RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited

RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited

Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms

Environmental Statement

Volume 7

Appendix 5-1 Project Description Consultation Responses

June 2024

Application Reference: 7.5.5.1

APFP Regulation: 5(2)(a)

Revision: 02

Unrestricted

Company:	**RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited**	Asset:	**Development**
Project:	**Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms**	Sub Project/Package:	**Consents**
Document Title or Description:	Appendix 5-1 Project Description Consultation Responses		
Document Number:	004300145-02	Contractor Reference Number:	PC2340-RHD-OF-ZZ-AX-Z-0079

Rev No.	Date	Status/Reason for Issue	Author	Checked by	Approved by
01	February 2024	Draft for PINS / TCE Submission	RHDHV	RWE	RWE
02	June 2024	Final for DCO Application	RHDHV	RWE	RWE

Contents

Tables

Glossary

Term	Definition
Baseline	The existing conditions as represented by the latest available survey and other data which is used as a benchmark for making comparisons to assess the impact of the Projects.
Effect	Term used to express the consequence of an impact. The significance of an effect is determined by correlating the magnitude of the impact with the value, or sensitivity, of the receptor or resource in accordance with defined significance criteria.
Impact	Used to describe a change resulting from an activity via the Projects, i.e. increased suspended sediments / increased noise.
Landfall	The point on the coastline at which the Offshore Export Cables are brought onshore, connecting to the onshore cables at the Transition Joint Bay (TJB) above mean high water.
Onshore Export Cable Corridor	This is the area which includes cable trenches, haul roads, spoil storage areas, and limits of deviation for micro-siting. For assessment purposes, the cable corridor does not include the Onshore Converter Stations, Transition Joint Bays or temporary access routes; but includes Temporary Construction Compounds (purely for the cable route).
Onshore Export Cables	Onshore Export Cables take the electric from the Transition Joint Bay to the Onshore Converter Stations.
Scoping opinion	The report adopted by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State.
Scoping report	The report that was produced in order to request a Scoping Opinion from the Secretary of State

Term	Definition
The Applicants	The Applicants for the Projects are RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited. The Applicants are themselves jointly owned by the RWE Group of companies (51% stake) and Masdar (49% stake).
The Projects	DBS East and DBS West (collectively referred to as the Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms).

Acronyms

Term	Definition
CP	Collector Platform
DCO	Development Consent Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
HVAC	High Voltage Alternating Current
HVDC	High Voltage Direct Current
MOD	Ministry of Defence
MW	Megawatt
NPS	National Policy Statement
NRA	Navigational Risk Assessment
OCP	Offshore Convertor Platform
OSP	Offshore Substation Platform
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Impact Report
RCP	Reactive Compensation Platform

5 Consultation Reponses

5.1 Introduction

1. This appendix covers those statutory consultation responses related to **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)** that have been received as a response to the Scoping Report (2022) and the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) (2023).
2. Response from stakeholders and regard given by the Applicants have been captured in **Table 5-15-1.**

Table 5-15-1 Consultation Responses Related to ***Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)***

Reference	Comment	Project Response
The Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion 02/09/2022		
2.1.1	"The Scoping Report does not confirm when a decision would be made on the approach to the consenting strategy, and whether the Dogger Bank South (East) and Dogger Bank South (West) projects, which comprise the Proposed Development, will be constructed concurrently or sequentially. It will be critical for the ES to clearly explain the implications of this decision, for example in relation to the description of the development, the phasing of construction and operation, the assessment of the cumulative effects of the two NSIPs, and the timings and security of any environmental mitigation and monitoring proposed. Careful consideration should be given to the presentation of this information to enable the relationship between the two projects to be clearly understood."	Whilst the Projects are the subject of a single DCO application (with a combined Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process and associated submissions), each Project is assessed individually, so that mitigation is specific to each development scenario. As such, the assessments cover the possibility that: • DBS East or DBS West are developed in isolation; or • Both DBS East and DBS West are developed, either concurrently or sequentially. In order to ensure that a robust assessment has been undertaken, all development scenarios and options have been considered to ensure the realistic worst case scenario for each topic has been assessed. Further details are provided within the worst case tables in **Volume 7, Chapters 8 to 30 (application ref: 7.8 to 7.30)**.

