



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

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

**Dogger Bank South Offshore
Wind Farms**

**Historic England Statement of Common Ground
Submission for Deadline 1**

Document Date: January 2025

Document Reference: 9-4

Revision Number: 01

Classification: Unrestricted



Company:	RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited	Asset:	Development		
Project:	Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms	Sub Project/Package	Consents		
Document Title or Description:	Historic England Statement of Common Ground				
Document Number:	005368457-01	Contractor Reference Number:	PC2340-RHD-ZZ-ZZ-RP-Z-0159		
<p><i>COPYRIGHT © RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited, 2024.</i></p> <p><i>All rights reserved.</i></p> <p><i>In preparation of this document RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited has made reasonable efforts to ensure that the content is accurate, up to date and complete for the purpose for which it was prepared.</i></p>					
Rev No.	Date	Status/Reason for Issue	Author	Checked by	Approved by
01	29/01/2025	Submission for Deadline 1	RHDHV	RWE	RWE

Signatories	
Signed	
Name	
Position	
On behalf of	

Signatories	
Signed	
Name	
Position	
On behalf of	

Contents

1	Introduction	9
1.1	Background	9
1.2	Approach to SoCG	11
2	Consultation and Engagement	12
2.1	Introduction	12
2.2	Consultation and Engagement Summary	12
3	Agreement Log	19
3.1	Overview	19
3.2	General	20
3.3	Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	21
3.4	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	27
3.5	Status of Discussions for Matters 'Not Agreed' or 'Under Discussion'	35
3.5.1	Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	35
3.5.2	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.....	37
4	Summary	43
5	References	44

Tables

Table 1-1 - Application Documents of interest to Historic England.....	10
Table 2-1 - Summary of pre-application and post-application consultation with Historic England.....	12
Table 3-1 - Agreement logs position status key.....	19
Table 3-2 - General Topics agreed, in discussion or not agreed with Historic England.....	20
Table 3-3 - Topics agreed, in discussion or not agreed in relation to Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	21
Table 3-4 - Topics agreed, in discussion or not agreed in relation to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	27
Table 3-5 - Status of discussions relating to Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	35
Table 3-6 - Status of discussions relating to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	37

Glossary

Term	Definition
CITiZAN Dataset	CITiZAN (the Coastal and Intertidal Zone Archaeological Network) is a national archaeological database
Concurrent Scenario	A potential construction scenario for the Projects where DBS East and DBS West are both constructed at the same time.
Decommissioning Plan	A document which would define the extent of works, in relation to the onshore infrastructure, which are required to be undertaken at the end of the operational lifetime of the Projects. The plan would be subject to agreement with relevant stakeholders at the time.
Development Consent Order (DCO)	An order made under the Planning Act 2008 granting development consent for one or more Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP).
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	A statutory process by which certain planned projects must be assessed before a formal decision to proceed can be made. It involves the collection and consideration of environmental information, which fulfils the assessment requirements of the EIA Directive and EIA Regulations, including the publication of an Environmental Statement (ES).
Environmental Statement (ES)	A document reporting the findings of the EIA and produced in accordance with the EIA Directive as transposed into UK law by the EIA Regulations.
Expert Topic Group (ETG)	A forum for targeted engagement with regulators and interested stakeholders through the EPP.
In Isolation Scenario	A potential construction scenario for one Project which includes either the DBS East or DBS West array, associated offshore and onshore cabling and only the eastern Onshore Converter Station within the Onshore Substation Zone and only the northern route of the onward cable route to the proposed Birkhill Wood National Grid Substation.
Local Authority	The Local Authority is a body empowered by law to exercise various statutory functions for a particular area of the United Kingdom. This includes County Councils, District Councils and the Broads Authority, as set out in Section 43 of the Planning Act 2008. East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) is the Local Authority for the entirety of the Onshore Development Area.
Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)	Project specific document forming the agreement between the Applicants, the appointed archaeologists, contractors and the relevant stakeholders landward of MHWS. The document sets out the methods to mitigate the

Term	Definition
	effects on all the known and potential archaeological Receptors within the Hornsea Four onshore Order Limits.
Planning Inspectorate (PINS)	The agency responsible for operating the planning process for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs).
Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)	Defined in the EIA Regulations as information referred to in part 1, Schedule 4 (information for inclusion in Environmental Statements) which has been compiled by the applicants and is reasonably required to assess the environmental effects of the development.
Statutory consultation	The statutory consultation ran in two periods. The first period ran between 6th June and 17th July 2023, with a second period running between 4th August and 15th September 2023 to gather responses from third parties missed during the initial consultation period. The PEIR was presented as part of this consultation.
The Applicants	The Applicants for the Projects are RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Limited and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Limited. The Applicants are themselves jointly owned by the RWE Group of companies (51% stake) and Masdar (49% stake).
The Projects	DBS East and DBS West (collectively referred to as the Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms).

Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
ANS	Artificial Nesting Structure
CEA	Cumulative Effects Assessment
CoCP	Code of Construction Practise
DBS	Dogger Bank South
DCO	Development Consent Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
ETG	Expert Topic Group
ExA	Examining Authority
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PINS	Planning Inspectorate
RR	Relevant Representation
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
TCC	Temporary Construction Compounds
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

1. This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared between RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (West) Ltd and RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank South (East) Ltd, ('the Applicants') and Historic England to set out the areas of agreement and disagreement between the two parties in relation to the proposed Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Dogger Bank South ('DBS') West Offshore Wind Farm and DBS East Offshore Wind Farm, collectively known as DBS Offshore Wind Farms (herein 'the Projects').
2. The Application is for development consent for the Applicants to construct and operate the proposed Projects under the Planning Act 2008. Further description of the Projects is available in **Chapter 5 Project Description** [APP-071].
3. In drafting this SoCG, the Applicants have had regard to the Planning Act 2008 Guidance: Examination stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, 2024).
4. The need for a SoCG between the Applicants and Historic England is set out within the **Rule 6 Letter** [PD-002] issued by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) on the 24th September 2024 and reiterated in the updated **Rule 6 Letter** [PD-010] issued on 17th December 2024.
5. This SoCG is intended to provide the Examining Authority (ExA) with a clear summary of discussions between the parties and has been structured to reflect topics which are of interest to Historic England, and which have been raised within Historic England's Relevant Representation (RR) [RR-022] to the Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms DCO that has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate pursuant to the Planning Act 2008.
6. It is the intention that this document will facilitate further discussions between the Applicants and Historic England and will provide the ExA with a clear overview of the level of common ground between both parties. This document will be updated throughout the Examination process.
7. The following application documents have informed the discussions with Historic England and address the elements of the Projects that may affect the interests of Historic England:

Table 1-1 - Application Documents of interest to Historic England

Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter / Application Document	Planning Inspectorate (PINS) Reference
Chapter 04 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives	APP-067 (superseded by AS-017)
Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	APP-133
Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	APP-172 (superseded by AS-092)
Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact	APP-192
Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation	APP-239
Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Offshore)	APP-246
Outline Code of Construction Practice - Superseded by AS-094 - Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision 2) (Clean) and AS-095 - Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision 2) (Tracked)	APP-234 (superseded by AS-094 and AS-095)
Geophysical Assessment Report (Revision 02) – Part 1-6	AS-031 to AS-035
Archaeological Trial Trenching Phase 1 (Final) Part 1 to 4	PDA-025 to PDA-028
Archaeological Trial Trenching Phase 2 (Interim) Section 3	PDA-029
Archaeological Trial Trenching Phase 2 (Interim) Section 17	PDA-030
Archaeological Trial Trenching Phase 2 (Interim) Section 10	PDA-031
Archaeological Trial Trenching Phase 2 (Interim) Section 11	PDA-032
Phase 2 2024 Archaeological Trial Trenching Technical Note (Revision 2)	PDA-033

Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter / Application Document	Planning Inspectorate (PINS) Reference
Archaeological Trial Trenching Phase 2 (Interim Report) Section 5	AS-023
Archaeological Trial Trenching Phase 2 (Interim Report) Section 6	AS-024
Project Change Request 1 - Environmental Assessment Update	C1.1
Project Change Request 2 - Onshore Substation Zone	C2.1

8. Historic England and the Applicants have been working so that Historic England may influence and enhance the design of the Projects where appropriate.

1.2 Approach to SoCG

9. This SoCG has been developed during the pre-examination and examination phases of the Projects. In accordance with discussions between the Applicants and Historic England, this SoCG is focused on matters of material interest and relevance to Historic England, namely matters covered in the Application Documents outlined in **Table 1-1** and related topics.
10. The structure of this SoCG is as follows:
 - **Introduction:** background to the development of the SoCG.
 - **Consultation and Engagement:** a summary of consultation and engagement with Historic England to date.
 - **Agreement Log:** a record of the Applicants’ position alongside Historic England’s position. **Table 3-2** to **Table 3-4** sets out those areas agreed in relation to the application documents set out in **Table 1-1**. Where a matter is ‘not agreed’ or ‘under discussion’ this is described in further detail in **Table 3-5** to **Table 3-6**.
11. It is agreed that this SoCG is an accurate description of the areas agreed and under discussion between the parties, and that this SoCG accurately records key meetings and consultation with the Historic England.
12. As referenced in **Table 2-1**, the Applicants consulted Historic England on Project Change Requests 1 and 2 between 15th November and 16th December 2024. Historic England provided consultation comments on 13th December 2024 regarding the Change Requests. As the Project Change Requests were only recently accepted into the Examination on 21st January 2025, this SoCG does not include details of those comments, which will instead be included in the next iteration of this document.

