	Draft ES Chapters issued for review

Date	Form of consultation	Statutory/Non Statutory	Summary
			The Geology and Ground Conditions, Hydrology and Flood Risk, Traffic and Transport draft ES chapters were issued to ERYC for review and comment (along with accompanying Impacts Register tabs and Commitment Register), to inform individual conference calls to provide an opportunity to ask questions and discuss.
18/12/2020	Draft documents	Non Statutory	<p>OnSS updated access junction issued for agreement</p> <p>The updated access design off the A1079 was distributed, with an independent safety audit for sign off by ERYC.</p>
10/05/2021	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Project catch up, including project update, discussions regarding digital consultation, baseline validity, Lockington Parish comments and draft document reviews to inform the SoCG.</p>
11/05/2021	Meeting	Non Statutory	Meeting to discuss the interaction between Hornsea Four's onshore ECC access off the A164 and the A164/Jocks Lodge Highways Improvement scheme. Recommendation from ERYC during meeting to move access point.
14/05/2021	Position papers	Non Statutory	Baseline data validity position papers issued via email for Noise and Vibration, Onshore Ecology, Traffic and Transport, Air Quality.
25/05/2021	Email	Non Statutory	Updated access design off the A164 issued for review and comment further to the meeting held on 11/05/2021.
13/07/2021	Meeting	Non Statutory	<p>Hornsea Project Four - Evidence Plan Steering Group #7</p>
21/02/2022	Meeting	Non-Statutory	Meeting to discuss the LIR programme and SoCG.

3 Onshore Agreement Log

3.1 Overview

3.1.1.1 The following sections of this SoCG set out the level of agreement between the parties for each relevant onshore topic (as identified in [paragraph 1.1.1.3](#)).

3.1.1.2 In order to easily identify whether a matter is 'agreed' 'not agreed', or an 'ongoing point of discussion' the colour coding system set out in [Table 2](#) below is used within the 'position' column of the following sections of this document.

Table 2: Position Status Key.

Position Status	Position Colour Coding
Agreed The matter is considered to be agreed between the parties	Agreed
Not Agreed – no material impact The matter is not agreed between the parties, however the outcome of the approach taken by either the Applicant or RSPB is not considered to result in a material impact to the assessment conclusions.	Not Agreed – no material impact
Not Agreed The matter is not agreed between the parties and the outcome of the approach taken by either the Applicant or RSPB is considered to result in a materially different impact to the assessment conclusions.	Not Agreed
Ongoing point of discussion The matter is neither 'agreed' nor 'not agreed' and is a matter where further discussion is required between the parties (e.g where documents are yet to be shared with RSPB).	Ongoing point of discussion

3.1.1.3 The following section of this SoCG summaries the level of agreement between Hornsea Four and ERYC on all relevant matters landward of MHWS.

3.1.2 General

Table 3: Agreement Log: General.

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
G3.1: 1.1	There is a specific need to provide renewable energy, which is in line with government policy.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 1.2	The Applicant has adequately consulted with ERYC throughout all stages of the project to date and the summary of Consultation (Section 2 of this SoCG) is a fair and accurate record of pre-application consultation.	Agreed. The way these discussions with ERYC have been recorded in the SoCG is a very thorough and accurate record.	Agreed
G3.1: 1.3	The site selection and route refinement outlined in Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives (APP-009) has properly considered the alternatives for the relevant elements of Hornsea Four (landfall, onshore ECC and OnSS).	ERYC consultees have discussed the landfall arrangements and we are satisfied with the locations/development configurations etc.	Agreed
G3.1: 1.4	The selection of the OnSS site is appropriate and was discussed and agreed with ERYC through the pre-application consultation process.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 1.5	The Applicant's approach to proportionate EIA has been discussed with ERYC and produces an Environment Statement that accords with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. .	ERYC have agreed that the ES should take a proportionate approach to the issues that needed to be addressed. ERYC can confirm that the ES accords with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.	Agreed
G3.1: 1.6	The Applicant and ERYC have discussed potential interaction between Hornsea Four and the A164 / Jock's Lodge Highway Improvement Scheme. This has resulted in Hornsea Four amending the access location off the A1079, and the updated access location and access design are considered appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 1.7	The design of the OnSS, as presented in F2.13: Outline Design Plan (APP-248) is considered appropriate and reflects good quality design standards for the onshore aboveground infrastructure.	ERYC agree the design of the OnSS is appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 1.8	EBI safety is satisfactorily considered and F2.12: Outline Energy Balancing Infrastructure HazID Report (APP-247) provides the framework for safety measures to be secured and agreed with ERYC prior to construction.	ERYC agree that physical security measures for the perimeter are secured through Requirement 12. If certainty were considered necessary for the	Agreed

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
		buildings, this could be incorporated into Requirement 7.	
G3.1: 1.9	<p>Volume A2, Chapter 1: Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes (APP-013) accurately and adequately assesses potential impacts and identifies that no significant effects will occur as a result of Hornsea Four.</p>	<p>Applicant required you to monitor any impact DCO may have upon local beach levels. Hence, ERYC would expect Applicant to provide a beach monitoring plan that would detail what survey work would be undertaken and what mitigation would be carried out to restore beach levels if the data shows that this is required.</p> <p>The monitoring frequency and techniques used would be agreed to suit the nature of the works being undertaken, previously this has been through the use of LiDAR or the weekly GPS surveying of agreed grid points. The outcome of each survey and details of what mitigation may be required to restore beach levels would then be documented within monthly reports to be submitted to this Council.</p>	Ongoing point of discussion
G3.1:1.10	The annexes provided within F2.2: Outline Code of Construction Practice are considered to be appropriate.	ERYC agree that it is not necessary to provide further details on the Emergency Response and Pollution Control Plan, Communications Plan, Crossing Method Statements and Construction Lighting Plan at this stage and these issues can be controlled at the requirements stage.	Agreed

3.1.3 Draft DCO

Table 4: Agreement Log: Draft DCO.