Reference	Comment	Project Response
2.2.1	The Scoping Report makes reference to the potential use of a multipurpose interconnector, private offtake, integration with future hydrogen infrastructure or a combination of these in place of a 'conventional' connection (see Table 2.3 below). It goes on to present information based on the assumption of a conventional grid connection to the connection point listed in Paragraph 3. It does not provide any further information on the alternative connection methods. It is unclear to what degree the options being considered will be established prior to the production of the ES. The Inspectorate considers that the connection method should be presented in the ES to avoid an assessment based on an array of differing environmental options and effects, which would make a robust assessment, compliant with the requirements of Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations difficult to achieve. The Inspectorate expects the ES supporting the application for the Proposed Development to describe the preferred option for connection and the assessment of the likely significant effects to be carried out on that basis.	The options taken forward for further assessment are detailed within this chapter and summarised in sections 5.4 of **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5).** The consideration of alternative options is detailed in **Volume 7**, **Chapter 4 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives (application ref: 7.4)**. Based on current information it is assumed that this option would fit within the Projects' redline boundary and envelope and any likely significant effects would therefore be the same as the assessed options.

Reference	Comment	Project Response
2.2.2	The ES must clearly explain the anticipated construction phasing between the two Dogger Bank South projects (East and West). In particular, to what extent the projects would be constructed concurrently or sequentially and how this has informed the worst-case scenario assessed in the ES. The Inspectorate acknowledges the statement in Paragraph 67 in this regard, however, advises the applicant to ensure all assumptions around construction phasing on which the ES is based are clearly explained.	The assessments cover the possibility that: • Either DBS East or DBS West are developed in isolation; or • Both DBS East and DBS West are developed, either concurrently or sequentially. Section 5.8 of **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)** provides an indicative construction programme for each development scenario, for both the offshore and onshore works. In order to ensure that a robust assessment has been undertaken, all development scenarios and options have been considered to ensure the realistic worst case scenario for each topic has been assessed. Further details are provided within the worst case tables in **Volume 7, Chapters 8 to 30 (application ref: 7.8 to 7.30)**.

Reference	Comment	Project Response
2.2.3	The information in Section 1.5 of the Scoping Report provides a generalised project description, with some indicative parameters provided in Table 1-2. Paragraph 33 of the Scoping Report States that "The Projects' design envelope allows for up to 300 10-Megawatt (MW) wind turbines (up to 150 for each Project). Turbine numbers will reduce if higher capacity wind turbines are installed". However, it also states that 10MW is likely to be at the lower end of the design envelope. Table 1-2 provides indicative parameter information related to the size of the turbines, but it is not clear if this is based on a 10MW turbine or an unstated higher capacity turbine. This should be clarified in the ES.	Minimum and maximum turbine parameters are detailed in **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5**) section 5.5.2.1**.**
2.2.3	Table 1-2 indicates that the onshore cable corridor would consist of one main corridor, to be split in two at pinch points or on approaches to substations. It is not clear how the maximum cable corridor width stated in Table 1-2 accommodates this approach. The Inspectorate considers that the presence of multiple cable corridors has the potential to introduce effects over a wider area than specified, and that the ES must ensure that the corridor width reflects that to which the assessment of significant effects has been based."	The Onshore Export Cable Corridor and parameters are detailed in section 5.7.1 of **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)**. The onshore export cable corridor options have been reduced as a result of further engineering feasibility, consultation with stakeholders and a review of constraints. The decision making is outlined within **Volume 7**, **Chapter 4 Site Selection and Alternatives (application ref: 7.4).**

Reference	Comment	Project Response
	The ES must clearly define the parameters of the Proposed Development, including in relation to the number, height, blade dimensions, foundation type and dimensions including depth of penetration, and capacity of turbines. The ES should be based on set parameters and include all project specific information on which the environmental assessments of the worst-case likely significant effects have been based. The ES should also consider the effects of any infrastructure that is to remain in situ following decommissioning.	Parameters for the offshore and onshore components of the Projects are detailed section 5.5 and 5.6 of **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5).** The realistic worst-case scenario for each topic is provided in their respective chapters.
2.2.4	The 'Rochdale Envelope' approach is employed when there is a need to seek flexibility to address uncertainty. The Applicant should make every attempt to narrow the range of options and explain clearly in the ES which elements of the Proposed Development have yet to be finalised and provide the reasons. The description of the Proposed Development in the ES must not be so wide that it is insufficiently certain to comply with the requirements of Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations. The need and justification to support the level of flexibility sought must be explained in the ES, including how it has been taken into account in the assessments through	The required flexibility in design envelope, and its justification, is outlined in section 5.1.2 and further detailed in **Volume 7, Chapter 6 EIA Methodology (application ref: 7.6)**. The design parameters necessary for a robust environmental assessment for each potential project scenario, namely DBS East and DBS West combined, or a Project in isolation, are presented in this chapter. Justification for the decisions made in narrowing the design envelope with regards to elements such as onshore/offshore cable routes, substation zones and cable landfalls is provided in **Volume 7,**