2 Consultation and Engagement

2.1 Introduction

13. Historic England have been consulted on the proposed development throughout the pre-application stage, having engaged in the Site Selection and Assessment Alternatives, Landscape and Visual Impact, and Onshore and Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Expert Topic Group (ETG) meetings under the Evidence Plan Process, as well as via non-statutory and statutory consultation under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008.

2.2 Consultation and Engagement Summary

14. **Table 2-1** summarises the consultation that the Applicants have undertaken with Historic England as statutory or non-statutory consultation during the pre-application and post-application phases.

Table 2-1 - Summary of pre-application and post-application consultation with Historic England

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title/ Topic	Summary of Consultation
Pre – Application			
15/09/2021	ETG Meeting	Historic Environment (onshore and offshore) Pre-scoping	The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Background; EPP; Scoping Report and the approach to the EIA (offshore and onshore); and Site Selection and Methodology.
04/05/2022	ETG Meeting	Site Selection	The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Update; and Review of site selection work for Creyke Beck.
06/10/2022	Email	Onshore Archaeology	RHDHV shared the Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for priority geophysical surveys with Historic England.
11/10/2022	Email(s)	Onshore Archaeology	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> RHDHV received response to the confirm the WSI is with Historic England. Comments were provided to RHDHV by Historic England on the WSI.

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title/ Topic	Summary of Consultation
22/10/2022	ETG Meeting	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Geophysics WSI	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project Update; ● Update on Scoping Report/Opinion; ● Update on data collection; ● Review of programme for collection of data; and ● Review of geophysics WSI.
13/12/2022	ETG Meeting	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project update; and ● LVIA.
06/01/2023	Email	Onshore Archaeology	RHDHV provided an updated geophysics WSI and onshore heritage strategy document to Historic England.
19/01/2023	ETG Meeting	Onshore and Offshore Archaeology	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project update; ● Offshore: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Update on data collection; and ○ Confirmation of scope for the offshore assessment for ES. ● Onshore: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Update on work done; ○ Stakeholder feedback on heritage viewpoints around substation zones; and ○ Stakeholder confirmation on geophysics results.
10/05/2023	ETG Meeting	Historic Environment	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project Update; and ● Approach to the DBS geophysical assessment and geoarchaeological assessment.
25/05/2023	ETG Meeting	Onshore Heritage	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project Update; and

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title/ Topic	Summary of Consultation
		Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update.
31/05/2023	Email	Onshore Archaeology	Historic England sent confirmation to RHDHV that the WSI for GI watching brief is acceptable once an additional reference is added/
13/06/2023	Email	Offshore Archaeology	RHDHV presented update to Historic England regarding success of Wessex's work on array area assessment and proposed expanding same approach to ECR.
29/06/2023	Email	Onshore Archaeology	RHDHV issued Trial Trenching WSI docs to Historic England for review by 13th July.
12.07.2023	Email	Onshore Archaeology	Historic England provided response to Trial Trenching WSI.
17/07/2023	Section 42 Consultation	Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Historic England response to Section 42 consultation on PEIR. See Appendix G of the Consultation Report [APP-044].
21/07/2023	Email	Onshore Archaeology	Historic England confirmed they are satisfied with approach to first phase of trial trenching.
12/09/2023	Email	Export Cable Corridor and Site Selection Report	Issued a report on Offshore Export Cable Corridor & Landfall Site Selection, requestion comments by 10/10/23.
20/09/2023	Email	Export Cable Corridor and Site Selection Report	RHDHV uses GIS shapefiles for the Offshore Export Cable Corridor and Landfall Site Selection Report.
20/09/2023	ETG Meeting	Offshore Archaeology	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project update; Seabed feature assessment; Marine geophysical survey – ECR; Results from large data set (Andrew Emery); and PEIR Comments.

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title/ Topic	Summary of Consultation
05/12/2023	ETG Meeting	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Onshore Historic Environment	The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Overview; S42 Consultation response and feedback; ES progress feedback; Programme for ES chapter drafting; and Agreement Logs
14/12/2023	ETG Meeting	Offshore Archaeology Pre-Submission	The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Design Update; Seabed feature assessment; Palaeolandscape assessment; and WSI.
06/03/2024	Email	Geotechnical Campaign	Correspondence between Historic England and the Applicants on their response on Marine licence application involving seabed sampling for DBS West Array area.
07/03/2024	Email	Onshore Archaeology	The Applicants issued a Draft Onshore Archaeology ES Chapter & Outline Onshore WSI to Historic England, for comment in the meeting 19/03/24.
19/03/2024	ETG Meeting	Onshore Historic Environment Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Update; ES update; Feedback on ES and Outline Onshore WSI; and Agreement logs.
22/03/2024	Email	Onshore Archaeology	Historic England responded to the issue of Draft Onshore Archaeology Chapter & Outline Onshore WSI.
13/06/2024	Email	General DCO Submission	The Applicants confirmed DCO was submitted on the 12/06/24, and queried if stakeholders would wish for meetings later in summer to discuss application docs.