ID	Hornsea Fours' Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
G3.1: 2.1	The Principal Powers (namely the development consent granted by the Order, power to construct and maintain the authorised project, benefit of the order and application, modification of legislative provisions, defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance) as set out in Part 2 of C1.1: Draft Development Consent Order (APP-203) are appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 2.2	Works associated with Streets as set out in Part 3 of C1.1: Draft Development Consent Order (APP-203) are appropriate. The streets included within Schedule 2 and Schedule 3 are accurate and appropriate.	ERYC agree the works associated with streets are appropriate. Schedules 2 and 3 are accurate and appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 2.3	Works associated with Public Rights of Ways as set out in Part 3 of C1.1: Draft Development Consent Order (APP-203) are appropriate. The Public Rights of Way included within Schedule 4 (subject to temporary stopping up, permanent diversion, temporary diversions and temporary suspension) are accurate and appropriate.	ERYC agreed the works associated with public rights of way are appropriate. Schedule 4 is accurate and appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 2.4	Access to works as set out in Schedule 5 of C1.1: Draft Development Consent Order (APP-203) is accurate and appropriate.	The Schedule is accurate and appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 2.5	The Authorised Project set out in Schedule 1, Part 1 in C1.1: Draft Development Consent Order (APP-203) (namely Work No, 6- 10, where relevant to ERYC) is appropriate.	ERYC agree that Authorised Project as set out is appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 2.6	Requirements set out in Schedule 1, Part 3 of C1.1: Draft Development Consent Order (APP-203) are appropriately worded to secure necessary mitigation measures (namely Requirements 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 30, where relevant to ERYC). The staged approach to discharge is considered appropriate.	The principles of the Requirements are accepted, however precise wording on some Requirements is still being discussed through the Examination process. The staged approach to discharge of requirements is considered appropriate.	Area for ongoing discussion

ID	Hornsea Fours' Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
G3.1: 2.7	Details set out regarding the procedure for discharge of requirements (such as necessary timeframes associated with ERYC decisions) in Schedule 1, Part 4 of C1.1: Draft Development Consent Order (REP2-061) are appropriate.	The procedure and timescales are agreed.	Agreed
G3.1: 2.8	Hedgerows set out in Schedule 10 in C1.1: Draft Development Consent Order (APP-203) are accurate and appropriate.	The hedgerows are accurate and appropriate.	Agreed

3.1.4 Geology and Ground Conditions

Table 5: Agreement Log: Geology and Ground Conditions.

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
<i>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</i>			
G3.1: 3.1	Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (APP-025) has identified all relevant plans and policies and appropriate consideration has been given to them in the assessment.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Baseline Environment</i>			
G3.1: 3.2	The ES adequately defines the baseline environment relevant to Geology and Ground Conditions in Section 1.7; Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (APP-025) to inform the EIA.	Agree the baseline environment is adequately defined.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Methodology</i>			
G3.1: 3.3	The study areas identified in Section 1.5 of Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (APP-025) are appropriate.	Agree the study areas are appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 3.4	The maximum design scenarios identified and outlined, where relevant, for each impact in Section 1.9 of Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (APP-025) , and in the 'Geology and Ground Conditions' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent the maximum project parameters for assessment.	Agree the maximum design scenario has been identified.	Agreed
G3.1: 3.5	The potential impacts identified in Table 1.7 and Section 1.11 of Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (APP-025) , and in the 'Geology and Ground Conditions' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent a comprehensive list of the potential impacts.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
G3.1: 3.6	The methodologies used in Section 1.10 of Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (APP-025) are appropriate for assessing the potential impacts of Hornsea Four.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</i>			
G3.1: 3.7	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at Scoping (or during subsequent correspondence with geology and ground conditions stakeholders) for impacts GGC-C-1 (damage to designated geological SSSIs), GGC-C-2 (indirect effects on designated geological SSSIs), GGC-C-6 (soil compaction), GGC-C/O-9 (accidental spills), and GGC-D-10 (decommissioning), and not being significant in EIA terms, which resulted in these potential impacts being 'Scoped out' of further assessment or 'not considered in detail in the ES', is appropriate.	The conclusion is appropriate. Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 3.8	The conclusion that no LSE was identified for GGC-O-3 (sterilisation of future mineral resources), GGC-C-7 (dewatering of trenches and excavations), ENC-C-8 (physical intrusion into groundwater resource), GGC-C-11 (impacts on groundwater resources) at PEIR, and not being significant in EIA terms, and were therefore not considered in detail in the ES, is appropriate.	ERYC agree.	Agreed
G3.1: 3.9	The conclusion that impacts GGC-C-4 (exposure of workforce to health impacts), GGC-C-5 (encountering contamination during intrusive works), assessed within Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (APP-025) are not considered to be significant in EIA terms is appropriate when considered alongside the commitments in Table 1.8 and where relevant, identified further mitigation measures.	The conclusion is appropriate. Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 3.10	The conclusions of the CEA on geology and ground conditions presented in Section 1.12 and inter-related effects in Section 1.14 of Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (APP-025) , are appropriate.	The conclusion is appropriate. Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 3.11	Requirement 14 of the draft DCO (C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203)) is sufficient to secure the mitigation measures associated with contaminated land and groundwater.	ERYC agree.	Agreed
G3.1: 3.12	F2.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (APP-237) includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions (APP-025) and is appropriate for managing construction impacts	ERYC agree.	Agreed

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
	<p>from Hornsea Four on geology and ground conditions receptors landward of MLWS.</p> <p>Volume A4, Annex 5.2: Commitments Register (APP-050) includes a commitment (Co124) to produce a CoCP in accordance with the Outline CoCP which is secured via Requirement 17 of C1.1: Draft Development Consent Order (APP-203).</p>		

3.1.5 Hydrology and Flood Risk

Table 6: Agreement Log: Hydrology and Flood Risk.