Reference	Comment	Project Response
	relevant parameters (temporal and spatial) and a defined worst-case for resulting environmental effects. It will be essential to ensure consistency throughout the ES and any other relevant assessments supporting the application from which the ES draws. It should be noted that if the Proposed Development materially changes prior to submission of the DCO application, the Applicant may wish to consider requesting a new scoping opinion.	**Chapter 4 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives (application ref: 7.4)**.
2.2.5	Paragraph 42 identifies that the current options for the export cable technologies are for both projects to use High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC), or for one to use HVDC and the other to use High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC). No reasons are given at present for the selection of either of these options (including the need for additional substations, converter platforms or reactive compensation platforms), or why the use of HVAC for both projects is not considered further. The ES should provide a justification of the technologies used and an assessment of alternatives, including an explanation as to how any additional construction that would result from either proposal is assessed within the ES.	As detailed in **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5**), HVAC technology has now been removed from the Projects' design envelope. Justification of the technologies used, and an assessment of alternatives is provided in **Volume 7, Chapter 4 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives (application ref: 7.4).**

Reference	Comment	Project Response
2.2.6	Table 1-2 identifies the need for accommodation platforms. The Table also lists 'reactive compensation platforms' which are also mentioned in Paragraph 43. Any platforms incorporated in the Proposed Development must be described in the ES and effort should be made to refine the design and number of platforms used. The project description in the ES should also include any other applicable offshore elements, for example meteorological masts.	Details of the platforms that may be required for the Projects operation are included in section 5.5.4 of **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)**. Following design refinements post-PEIR and the removal of HVAC technology from the Projects design envelope, the maximum number of potential offshore platforms for the Projects has been reduced from eleven to eight.
2.2.7	There is no mention in the Scoping Report of the intention to include any electricity balancing infrastructure as part of the Proposed Development. If such infrastructure is to form part of the Proposed Development, this must be included in the project description in the ES.	No battery storage is proposed for the projects.
2.2.8	The ES should demonstrate how the principles of 'good design', as set out in National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 and EN-3, have been applied to the Proposed Development including the onshore substations, and how this information has been taken into account within the assessments of likely significant effects.	The guidance of NPS EN-1 and EN-3 with regard to good design has been taken into consideration in the development of the Design Envelope. Selection of the proposed Projects and assessment of alternatives is detailed in **Volume 7**, **Chapter 4 Site Selection & Assessment of**

Reference	Comment	Project Response
		Alternatives (application ref: 7.4). Consideration of 'good design' in terms of embedding mitigation in the Projects design also occurs in the relevant receptor topics in **Volume 7, Chapters 8** to **30**. In addition, see the accompanying **Design and Access Statement (application ref: 7.8 to 7.30)** for further information regarding the Projects design process.
2.3.1	The Inspectorate acknowledges the Applicant's description of work undertaken to date regarding site selection as set out in Section 1.6 of the Scoping Report. No reference to alternatives in relation to turbine array layout is made, however it is noted that Paragraph 35 in Section 1.5 discusses factors that will influence the final layout. The ES should explain how these factors have been considered within the discussion of alternatives, where alternative layouts have been assessed. The Inspectorate would expect to see a discrete section in the ES that provides details of the alternatives studied and the reasoning for the selection of the chosen option(s), including a comparison of the environmental effects, with reference to the Black-Red-Amber-Green ranking referenced in Paragraph 78.	Following the industry standard approach, the wind turbine layout will not be finalised until much closer to the time of construction, following completion of a detailed wind yield assessment to develop the layout of the preferred turbines and their foundations. Selection of the proposed project design and assessment of alternatives is detailed in **Volume 7**, **Chapter 4 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives (application ref: 7.4).** Alternative layouts, and their impacts on shipping and navigation, are detailed in **Volume 7, Chapter 14 Shipping and Navigation (application ref: 7.14)** and the accompanying Navigational Risk Assessment (NRA) to that chapter.