Post – Application

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title/ Topic	Summary of Consultation
23/08/2024	Email	Geophysical Survey Report	The Applicants issued the Interim Update Geophysical Survey Report to Historic England. This provides results on additional areas surveyed since DCO Submission.
09/09/2024	Relevant Representation	Onshore and Offshore Archaeology	Received Historic England's RR to The Planning Inspectorate.
24/09/2024	Email	Phase 1 Trial Trenching final report	The Applicants issued the final version of the Phase 1 Trial Trenching report to Historic England.
30/09/2024	Email	SoCG	A draft of the SoCG and links to the Rule 6 Letter [PD-002] and the document library were shared with Historic England
07/10/2024	Offshore Teams Meeting	SoGC and RR Meeting	<p>The following topics were discussed during the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project Overview; ● Proposed Changes to the Projects Design Envelope; ● Statement of Common Ground; ● RR; and ● Next Steps.
08/10/2024	Email	Relevant Representation	The Applicants responded to Historic England's RR within The Applicants' Responses to Relevant Representations [PDA-013].
14/10/2024	Onshore Teams Meeting	SOGC and RR Meeting	<p>The following topics were discussed during the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project Overview; ● Development Consent Order Examination Timetable; ● Statement of Common Ground; ● Next Steps; and ● RR.
17/10/2024	Email	SoCG Meeting	Historic England advised the Applicants that they will not agree or respond to the SoCG until they have submitted their Written Representation and received their first Written Questions from PINS. They advised they will

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title/ Topic	Summary of Consultation
			therefore not meet the deadline for returning comments on the SoCG.
18/10/2024	Site Visit	Site Visit to Butt Farm	<p>Keith Emerick met with the Applicants at Butt Farm. The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline the elements of setting that contribute to significance of the Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite, 350m west of Butt Farm. • Mitigation and proposed enhancements / engagement. • Kinetic, dynamic and 3rd viewpoints.
23/10/2024	Email	SoCG and Meeting Minutes	<p>The Applicants issued the meeting minutes and presentation from the 14/10/2024 meeting, notes from the site visit on 18/10/2024, and a draft revision of the SoCG, including wording that Historic England will not be engaging in the SoCG process prior to the submission of their Written Representation and receipt of First Written Questions from PINS. A follow up email was sent with a link to the Design and Access Statement [APP-233].</p>
25/10/2024	Email	SoCG	<p>Historic England confirmed they had received the 23/10/2024 email from the Applicants and that they would read the attached and linked documents with interest.</p>
28/11/2025	Email	Project Change Request 2	<p>The Applicants provided an examination update and provided links to information regarding the Project Change Request 2 and requested feedback by the 16/12/2024 and offered a meeting to discuss.</p>
09/12/2024	Email	SoCG meeting minutes	<p>The Applicants issued draft SoCG meeting minutes for the 07/10/2024.</p>
13/12/2024	Letter	Offshore Artificial Nesting Structure (ANS)	<p>Historic England response to request for comments from Interested Parties for Deadline 16th December 2024, raising questions in relation to the ANS site selection process and onshore converter station landscaping.</p>
18/ 12/ 2024	Email	Offshore ANS	<p>The Applicant's provided a brief overview of the ANS AoS site selection process and asked for a</p>

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title/ Topic	Summary of Consultation
			meeting to discuss this and the future ANS consenting route.
09/01/2025	Email	SoCG and Issue Specific Hearing 2	The Applicants shared the new Rule 6 Letter [PD-010], asked whether Historic England would issue a response on the most recent SoCG, and asked whether they were to attend Issue Specific Hearing 2.
09/01/2025	Email	SoCG	Historic England confirmed that they were unlikely to issue a response on the draft revision of the SoCG, pending a decision from their lawyers.
13/01/2025	Meeting	Offshore ANS	Meeting to run through the ANS site selection process, the consenting route for the installation of the ANS and discuss and concerns.
28/01/2025	Email	SoCG	Historic England returned the version of the SoCG issued on 30/09/2024 with their comments. These comments have not been incorporated within this revision of the SoCG submitted at Deadline 1 as noted in the covering letter.

3 Agreement Log

3.1 Overview

15. The following sections of this SoCG summarise the level of agreement between the parties for each relevant onshore and offshore topic.
16. To easily identify whether a matter is 'agreed', 'not agreed' or 'under discussion', a colour coding system of, red, amber, green, is used respectively within the 'position status colour' column as set out in **Table 3-1**.
17. Where a matter is 'not agreed' or 'under discussion' further detail is provided in section 3.6.