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
<i>EIA – Policy and planning</i>			
G3.1: 4.1	Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (APP-026) has identified all relevant plans and policies and appropriate consideration has been given to them in the assessment.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Baseline Environment</i>			
G3.1: 4.2	The ES adequately defines the baseline environment relevant to Hydrology and Flood Risk in Section 2.7, Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (APP-026) , to inform the EIA.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Methodology</i>			
G3.1: 4.3	The study areas identified in Section 2.5 of Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (APP-026) are appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 4.4	The maximum design scenarios identified and outlined, where relevant, for each impact in Section 2.9 of Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (APP-026) , and in the 'Hydrology and Flood Risk' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent the maximum project parameters for assessment.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 4.5	The potential impacts identified in Table 2.9 of Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (APP-026) , and in the 'Hydrology and Flood Risk' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent a comprehensive list of the potential impacts.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 4.6	The methodologies used in Section 2.10 of Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (APP-026) are appropriate for assessing the potential impacts of Hornsea Four.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</i>			
G3.1: 4.7	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at Scoping (or during subsequent correspondence with hydrology and flood risk stakeholders) for impacts HFR-C-1 (disturbance from cable crossings of Main Rivers and IDB watercourses), HFR-C-3 (disturbance from cable crossings of minor drainage ditches), HFR-C-5	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed

Hornsea 4



ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
	(disruption of local land drainage), HFR-C-6 (changes in water quality, construction), HFR-O-7 (alteration in run-off characteristics at onshore substation), HFR-C-8 (mobilisation of pollutants), HFR-D-9 (decommissioning onshore ECC), HFR-D-10 (impacts associated with decommissioning onshore substation), HFR-O-11 (impacts associated with operation) and not being significant in EIA terms, which resulted in these potential impacts being 'Scoped out' of further assessment or 'not considered in detail in the ES', is appropriate.		
G3.1: 4.8	The conclusion that no LSE was identified for impacts HFR-C-12 (hydrological and water quality effects on designated sites) and HFR-O-13 (thermal impacts on water resources) (both not identified at Scoping), and not being significant in EIA terms, resulted in these potential impacts being not considered in detail in the PEIR or ES. This is appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 4.9	The conclusion that no LSE was identified for HFR-C-2 (access across watercourses) and HFR-C-4 (access across minor drainage ditches) at PEIR, and not being significant in EIA terms, and were therefore not considered in detail in the ES, is appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 4.10	The assessment of potential effects on Hydrology and Flood Risk in Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (APP-026) is appropriate and proportionate and identifies the likely significant effects from Hornsea Four.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 4.11	The conclusions of the CEA on hydrology and flood risk presented in Section 2.12 and inter-related effects in Section 2.14 of Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (APP-026) , are appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</i>			
G3.1: 4.12	The measures described in F2.6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy (APP-241) are appropriate and adequately mitigate likely significant effects where possible. F2.6 Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy (APP-241) includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (APP-026) and is appropriate for managing construction and	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
	<p>post construction impacts from Hornsea Four on hydrology and flood risk receptors landward of MLWS.</p> <p>Volume A4, Annex 5.2: Commitments Register (APP-050) includes commitments (Co14, Co19, Co191) to produce a strategy in accordance with the outline strategy which is secured via Requirement 13 and 15 of C1.1: Draft Development Consent Order (APP-203).</p>		
G3.1: 4.13	<p>Requirement 13 and 15 of the draft DCO (C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203)) is sufficient to secure the mitigation measures described in F2.6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy (APP-241).</p>	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 4.14	<p>F2.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (APP-237) includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk (APP-026) and is appropriate for managing construction and post construction impacts from Hornsea Four on hydrology and flood risk receptors landward of MLWS.</p> <p>Volume A4, Annex 5.2: Commitments Register (APP-050) includes a commitment (Co124) to produce a CoCP in accordance with the Outline CoCP which is secured via Requirement 17 of C1.1: Draft Development Consent Order (APP-203).</p>	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 4.15	<p>The application and modification of legislative provisions, as set out in of C1.1: Draft Development Consent Order (APP-203), in the context of the disapplication of Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) 2016 is considered appropriate.</p>	This is a matter for the relevant permitting authorities.	N/A

3.1.6 Ecology and Nature Conservation

Table 7: Agreement Log: Ecology and Nature Conservation.