Reference	Comment	Project Response
2.3.2	Paragraph 92 of the Scoping Report indicates that the onshore cable corridor scoping boundary comprises five route variations. These routes are not provided, either within a figure or accompanying text, and as such it is not clear where the routes would be. Paragraph 97 indicates that there are three onshore substation location zones, which are also not represented on a figure. The ES should clearly describe any alternative cable routes and substation locations assessed, including the use of appropriate figures, and provide a justification for the chosen options.	The areas under consideration for the Onshore Export Corridor routes and Onshore Substation Zone are detailed in section 5.7.1 and 5.7.2 and displayed in **Volume 7, Figure 5-3 (application ref: 7.5.1)**. Selection of the proposed infrastructure options and assessment of alternatives is detailed in **Volume 7, Chapter 4 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives (application ref: 7.4).**
2.3.3	The Scoping Report describes the potential use of alternatives in the place of a 'conventional' connection (Section 1.1 Paragraph 5). The Inspectorate expects the ES supporting the application for the Proposed Development to describe the preferred option for connection and an assessment of the alternatives considered.	The options taken forward for further assessment are detailed within this chapter and summarised in sections 5.3 and 5.3.1. The consideration of alternative options is detailed in **Volume 7**, **Chapter 4 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives (application ref: 7.4)**. Based on current information it is assumed that this option would fit within the Projects' redline boundary and envelope and any likely significant

Reference	Comment	Project Response
		effects would therefore be the same as the assessed options.
2.3.4	The ES should provide specific information on where any restricted working widths or seasonal restrictions are to apply during construction. The choice of construction methodology e.g., through open-cut trench or Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) or other trenchless methods, should be justified and explained in the ES. The Inspectorate advises that effort is made to commit to a construction method particularly in sensitive locations, and for the ES assessment to be based on the chosen method rather than introduce unnecessary uncertainty by retaining multiple options.	The construction methods under consideration for offshore, landfall, and onshore elements are detailed in sections 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 respectively.
2.3.4	The Inspectorate would expect the ES to explain how the outcomes of consultation with stakeholders has been used to refine the site selection options. This is likely to be particularly important where options for micro-siting infrastructure are limited by the presence of other existing or planned infrastructure proposals.	The outcomes of stakeholder consultation and how these outcomes are addressed are tabulated in a consultation table such as this for each chapter of this PEIR. Consultation pertaining to site selection is displayed in **Volume 7, Chapter 4 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives (application ref: 7.4).**

Reference	Comment	Project Response
Scoping Response - Other Consultation		
Ministry of Defence	The landfall and onshore elements of the proposal, described in section 1.5.2 and 1.5.3 of the Scoping Report, identifies landfall at one of two sites close to Skipsea and an 80km² area within which two substations may be sited and an export cable will connect landfall with onshore substations. As the proposal matures MOD would hope to be consulted in order that any impact on MOD assets can be identified.	The proposed Landfall Zone is detailed in **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5).** The Ministry of Defence (MOD) will be further consulted during the preparation of the Environmental Statement.
Natural England Annex B	In the majority of instances our original comments remain relevant (Annex C) as the scoping report continues to be too high level to advise with more specific technical detail. The focus of our advice is therefore on the transmission assets as the generation scoping remains mostly unchanged.	Noted.
Natural England Annex C 1	Please consider definitions of temporal scale, duration, and spatial extent carefully. Please also consider the different phases of the development when defining the significance of an impact.	The maximum and minimum limits of parameters in the project design envelope are detailed in this chapter, allowing assessment to proceed on a worst case scenario basis in the relevant topics in

Reference	Comment	Project Response
		Volume 7, Chapters 8 to 30 (application ref: 7.8 to 7.30).
Natural England Annex C 3	At this point in time the onshore search area is too large for Natural England to meaningfully comment on. We therefore advise that nothing is scoped out at this stage and request that the Project consider the best practice EIA guidance provided in Annex A. We recommend that further information is provided for consultation once the transmission asset locations are known.	Noted, and the onshore elements of the Projects have now been refined and presented in this chapter. Where impacts are proposed to be scoped out, either due to refinement of onshore export cable corridor options, or through additional baseline information, this scoping out is given further justification for the relevant topic in **Volume 7, Chapters 8 to 30 (application ref: 7.8 to 7.30)**.
Section 42 Consultation – Marine Management Organisation July 2023		
6.1	Within the project description it would be beneficial to outline what section of the works will be applied for under each of the proposed Deemed Marine Licences; separated out per marine licensable activity according to the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, Section 66.	Deemed Marine Licences (DMLs) 1 and 2 relate to works associated with the DBS East and DBS West Array Areas respectively. DMLs 3 and 4 relate to works associated with the DBS East and DBS West Offshore Export Cable Corridors respectively. Finally, DML 5 relates to all works associated with the Inter Platform Cable Corridor, located between the DBS East and DBS West Array Areas.