Table 3-1 - Agreement logs position status key

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

3.2 General

Table 3-2 - General Topics agreed, in discussion or not agreed with Historic England

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
EIA – Consultation			
1.	<p>The Applicants have adequately consulted with Historic England throughout all stages of the Projects to date and the summary of Consultation (section 2.2 of this SoCG) is a fair and accurate record of pre-application consultation.</p> <p>Section 2 of this document evidences the engagement and consultation process between the Parties. It is the Applicants' position that Historic England have been appropriately engaged throughout the Application process by the Applicants.</p>		
EIA – Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives			
2.	<p>The site selection and route refinement outlined in Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [AS-017] has properly considered the alternatives for the relevant elements of the Projects.</p>	<p>Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment (05/12/2023) ETG that they agree with the approach taken to site selection.</p>	
3.	<p>The rationale for the placement of the Onshore Substation Zone as set out in Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [AS-017] is appropriate and acceptable.</p>	<p>Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
		agree with the rationale behind the Onshore Substation Zone placement.	

3.3 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Table 3-3 - Topics agreed, in discussion or not agreed in relation to Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
EIA – Planning and Policy			
4.	All relevant plans and policies have been identified in section 17.4.1 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133] and these have been appropriately considered in the assessment.		
EIA – Baseline Environment			
5.	The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment as detailed in section 17.5 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133]. Discussed and agreed in Historic Environment – Pre-Scoping ETG (14/09/2021).	Historic England confirmed in the Historic Environment – Pre-Scoping ETG (14/09/2021) that they agree with the characterisation of the baseline environment if information on lost villages and submerged forest are included.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
6.	<p>Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within section 17.6 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133].</p>	<p>Historic England confirmed in the Historic Environment – Pre-Scoping ETG (14/09/2021) that they agree with the desk-based data collection approach.</p>	
EIA – Assessment Methodology			
7.	<p>The study areas identified in section 17.3.1 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133] are appropriate.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
8.	<p>The realistic worst case scenario presented in the assessment for the development scenarios, as outlined in Table 17-1 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133] are appropriate.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
9.	<p>The embedded mitigation measures in Table 17-3 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133] are appropriate.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
10.	<p>The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, as presented in section 17.4 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133], provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on the Projects.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>	<p>Historic England confirmed in the Historic Environment – Pre-Scoping ETG (14/09/2021) that they agree with the approach to the EIA assessment.</p>	
11.	<p>The assessment of significance presented in section 17.6 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133] is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42</p>		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
	<p>response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
12.	<p>Section 17.6.1 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during construction.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
13.	<p>Section 17.6.2 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during operation.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
14.	<p>The assessment of cumulative effects, as detailed in section 17.8 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133] is consistent with the agreed methodologies.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42</p>		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
	<p>response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
15.	<p>The impacts scoped in for assessment in section 17.6 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133] are appropriate and acceptable.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>	<p>Historic England confirmed in the Historic Environment – Pre-Scoping ETG (14/09/2021) that they agree with the impacts scoped in for assessment within the ESI</p>	
EIA - Assessment Conclusions			
16.	<p>The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in in section 17.6 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-133] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
EIA – Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) Conclusions			
17.	<p>The conclusions of the CEA as detailed in section 17.8 of Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</p>		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
	<p>[APP-133] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring			
18.	<p>The Conditions detailed in Marine Licences 1-5 of the Draft Development Consent Order [APP-027] contain appropriate detail with regards to conducting an archaeological written scheme of investigation prior to construction of the Projects.</p>	<p>In their RR, Historic England requested that (with regards to the Project-Level Kittiwake Compensation Plan [APP-052] and Guillemot [and Razorbill] Compensation Plan [APP-056];</p> <p><i>'the applicant includes in the DCO an obligation to conduct a WSI in relation to the compensation measures proposed in the plans referred to above, similar to that contained at Schedules 10 and 11 (15(1)(e)) of the draft DCO'.</i></p>	
19.	<p>The Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Offshore) [APP-246] appropriately details the proposed approach to archaeological investigation and mitigation to be undertaken within the offshore and intertidal areas of the Projects.</p>	<p>Historic England noted in their RR that <i>'...the present Outline Offshore WSI (Volume 8 (June 2024) APP-239) needs to appropriately consider mitigation and offsetting works in relation to pre-construction, construction, operation & maintenance, and decommissioning phases of proposed locations for installation of the Artificial Nesting Structures (ANS)</i></p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
		<i>(as described in the above referenced Project-Level Kittiwake Compensation Plan).</i>	