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
<i>EIA – Policy and planning</i>			
G3.1: 5.1	Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation (APP-027) has identified all relevant plans and policies and appropriate consideration has been given to them in the assessment.	Agree all relevant plans and policies identified and appropriate consideration given to them in the assessment.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Baseline Environment</i>			
G3.1: 5.2	The ES adequately defines the baseline environment relevant to Ecology and Nature Conservation in Section 3.7; Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation (APP-027) to inform the EIA.	Agree the baseline established is appropriate.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Methodology</i>			
G3.1: 5.3	The study areas identified in Section 3.5 of Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation (APP-027) are appropriate.	Agree the study areas are appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 5.4	The maximum design scenarios identified and outlined, where relevant, for each impact in Section 3.9 of Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation (APP-027) , and in the 'Ecology and Nature Conservation' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent the maximum project parameters for assessment.	Agree maximum design parameters are identified.	Agreed
G3.1: 5.5	The potential impacts identified in Table 3.13 and Section 3.11 of Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation (APP-027) , and in the 'Ecology and Nature Conservation' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent a comprehensive list of the potential impacts.	ERYC cannot identify any further potential impacts.	Agreed
G3.1: 5.6	The methodologies used in Section 3.10 of Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation (APP-027) are appropriate for assessing the potential impacts of Hornsea Four.	Agree an appropriate methodology has been used for assessing the potential impacts.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</i>			
G3.1: 5.7	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at Scoping (or during subsequent correspondence with ecology and nature conservation stakeholders) for impacts ENC-C-7 (impacts on white clawed crayfish and fish, construction), ENC-C-10 (accidental release of pollution, construction), ENC-O-12 (habitat	Agree that the conclusions reached are appropriate.	Agreed

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
	degradation from operation and maintenance of onshore ECC), ENC-O-13 (impacts on protected species from operation and maintenance of onshore ECC), ENC-O-15 (accidental release of pollution, operation), ENC-D-16 (impacts on habitats of decommissioning of onshore ECC), ENC-D-19 (accidental release of pollutants, decommissioning), and not being significant in EIA terms, which resulted in these potential impacts being 'Scoped out' of further assessment or 'not considered in detail in the ES', is appropriate.		
G3.1: 5.8	The conclusion that no LSE was identified for ENC-C-2 (impacts on designated sites, construction), ENC-C-8 (impacts on reptiles, construction), ENC-D-17 (decommissioning onshore substation on habitats) at PEIR, and not being significant in EIA terms, and were therefore not considered in detail in the ES, is appropriate.	The conclusion is appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 5.9	The conclusion that impacts ENC-C-1, ENC-C-3, ENC-C-4, ENC-C-5, ENC-C-6, ENC-C-9, ENC-O-11, ENC-O-14, ENC-D-18 assessed within Volume A3 Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation (APP-027) are not considered to be significant in EIA terms is appropriate when considered alongside the commitments in Table 3.14 and where relevant, identified further mitigation measures.	The conclusion is appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 5.10	The conclusions of the CEA on ecology and nature conservation presented in Section 3.12 and inter-related effects in Section 3.14 of Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation (APP-027) , are appropriate.	The conclusions are appropriate.	Agreed
<i>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</i>			
G3.1: 5.11	Requirement 8, 10 and 19 of the draft DCO (C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203)) is sufficient to secure the mitigation measures described in F2.3: Outline Ecological Management Plan (APP-238) and F2.8: Outline Landscape Management Plan (APP-243) .	ERYC agrees the requirements are sufficient to secure the mitigation measures.	Agreed
G3.1: 5.12	F2.3 Outline Ecological Management Plan (APP-238) includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation (APP-027) and is appropriate for managing construction and post construction impacts from Hornsea Four on ecology and nature conservation receptors landward of MHWS.	ERYC agrees mitigation measures are sufficient and appropriate.	Agreed

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
	<p>Volume A4, Annex 5.2: Commitments Register (APP-050) includes a commitment (Co168) to produce an EMP in accordance with the Outline EMP which is secured via Requirement 10 of C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203).</p>		
G3.1: 5.13	<p>F2.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (APP-237) includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation (APP-027) and is appropriate for managing construction and post construction impacts from Hornsea Four on ecology and nature conservation receptors landward of MLWS.</p> <p>Volume A4, Annex 5.2: Commitments Register (APP-050) includes a commitment (Co124) to produce a CoCP in accordance with the Outline CoCP which is secured via Requirement 17 of C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203).</p>	ERYC agrees mitigation measures are sufficient and appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 5.14	<p>The biodiversity net gain measures set out in F2.16: Outline Net Gain Strategy (APP-251) are sufficiently comprehensive and appropriate.</p>	ERYC agrees biodiversity net gain measures are sufficient, comprehensive and appropriate.	Agreed

3.1.7 Landscape and Visual

Table 8: Agreement Log: Landscape and Visual.

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
<i>EIA – Policy and planning</i>			
G3.1: 6.1	Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (APP-028) has identified all relevant plans and policies and appropriate consideration has been given to them in the assessment.	Agree all relevant plans and policies identified and appropriate consideration given to them in the assessment.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Baseline Environment</i>			
G3.1: 6.2	The ES adequately defines the baseline environment relevant to landscape and Visual in Section 4.7, Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (APP-028) , to inform the EIA.	Agree the baseline established is appropriate.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Methodology</i>			
G3.1: 6.3	The study areas identified in Section 4.5 of Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (APP-028) , are appropriate.	Agree the study area is appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 6.4	The maximum design scenarios identified and outlined, where relevant, for each impact in Section 4.9 of Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (APP-028) , and in the 'landscape and Visual' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent the maximum project parameters for assessment.	Agree maximum design parameters are identified.	Agreed
G3.1: 6.5	The potential impacts identified in Table 4.10 and Section 4.11 of Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (APP-028) , and in the 'Landscape and Visual' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent a comprehensive list of the potential impacts.	ERYC cannot identify any further potential impacts.	Agreed
G3.1: 6.6	The methodologies used in Section 4.10 of Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (APP-028) are appropriate for assessing the potential impacts of Hornsea Four.	Agree an appropriate methodology has been used for assessing the potential impacts.	Agreed
G3.1: 6.7	The photomontages and wireframes presented in Volume A4, Annex 4.1: Landscape and Visual Resources Wireframes and Photomontages (APP-115) appropriately inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the OnSS.	ERYC Agree photomontages and wireframes are appropriate to appropriately inform the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</i>			