Reference	Comment	Project Response
		See **Volume 3, Draft Development Consent Order (application ref: 3.1)** for further details.
6.2	Table 5-2 Offshore Scheme Summary states that there will be a total combined number of 11 offshore platforms. However it also states that there will be a maximum of 6 platforms in each area (6 in DBS East and 6 in DBS West), which is 12 in total. The ES should provide clarification of the total number of offshore platforms.	Following the removal of HVAC technology from the Project envelope, the maximum number of platforms has been reduced to eight for DBS East and DBS West combined, comprising: • Three Offshore Converter/Collector Platforms in DBS East Array Area; • Three Offshore Converter/Collector Platforms in DBS West Array Area; • One accommodation platform in either DBS East or West Array Area; and • One electrical switching platform in either DBS East or West Array Area or within the Export Cable Corridor Platform Area of Search. Section 5.5.4 of **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)** has been

Reference	Comment	Project Response
		updated to reflect the refinement in platform number.
6.3	Further on, section 5.4.4 states that there will be up to eight OSPs/Offshore Converter Platforms (OCPs)/Collector Platforms (CPs), depending on how the Projects are developed (four located in DBS EAST and four in DBS West). The final number of OSPs/OCPs/CPs should be clarified and confirmed in the ES.	Following the removal of HVAC technology from the Projects design envelope, there will be a maximum of six OCP/CPs for DBS East and DBS West combined. As OSPs would only have been required if using HVAC technology, they reference to such platforms have been removed from the design envelope and chapter.
Section 42 Consultation – Natural England July 2023		
B11	These tables indicate that there could be 48-100 turbines within each array across both projects. Natural England understands that the number used is based on the size of the turbine deployed, i.e. 48 large turbines or 100 small turbines. Clarity is needed on whether a mix of large and small turbines could also be installed within each array and what will determine the number of turbines installed, noting that the combination of size and number will impact both benthic and marine process receptors and will dictate the worst-case scenario.	There does exist the potential for a mix of large and small turbines to be installed within each array area. However, it should be noted that regarding the worst-case scenario for benthic and intertidal ecology, a full build-out of small turbines would cover the largest footprint, over that of any potential mix of large and small turbines.

Reference	Comment	Project Response
B13	The wind turbine layout will not be finalised until much closer to construction with the final layout being based on optimising energy output and ground conditions. We consider that the layout should also factor in reducing environmental impacts to both benthic and marine processes receptors. We advise that more detail on the type of foundation, orientation, and distribution pattern of the turbines relative to mean currents and tidal patterns is required as the cumulative impacts could have adverse effects on benthic communities as a result of changes in sediment transport processes.	Site-specific data collected for the Projects will be used to further refine the layout for the Projects. Detail from the project-specific marine physical processes modelling has been used to inform the cumulative impacts regarding sediment transport processes (see **Volume 7, Chapter 8 Marine Physical Environment (application ref: 7.8).**
B14	As with wind turbines, locations of offshore platforms have not been provided. Noting that there could be up to four within each array, we advise that consideration should be given to environmental impacts to benthic and marine process receptors in their location. See Point B13.	Site-specific data collected for the Projects will be used to inform the locations of the potential offshore platforms.
B15	It is stated that the Electrical Switching Platform (ESP; if required) will provide a link to a co-ordinated east coast transmission system which is planned to run from	The parameters detailed in the worst-case description encompass any additional inputs from