3.4 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Table 3-4 - Topics agreed, in discussion or not agreed in relation to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
EIA – Planning and Policy			
20.	<p>All relevant plans and policies have been identified in section 22.4.1 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] and these have been appropriately considered in the assessment.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
EIA – Baseline Environment			
21.	The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in of the Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage risks as	Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they agree with the baseline scope for the ES Onshore Development	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
	detailed in section 22.5 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092].	Boundary, including areas that are outside the previous PEIR Development Boundary limits.	
22.	Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within section 22.6 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092].	Historic England confirmed in the Historic Environment – Pre-Scoping ETG (14/09/2021) that they agree with the approach to the onshore surveys and desk-based data collection.	
EIA – Assessment Methodology			
23.	The study areas identified in section 22.3.2 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] are appropriate.	Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Archaeology – Survey Update ETG (20/10/2022) that they agree with the selection of priority areas identified for further study.	
24.	<p>The realistic worst case scenario presented in the assessment for the development scenarios, as outlined in Table 22-1 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] are appropriate.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
25.	The embedded mitigation measures in Table 22-3 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] are appropriate.		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
	<p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
26.	<p>The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, as presented in section 22.4.3 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092], provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts of the Projects.</p>	<p>Historic England confirmed in the Historic Environment – Pre-Scoping (14/09/2021) that they agree with the approach to the EIA methodology, and in the Onshore Heritage – Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update ETG (2023).</p> <p>However, Historic England raised concerns with the methodology within their RR (16/09/2024). See Table 3-6.</p>	
27.	<p>The assessment of significance presented in section 22.6 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
28.	<p>Section 22.6.1 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during construction.</p>		

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
	<p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
29.	<p>Section 22.6.2 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] represents a comprehensive list of the potential effects during operation.</p> <p>Historic England did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, or within their RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicants that the matter is agreed.</p>		
30.	<p>The impacts scoped in and assessed in section 22.6 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] are acceptable and appropriate.</p>	<p>Historic England confirmed in the Historic Environment – Pre-Scoping ETG (14/09/2021) that they agree with the impacts scoped in for assessment.</p>	
31.	<p>The EIA assessment set out in Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] is appropriate and acceptable regarding Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.</p>	<p>Historic England agreed in their RR (16/09/2024) the '<i>assessment of the archaeological resource</i>' set out in the ES provides a '<i>clear basis for directing effective and functioning work packages</i>' in the '<i>onshore realms</i>'.</p>	
32.	<p>The approach to and objectives of the geophysical surveys, as set out in the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239] is appropriate and acceptable.</p>	<p>Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Archaeology – Survey Update ETG (20/10/2022) that</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
		<p>they agree with the approach to and objectives of the geophysical surveys.</p> <p>Historic England also confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) they agree with the geophysical survey coverage and the effects of availability of access to land.</p>	
33.	The method of consulting the CiTIZAN dataset is appropriate and acceptable.	Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they agree with the method of consulting the CiTIZAN dataset.	
EIA - Assessment Conclusions			
34.	The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in in section 22.6 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	Historic England confirmed in their RR (16/09/2024) that the Onshore Converter Stations represent ' <i>less than substantial harm but on the higher end of the scale</i> ' to the significance of the Scheduled Monument of 'Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite, 350m west of Butt Farm'. Historic England noted that this high degree of 'harm' needs to be addressed.	
EIA – Cumulative Impacts			
35.	The conclusions of the CEA as detailed in section 22.8 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.	Historic England confirmed in the 14/10/2024 meeting that they do not disagree with the conclusions of the CEA.	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
36.	The offshore wind farm projects in the area are having discussions and taking appropriate measures to ensure a collaborative approach.	Historic England provided comments in their RR (16/09/2024). See Table 3-6 .	
Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring			
37.	The approach of including an overarching Trial Trenching section (section 7.3) in the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239], and to review and approve trenching plans on a rolling basis is appropriate and acceptable.	Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Heritage – Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update ETG (25/05/2023) that they agree with the approach of including an overarching Trial Trenching section within the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239] and with reviewing and approaching trenching plans on a rolling basis.	
38.	The refined regional research objectives within section 7.3 of the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239] relating to Trial Trenching are appropriate and acceptable.	Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they agree with the refined regional research objectives within the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239].	
39.	The approach to the Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment [APP-178] regarding the Beverley Minster is appropriate and acceptable.	Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they agree with the approach the Settings Assessment takes to Beverley Minster.	
40.	The approach set out in the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239] is appropriate and acceptable.	Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Heritage – Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update ETG (25/05/2023) that they agree with the approach set	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
	<p>The Applicants consider that the surveys carried out pre-application are sufficient to inform the consent decision and the principle of the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239], which acknowledges [section 7, APP-239] that further archaeological work is required to define the final WSI(s) and sets out a process for this work to be carried out and verified by consultees, including Historic England.</p>	<p>out in the WSI for Geoarchaeology and Archaeology Watching Brief.</p> <p>Historic England confirmed in their RR (16/09/2024) that they agree the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239] <i>'set(s) out a clear basis for directing effective and functioning work packages'</i>.</p> <p>Historic England also noted that <i>'additional surveys and evaluation'</i> are required.</p>	
41.	<p>The approach to Outreach and Engagement as set out in section 9 of Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239] is appropriate and acceptable.</p>	<p>See Table 3-6.</p>	
Other Matters as Required			
42.	<p>The approach taken to trial trenching is appropriate and acceptable.</p>	<p>Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Heritage – Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update ETG (25/05/2023) that they agree with the approach taken to trial trenching.</p>	
43.	<p>The approach to invoking contingency set out in the Trial Trenching WSI (not submitted with the Application) is appropriate and acceptable.</p>	<p>Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Heritage – Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update ETG (25/05/2023) that they agree with the approach to invoking contingency.</p>	
44.	<p>An interim Trial Trenching Report will be provided to Historic England during the examination process. This is currently</p>	<p>Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Heritage– Onshore Archaeology and Heritage</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
	being drafted and will be submitted to Historic England during the examination process.	Update ETG (25/05/2023) that they agree this approach is acceptable.	
45.	The technicality of reporting and illustrations in Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] is appropriate and acceptable.	Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (19/03/2024) that they agree with the approach to pre-examination fieldwork.	
46.	The proposed locations of the Temporary Construction Compounds (TCC) and Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) compounds at landfall as shown in Figure 5-3 Onshore Development Area Indicative Design [APP-072], are acceptable, and a degree of flexibility on these locations is retained.	Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they agree with the proposed TCC and HDD compound locations and the retention of a degree of flexibility on these locations.	
47.	The approach to pre-examination field work is acceptable and appropriate.	Historic England confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (19/03/2024) that they agree with the approach to pre-examination fieldwork.	
48.	Screening by mitigation planting, as set out in section 23.6 and 23.7 of Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact [APP-192], and further detailed in the Outline Landscape Management Plan [APP-236] is sufficient to mitigate the 'less than substantial harm' to views from the Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite, 350m west of Butt Farm caused by the Onshore Converter Stations.	Historic England confirmed in their RR (16/09/2024) that they agree the Onshore Converter Stations represents ' <i>less than substantial harm</i> ' to the significance of the Scheduled Monument site. However, Historic England also raised concerns regarding the setting of the Scheduled Monument as set out in Table 3-6 .	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Historic England's Position	Position Status
49.	The Archaeology and Cultural Heritage specific viewpoints included in the Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment [APP-178] have been agreed with Historic England and are acceptable and appropriate.	See Table 3-6 .	