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
G3.1: 6.8	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at Scoping (or during subsequent correspondence with stakeholders) for impacts LV-O-3, LV-D-6 and LV-O-2 (operational impacts associated with the landfall and onshore ECC and decommissioning impacts for the entire project)) resulted in these potential impacts being 'Scoped out' or 'not considered in detail' in the PEIR and ES. This is appropriate.	Agree that the approach to assessment and justification set out for these impacts is appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 6.9	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at PEIR for impact LV-C-1(temporary change to views at landfall and onshore ECC from construction activities)) resulted in the potential impact being 'not considered in detail in the ES'. This is appropriate.	Agree that the approach to assessment and justification set out for this impact is appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 6.10	The assessment of potential effects in Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (APP-028) is appropriate and proportionate and identifies the likely significant effects from Hornsea Four.	Agree that the assessment is appropriate and the likely significant effects have been identified.	Agreed
<i>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</i>			
G3.1: 6.11	The measures set out in F2.8: Outline Landscape Management Plan (APP-243) and F2.13: Outline Design Plan (APP-248) are appropriate and adequately mitigate likely significant effects identified in Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (APP-028) where possible.	Agree the measures are appropriate and adequately mitigate likely significant effects.	Agreed
G3.1: 6.12	Requirement 8 of the draft DCO (C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203)) is sufficient to secure the mitigation measures described in F2.8: Outline Landscape Management Plan (APP-243) .	Agree the wording of the requirement is sufficient to secure the mitigation.	Agreed

3.1.8 Historic Environment

Table 9: Agreement Log: Historic Environment.

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
<i>EIA – Policy and planning</i>			
G3.1: 7.1	Volume A3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment (APP-029) has identified all relevant plans and policies and appropriate consideration has been given to them in the assessment.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Baseline Environment</i>			
G3.1: 7.2	The ES adequately defines the baseline environment relevant to Historic Environment in Section 5.7, Volume A3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment (APP-029) , to inform the EIA.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Methodology</i>			
G3.1: 7.3	The study areas identified in Section 5.5 of Volume A3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment (APP-029) , are appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 7.4	The maximum design scenarios identified and outlined, where relevant, for each impact in Section 5.9 of Volume A3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment (APP-029) , and in the 'Historic Environment' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent the maximum project parameters for assessment.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 7.5	The potential impacts identified in Table 5.6 and Section 5.11 of Volume A3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment (APP-029) , and in the 'Historic Environment' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent a comprehensive list of the potential impacts.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 7.6	The methodologies used in Section 5.10 of Volume A3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment (APP-029) are appropriate for assessing the potential impacts of Hornsea Four.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</i>			
G3.1: 7.7	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at Scoping (or during subsequent correspondence with historic environment stakeholders) for impacts HE-D-7, HE-D-8, HE-D-9 and HE-D-10 (all impacts during decommissioning) resulted in these potential impacts being 'Scoped out' or 'not considered in detail' of further assessment in the PEIR and ES. This is appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
G3.1: 7.8	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at PEIR for impacts HE-C-2, HE-C-4, HE-O-5 and HE-O-6 (all 'indirect' impacts) resulted in these potential impacts being 'not considered in detail in the ES' and are instead considered further in Volume A6, Annex 5.1: Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment (APP-116 and APP-117) . This is appropriate.	This agreement is considered by ERYC to be more relevant for Historic England.	N/A
G3.1: 7.9	The assessment of potential effects on Historic Environment in Volume A3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment (APP-029) is appropriate and proportionate and identifies the likely significant effects from Hornsea Four.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</i>			
G3.1: 7.10	The measures described in F2.10: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Onshore Archaeology (APP-245) are appropriate and adequately mitigate likely significant effects identified in Volume A3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment (APP-029) .	Agreed in principal – subject to review of the final outline WSI.	Agreed
G3.1: 7.11	Requirement 16 of the draft DCO (C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203)) is sufficient to secure the mitigation measures described in F2.10: Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Onshore Archaeology (APP-245) .	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed

3.1.9 Land Use and Agriculture

Table 10: Agreement Log: Land Use and Agriculture.

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
<i>EIA – Policy and planning</i>			
G3.1: 8.1	Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture (APP-030) has identified all relevant plans and policies and appropriate consideration has been given to them in the assessment.	Agree all relevant plans and policies identified and appropriate consideration given to them in the assessment.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Baseline Environment</i>			
G3.1: 8.2	The ES adequately defines the baseline environment relevant to Land Use and Agriculture in Section 6.7; Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture (APP-030) to inform the EIA.	Agree the baseline established is appropriate.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Methodology</i>			
G3.1: 8.3	The study areas identified in Section 6.5 of Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture (APP-030) are appropriate.	Agree the study area is appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 8.4	The maximum design scenarios identified and outlined, where relevant, for each impact in Section 6.9 of Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture (APP-030) , and in the 'Land Use and Agriculture' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent the maximum project parameters for assessment.	Agree maximum design parameters are identified.	Agreed
G3.1: 8.5	The potential impacts identified in Table 6.12 and Section 6.11 of Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture (APP-030) , and in the 'Land Use and Agriculture' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent a comprehensive list of the potential impacts.	ERYC cannot identify any further potential impacts.	Agreed
G3.1: 8.6	The methodologies used in Section 6.10 of Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture (APP-030) are appropriate for assessing the potential impacts of Hornsea Four.	Agree an appropriate methodology has been used for assessing the potential impacts.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</i>			
G3.1: 8.7	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at Scoping (or during subsequent correspondence with ecology and nature conservation stakeholders) for impacts LUA-O-6 (disruption of land, operation) and LUA-D-7 (disruption of land, decommissioning), and not being significant in EIA terms, which resulted in these	Agree that the approach to assessment and justification set out for these impacts is appropriate.	Agreed