Reference	Comment	Project Response
	Scotland to England, as per National Grid ESO's Holistic Network Design. Further information is needed on whether this would affect any other parameters within the project description, e.g. number of export cables, and when it will be known if this option is being taken forward. And any cumulative impacts HND options may pose, in-combination with the project, or is it a case of HND only?	the HND. As such its' implementation will not affect the other parameters.
B16	Table 5-2 The minimum lower blade tip height has been provided in meters to MSL. We are unclear what MSL refers to. Please provide the minimum clearance height in relation to highest astronomical tide (HAT). We advise that this should be raised above 22m as much as possible to reduce seabird collision risk.	MSL = mean sea level, which is the datum used for seabird flight heights, and the reason what the CRM includes an 'offset' value as turbine clearance heights are often quoted from other datums, such as HAT, MHWS, LAT, etc. The use of MSL simplifies this since no other calculation is required.
F8	Natural England is provisionally content that the onshore project parameters have been appropriately defined. We reserve the right to comment further if further information is provided.	Noted with thanks.

Reference	Comment	Project Response
Section 42 Consultation - Chamber of Shipping July 2023		
N/A	The red line boundary of the Projects should be reduced to create additional available sea room.	The DBS array areas have been refined as described in Section 6 of **Volume 7, Appendix 14-1 Navigational Risk Assessment (application ref: 7.14.14.1)**.
Expert Topic Group (ETG) Meetings – Pre-DCO Submission 2024		
N/A	Benthic Ecology and Physical Processes ETG (29th January 2024) It was queried during the ETG whether the presence of cofferdams in the intertidal zone have had been given any considerations during and after the 18 month period they were due to be present in the worst-case scenario, since they will be disturbing material in the intertidal zone, and if the Applicants had considered the long-term impacts?	Cofferdams have been withdrawn from the design envelope in response to stakeholder comments during this ETG, see section 5.6 of **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)** for further details.
N/A	Terrestrial Ecology ETG (19th March 2024) The latest project description was presented at the ETG. No comments or queries were raised on the project description by stakeholders either at or during the	Stakeholders were informed of the latest project description as per **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)** at the latest ETG meeting. Stakeholder attendees included:

Reference	Comment	Project Response
	consultation period (two weeks) post this latest ETG meeting.	• East Riding of Yorkshire Council • Yorkshire Wildlife Trust • Natural England
N/A	Flood Risk and Geology ETG (20th March 2024) The latest project description was presented at the ETG. No comments or queries were raised on the project description by stakeholders either at or during the consultation period (two weeks) post this latest ETG meeting.	Stakeholders were informed of the latest project description as per **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)** at the latest ETG meeting. Stakeholder attendees included: • East Riding of Yorkshire Council • Environment Agency • Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board
N/A	Onshore Historic Environment ETG (19th March 2024) The latest project description was presented at the ETG. No comments or queries were raised on the project description by stakeholders either at or during the consultation period (two weeks) post this latest ETG meeting.	Stakeholders were informed of the latest project description as per **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)** at the latest ETG meeting. Stakeholder attendees included: • East Riding of Yorkshire Council • Historic England • Humber Archaeological Partnership

Reference	Comment	Project Response
N/A	Landscape Visual Impact Assessment ETG (15th March 2024) The latest project description was presented at the ETG. No comments or queries were raised on the project description by stakeholders either at or during the consultation period (two weeks) post this latest ETG meeting.	Stakeholders were informed of the latest project description as per **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)** at the latest ETG meeting. Stakeholder attendees included: • East Riding of Yorkshire Council • Hull City Council • 2B Landscape Consultancy (East Riding of Yorkshire Council LVIA Advisor)
N/A	Noise and Air Quality ETG (14th March 2024) The latest project description was presented at the ETG. No comments or queries were raised on the project description by stakeholders either at or during the consultation period (two weeks) post this latest ETG meeting.	Stakeholders were informed of the latest project description as per **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)** at the latest ETG meeting. Stakeholder attendees included: • East Riding of Yorkshire Council • Hull City Council
N/A	Human Health ETG (25th March 2024) The latest project description was presented at the ETG. No comments or queries were raised on the project description by stakeholders either at or during the	Stakeholders were informed of the latest project description as per **Volume 7, Chapter 5 Project Description (application ref: 7.5)** at the latest ETG meeting. Stakeholder attendees included: • East Riding of Yorkshire Council

Reference	Comment	Project Response
	consultation period (two weeks) post this latest ETG meeting.	• UK Health Security Agency • Department of Health & Social Care, Office for Health Improvement and Disparities • Deputy Director of Public Health

RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited

RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited

Windmill Hill Business Park
Whitehill Way
Swindon
Wiltshire, SN5 6PB