3.5 Status of Discussions for Matters 'Not Agreed' or 'Under Discussion'

3.5.1 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Table 3-5 - Status of discussions relating to Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	Historic England's position	Position Status
18.	Draft DCO	The Applicants responded to Historic England's Relevant Representation within The Applicants' Responses to Relevant Representations [PDA-013].	In their RR, Historic England requested that (with regards to the Project-Level Kittiwake Compensation Plan [APP-052] and Guillemot [and Razorbill] Compensation Plan [APP-056]);	

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	Historic England's position	Position Status
		It should be noted however that any potential offshore ANS for kittiwake would be applied for under a separate marine licence outside of this DCO application.	<i>'the applicant includes in the DCO an obligation to conduct a WSI in relation to the compensation measures proposed in the plans referred to above, similar to that contained at Schedules 10 and 11 (15(1)(e)) of the draft DCO'.</i>	
19.	DCO Protective Provisions	The Applicants responded to Historic England's Relevant Representation within The Applicants' Responses to Relevant Representations [PDA-013]. It should be noted however that any potential offshore ANS for kittiwake would be applied for under a separate marine licence outside of this DCO application.	Historic England have requested within their RR, that additional wording is added to the DCO to commit to conducting a WSI in relation to any kittiwake / auk compensation measures implemented by the Applicants.	
20.	Outline WSI (Offshore)	As any potential offshore ANS for kittiwake would be applied for under a separate marine licence outside of this DCO application, the Applicants believe that the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Offshore) [APP-246] should not be updated. Instead, a separate WSI for the pre-construction, construction, operation & maintenance, and decommissioning phases of proposed locations for installation of the ANS would	Historic England have requested that the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Offshore) [APP-246] be updated to consider mitigation and offsetting works in relation to pre-construction, construction, operation & maintenance, and decommissioning phases of proposed locations for installation of the ANS (as described in the above referenced Project-Level Kittiwake Compensation Plan).	

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	Historic England's position	Position Status
		be submitted alongside the marine licence application for the ANS.		