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
	potential impacts being 'Scoped out' of further assessment or 'not considered in detail in the ES', is appropriate.		
G3.1: 8.8	The conclusion that no LSE was identified for LUA-C-2 (impacts on coastal recreation, construction), LUA-C-3 (impacts on recreation and amenity, construction), LUA-C-4 (impacts on National Cycle network routes and other PRoWs, construction), LUA-O-5 (impacts on National Cycle network routes and other PRoWs, operation) at PEIR, and not being significant in EIA terms, and were therefore not considered in detail in the ES, is appropriate.	ERYC agree this is an appropriate conclusion.	Agreed
G3.1: 8.9	The conclusion that impact LUA-C-1 assessed within Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture (APP-030) is not considered to be significant in EIA terms is appropriate when considered alongside the commitments in Table 6.13 and where relevant, identified further mitigation measures.	ERYC agree with the conclusions and can confirm they are appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 8.10	The conclusions of the CEA on Land Use and Agriculture presented in Section 6.12 and inter-related effects in Section 6.14 of Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture (APP-030) , are appropriate.	ERYC agree with the conclusions and can confirm they are appropriate.	Agreed
<i>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</i>			
G3.1: 8.11	The management measures for PRoWs as set out in the Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan (which forms Appendix C or F2.2: Outline Code of Construction Practice (APP-237)) are appropriate. This includes the stopping up and permanent diversion of PRoWs.	ERYC agree management measures for PROW are appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 8.12	<p>F2.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture (APP-030) and is appropriate for managing construction and post construction impacts from Hornsea Four on Land Use and Agriculture receptors landward of MLWS. This includes the content of Appendix A: Outline Soil Management Strategy and Appendix C: Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan.</p> <p>Volume A4, Annex 5.2: Commitments Register (APP-050) includes a commitment (Co124) to produce a CoCP in accordance with the Outline CoCP which is secured via Requirement 17 of C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203).</p>	ERYC agree mitigation measures are appropriate.	Agreed

3.1.10 Traffic and Transport

Table 11: Agreement Log: Traffic and Transport.

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
<i>Hornsea Four Design</i>			
G3.1: 9.1	The temporary construction access locations proposed by Hornsea Four during construction (identified on Figure 11 of Volume A6, Annex 7.1: Traffic and Transport (APP-031)) are appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 9.2	The location and design of the OnSS permanent access road, off the A1079 (identified on Figure 11 and Appendix L of Volume A6, Annex 7.1: Traffic and Transport Technical Report (APP-125)), to be used during construction and operation and maintenance, is appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 9.3	The location of the Primary Logistics compound, adjacent to the A164 and Station Road, to the east of Lockington, is acceptable. The traffic and transport assessment undertaken for Station Road (link ID 43) has demonstrated that no significant adverse effects will occur and this is appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Policy and planning</i>			
G3.1: 9.4	Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-031) has identified all relevant plans and policies and appropriate consideration has been given to them in the assessment.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Baseline Environment</i>			
G3.1: 9.5	The ES adequately defines the baseline environment relevant to Traffic and Transport in Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-031) , to inform the EIA.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 9.6	The future baseline identified in Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-031) is considered appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>Assessment Methodology</i>			
G3.1: 9.7	The study area identified in Section 7.5 of Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-031) , is appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 9.8	The maximum design scenarios identified and outlined, where relevant, for each impact in Section 7.9 and Table 7.13 of Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-031) , and in the 'Traffic and Transport' tab of Volume A4, Annex	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
	5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent the maximum project parameters for assessment. This represents the peak HGV, LCV and employee traffic generation for Hornsea Four.		
G3.1: 9.9	The potential impacts identified in Table 7.11 and Section 7.11 of Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-031) , and in the 'Traffic and Transport' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent a comprehensive list of the potential impacts.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 9.10	The definitions for 'magnitude' and 'sensitivity, as outlined in Section 7.10 of Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-031) , are appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 9.11	The origin and distribution of HGV and LCV movements and employee traffic used to inform impact assessments in Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-031) , is appropriate and represents a Maximum Design Scenario.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 9.12	Consideration of the routing of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) associated with the OnSS is presented in Volume A6, Annex 7.1: Abnormal Load Report (APP-126) . The movement of AILs will be subject to separate agreement with the relevant highway authorities and police through the Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads system.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</i>			
G3.1: 9.13	The conclusion is appropriate that no likely significant effect was identified at Scoping for impacts TT-C-1 (movement of offshore project components on road network), TT-O-10 (operation and maintenance) and TT-D-11 (decommissioning) and resulted in these potential impacts being 'Scoped out' or 'not considered in detail in the ES', is appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 9.14	The assessments TT-C- 2 (driver delay (capacity)) and TT-C-12 (cumulative effects) are not considered in the ES as they will be addressed post-determination within the final CTMP, secured under Requirement 18 of the draft DCO (C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203)). This is considered appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 9.15	The assessment of potential effects on the local highway network in Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-031) is appropriate and proportionate and identifies the likely significant effects from Hornsea Four.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed

Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
G3.1: 9.16	The measures described in the oCTMP (which forms Appendix F of F2.2: Outline Code of Construction Practice (APP-237)) are appropriate and adequately mitigate likely significant effects identified in Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport (APP-031) and in the 'Traffic and Transport' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) . Further detail and site-specific measures will be agreed with ERYC in the final CTMP secured under Requirement 18 of the draft DCO (C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203)).	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 9.17	The access concept designs set out in the oCTMP (which forms Appendix F of F2.2: Outline Code of Construction Practice (APP-237)) are appropriate. Detailed access designs will be developed and agreed with ERYC prior to the start of construction, secured under Requirement 11 of the draft DCO (C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203)).	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 9.18	The oCTMP (which forms Appendix F of F2.2: Outline Code of Construction Practice (APP-237)) provides the adequate framework to secure necessary mitigation measures to facilitate the removal of impacts TT-C- 2 (driver delay (capacity)) and TT-C-12 (cumulative effects) from consideration in the EIA.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 9.19	The monitoring procedures set out in the oCTMP (which forms Appendix F of F2.2: Outline Code of Construction Practice (APP-237)) are appropriate and comprehensive.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed

3.1.11 Noise and Vibration

Table 12: Agreement Log: Noise and Vibration.

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
<i>EIA – Policy and Planning</i>			
G3.1: 10.1	Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration (APP-032) has identified all relevant plans and policies and appropriate consideration has been given to them in the assessment.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Baseline Environment</i>			
G3.1: 10.2	The ES adequately defines the baseline environment relevant to Noise and Vibration in Section 8.7, Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration (APP-032) , to inform the EIA.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Methodology</i>			
G3.1: 10.3	The study areas identified in Section 8.5 of Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration (APP-032) , are appropriate.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
G3.1: 10.4	The maximum design scenarios identified and outlined, where relevant, for each impact in Section 8.9 of Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration (APP-032) , and in the 'Noise and Vibration' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent the maximum project parameters for assessment.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
G3.1: 10.5	The potential impacts identified in Table 8.16 and Section 8.11 of Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration (APP-032) , and in the 'Noise and Vibration' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent a comprehensive list of the potential impacts.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
G3.1: 10.6	The methodologies used in Section 8.10 of Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration (APP-032) are appropriate for assessing the potential impacts of Hornsea Four.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</i>			
G3.1: 10.7	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at Scoping (or during subsequent correspondence with ERYC) for impacts NV-C-1 (noise and vibration from onshore cable installation), NV-O-9 (buried cables noise), NV-O-10 (operational traffic noise), NV-O-11 (routine maintenance noise), NV-O-12 (operational vibration), NV-D-14 (noise and vibration from plant during decommissioning of cable route), NV-	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
	C-5 (haul road construction noise and vibration), NV-O-13 (offshore HVAC booster station noise) and NV-D-15 (noise and vibration from plant during decommissioning of onshore substation) resulted in these potential impacts being 'Scoped out' of further assessment in the PEIR and ES. This is appropriate.		
G3.1: 10.8	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at PEIR for impacts NV-C-2 (noise and vibration from HDD works alone cable route), NV-C-4 (joint bay construction noise), NV-C-6 (onshore substation construction noise) and NV-O-8 (operational noise from the onshore substation) resulted in these potential impacts being 'not considered in detail in the ES'. This is appropriate.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
G3.1: 10.9	The assessment of potential effects in Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration (APP-032) (Section 8.11) is appropriate and proportionate and identifies the likely significant effects from Hornsea Four.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
G3.1: 10.10	The cumulative effect assessment and inter-related effects in Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration (APP-032) (Sections 8.12 and 8.14) is appropriate and proportionate and identifies the likely significant effects from Hornsea Four.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
<i>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</i>			
G3.1: 10.11	The mitigation measures outlined in Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration (APP-032) , and in the 'Noise and Vibration' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) are appropriate and mitigate potentially significant effects to acceptable levels.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
G3.1: 10.12	The measures set out in F2.2: Outline Code of Construction Practice (APP-237) and the oCTMP (which forms Appendix F of the outline CoCP) are appropriate and adequately mitigate likely significant effects identified in Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration (APP-032) and in the 'Noise and Vibration' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) . These documents will form the basis of the detailed CoCP and CTMP secured under Requirement 17 and 18 of the draft DCO (C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203)).	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
G3.1: 10.13	The indicative onshore substation operational noise mitigation measures outlined in F2.13: Outline Design Plan (APP-248) is appropriate and will inform the detailed Design Plan to be submitted under Requirement 7 of the DCO.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
G3.1: 10.14	DCO Requirement 21 (Control of noise during operational phase) is appropriate and secures necessary mitigation measures through a noise management plan.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed

3.1.12 Air Quality

Table 13: Agreement Log: Air Quality.

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
<i>EIA – Policy and Planning</i>			
G3.1: 11.1	Volume A3, Chapter 9: Air Quality (APP-033) has identified all relevant plans and policies and appropriate consideration has been given to them in the assessment.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Baseline Environment</i>			
G3.1: 11.2	The ES adequately defines the baseline environment relevant to Air Quality in the jurisdiction of ERYC in Volume A3, Chapter 9: Air Quality (APP-033) , to inform the EIA.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 11.3	The future baseline identified in Volume A3, Chapter 9: Air Quality (APP-033) is considered appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant. ERYC note that at the time of DCO application there will be further monitoring data available, but there is no expectation to be incorporated into the assessment.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Methodology</i>			
G3.1: 11.4	The study areas identified in the jurisdiction of ERYC in Section 9.5 of Volume A3, Chapter 9: Air Quality (APP-033) , are appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 11.5	The maximum design scenarios identified and outlined, where relevant, for each impact in Section 9.8 of Volume A3, Chapter 9: Air Quality (APP-033) , and in the 'Air Quality' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent the maximum project parameters for assessment.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 11.6	The potential impacts identified in Table 9.9 and Section 9.11 of Volume A3, Chapter 9: Air Quality (APP-033) , and in the 'Air Quality' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent a comprehensive list of the potential impacts.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 11.7	The methodologies used in Section 9.10 of Volume A3, Chapter 9: Air Quality (APP-033) are appropriate for assessing the potential impacts of Hornsea Four.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</i>			
G3.1: 11.8	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at Scoping (or during subsequent correspondence with ERYC) for impacts AQ-O-4 (emissions from facilities during	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
	operation), AQ-O-3 (dust and exhaust emissions from traffic during operation) and AQ-D-5 (dust generation during decommissioning) resulted in these potential impacts being 'Scoped out' of further assessment in the PEIR and ES. This is appropriate.		
G3.1: 11.9	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at PEIR for impacts AQ-C-1 (dust generation during onshore construction) and AQ-A-2a (dust generation and exhaust emissions from traffic during operation within ERYC's area of jurisdiction) resulted in these potential impacts being 'not considered in detail in the ES'. This is appropriate.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 11.10	The assessment of potential effects in Volume A3, Chapter 9: Air Quality (APP-033) (Section 9.11) is appropriate and proportionate and identifies the likely significant effects from Hornsea Four.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 11.11	The cumulative effect assessment and inter-related effects in Volume A3, Chapter 9: Air Quality (APP-033) (sections 9.12 and 9.14) is appropriate and proportionate and identifies the likely significant effects from Hornsea Four.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant. ERYC note that additional projects may be identified at the time of application and therefore may need consideration.	Agreed
<i>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</i>			
G3.1: 11.12	The mitigation measures outlined in Volume A3, Chapter 9: Air Quality (APP-033) , and in the 'Air Quality' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) are appropriate and mitigate potentially significant effects to acceptable levels.	Agreed with ERYC and the Applicant.	Agreed
G3.1: 11.13	The measures described in F2.2: Outline Code of Construction Practice (APP-237) and the oCTMP (which forms Appendix F of the outline CoCP) are appropriate and adequately mitigate likely significant effects identified in Volume A3, Chapter 9: Air Quality (APP-033) and in the 'Air Quality' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) . These documents will form the basis of the detailed CoCP and CTMP secured under Requirement 17 and 18 of the draft DCO (C1.1: Draft DCO (APP-203)).	ERYC agrees with the mitigation proposed and can confirm it is appropriate and adequate to mitigate likely significant effects.	Agreed

3.1.13 Socio-economics

Table 14: Agreement Log: Socio-economics.

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
<i>EIA – Policy and planning</i>			
G3.1: 12.1	Volume A3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics (APP-034) has identified all relevant plans and policies and appropriate consideration has been given to them in the assessment.	Agree all relevant plans and policies identified and appropriate consideration given to them in the assessment.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Baseline Environment</i>			
G3.1: 12.2	The ES adequately defines the baseline environment relevant to socio-economics in Section 10.7, Volume A3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics (APP-034) and supporting technical annex (APP-128), to inform the EIA.	Agree the baseline established is appropriate.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Methodology</i>			
G3.1: 12.3	The study areas identified in Section 10.5 of Volume A3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics (APP-034) , are appropriate.	Agree the study area is appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 12.4	The justification for why no maximum design scenario is appropriate for assessment, as set out in Section 10.9 of Volume A3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics (APP-034) , and in the 'socio-economics' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , is acceptable and appropriate information has been used to inform the assessment.	Agree no maximum design scenario is appropriate in this case and appropriate information has been used to inform the assessment.	Agreed
G3.1: 12.5	The potential impacts identified in Table 10.9 and Section 10.11 of Volume A3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics (APP-034) , and in the 'socio-economics' tab of Volume A4, Annex 5.1: Impacts Register (APP-049) , represent a comprehensive list of the potential impacts.	ERYC cannot identify any further potential impacts.	Agreed
G3.1: 12.6	The methodologies used in Section 10.10 of Volume A3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics (APP-034) are appropriate for assessing the potential impacts of Hornsea Four.	Agree an appropriate methodology has been used for assessing the potential impacts.	Agreed
<i>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</i>			
G3.1: 12.8	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at Scoping (or during subsequent correspondence with stakeholders) for impacts SE-D-7 (decommissioning phase impacts on employment and GVA), SE-A-9 (tourism impacts), SE-A-10 (impacts on social services), SE-A-11 (impacts on housing), SE-A-8 (sumulative impacts),	The conclusion is appropriate.	Agreed

ID	Hornsea Four's Position	ERYC's Position	Position Summary
	resulted in these potential impacts being 'Scoped out' or 'not considered in detail' in the PEIR and ES. This is appropriate.		
G3.1: 12.9	The conclusion that no LSE was identified at PEIR for impacts SE-C-1 (economic activity, construction), SE-C-2 (employment, construction), SE-O-4 (economic activity, operation) and SE-O-5 (employment, operation) resulted in the potential impacts being 'not considered in detail in the ES'. This is appropriate.	The conclusion is appropriate.	Agreed
G3.1: 12.10	The assessment of potential effects in Volume A3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics (APP-034) is appropriate and proportionate and identifies the likely significant effects from Hornsea Four.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed
<i>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</i>			
G3.1: 12.11	The measures described in F2.18: Outline Employment and Skills Plan are appropriate and provide an adequate basis for future development with ERYC.	Agreed by ERYC.	Agreed

4 Summary

- 4.1.1.1 This SoCG has outlined the consultation that has taken place between the Applicant and East Riding of Yorkshire Council. The agreement logs present the position reached between Hornsea Four and East Riding of Yorkshire Council in relation to relevant onshore matters.
- 4.1.1.2 This SoCG will be updated as discussions progress and made available to PINS as requested through the DCO examination phase.