3.5.2 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Table 3-6 - Status of discussions relating to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	Historic England's position	Position Status
26.	The definitions of importance for cultural heritage assets as set out in the EIA methodology	<p>The ES sets out at Table 22-7 that Grade II listed buildings are considered with other heritage assets of 'regional/national importance', distinguishing them from designated heritage assets 'of the highest significance' which are considered to be of national/international importance [AS-092]. This distinction follows the distinction in NPS sections 5.9.29 to 5.9.30 and NPPF section 206.</p> <p>The Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment[APP-178] considers a number of Grade II Listed Buildings (section 22.5.6) and identifies a negligible magnitude of impact to the Grade II listed Black Mill. Even if the valuation of this asset were to be increased to</p>	<p>Historic England set out in their RR (16/09/2024) that their position on the EIA methodology set out in section 22.4.3 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] is that they <i>'disagree with elements of the Assessment Methodology identified in Table 22-7, AS-092, and used throughout the Environmental Statement'</i>. Historic England hold the position that <i>'Buildings listed at Grade II are nationally important, not 'Medium' importance'</i>.</p> <p>Whilst Historic England <i>'agree with the 'Definition of magnitude of impact to heritage assets''</i> as set out in Table 22-8 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092], they hold the position that <i>'because</i></p>	

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	Historic England's position	Position Status
		<p>'high' in line with the Historic England response, this would not result a significant effect.</p>	<p><i>the importance of Grade II buildings has been downgraded, the magnitude of impact and the significance of impact will be distorted accordingly'.</i></p>	
34.	EIA - Assessment Conclusions	<p>The conclusions of the assessment of significance as detailed in in section 22.6 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] are appropriate and are considered not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>The Applicants are engaging with Historic England to resolve these issues.</p>	<p>Historic England confirmed in their RR (16/09/2024) that the Onshore Converter Stations represent '<i>less than substantial harm</i>' to the significance of the Scheduled Monument of 'Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite, 350m west of Butt Farm' but at the high end of this scale. Noting that this high degree of 'harm' needs to be addressed.</p>	
36.	Collaboration between offshore wind farm schemes on landscaping	<p>The Applicants are engaging with Historic England to further clarify this point.</p>	<p>Historic England set out in their RR (16/09/2024) that their position on the CEA as set out in section 22.8 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] is that the Chapter should '<i>provide more thorough assessment of the cumulative impact of this and other related energy proposals</i>'.</p> <p>This was discussed further at the 14/10/2024 meeting and it was clarified that Historic England's comment was regarding the overarching opportunity for collaboration on landscaping between schemes and feel this is</p>	

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	Historic England's position	Position Status
			an opportunity which has been missed by all schemes in the area.	
42.	Section 9 of the Outline Onshore WSI, Public Outreach / Community Engagement	<p>The outreach sections of the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239] were presented as an initial draft, reflecting the early stage of the proposals.</p> <p>The Applicants are engaging with Historic England to agree more detailed proposals.</p>	<p>Historic England set out in their RR (16/09/2024) their position is that section 9 of Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239] requires '<i>greater clarification</i>' and '<i>the possibilities for wider public benefits are being missed</i>'. Historic England noted in their RR that they '<i>remain willing to assist the applicant in the formulation of an appropriate outreach and engagement scheme befitting the scale of the project</i>'.</p>	
49.	Mitigation of effects on the Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite, 350m west of Butt Farm	<p>The screening/planting is only one of a number of proposed mitigation measures. Other mitigation measures are set out in section 22.5.6.3.3 of the Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment [APP-178].</p> <p>The options for the final finish of the Converter Stations and associated landscaping are set out in the Design and Access Statement [section 4.3, APP-233] and would be agreed through a design review process post consent [section 5, APP-233].</p>	<p>Historic England set out in their RR (16/09/2024) that their position regarding the mitigation planting set out in paragraph 23.6.2.3.1 of Chapter 23 Landscape and Visual Impact [APP-192] onwards and Figures 23-15a2 [APP-193]; Figures 23-15a3 [APP-193] is not an '<i>effective or lasting mitigation measure in this instance</i>'. Historic England's position is that the harm '<i>this can be achieved by removing the intervention, reducing its impact, or finding ways to mitigate that harm</i>'.</p>	

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	Historic England's position	Position Status
		<p>Mitigation for the Butt Farm site also includes proposals for interpretation and investigation of the site which have been shared with Historic England.</p> <p>The Applicants are engaging with Historic England (via site visit) to further refine mitigation proposals.</p>		
50.	<p>The effect of the Onshore Converter Station on the views from and the setting and significance of the 'Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite, 350m west of Butt Farm, Registered Park and Garden at Rigsby Hall, listed buildings, and conservation areas.</p>	<p>Archaeology and Cultural Heritage specific viewpoints were discussed in the LVIA – PEIR Approach ETG (13/12/2022) and agreed.</p> <p>Kinetic and dynamic views have been considered in the assessment of assets such as <i>The Minster Church of St John</i> (section 22.5.6.8, Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment [APP-178] and Walkington Conservation Area [section 22.5.6.4, APP-178] where views of that nature contribute to the significance of the heritage asset.</p> <p>In the case of the Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite the perception of the asset in the wider landscape is limited by its height (sunken structures) and location (adjacent to field boundaries/hedgerows). As a result, the experience of the heritage asset is primarily from within the field to the south-east of the</p>	<p>Historic England set out in their RR (16/09/2024) that their position is that <i>'two elements are missing from the visualisations and the assessment of setting, experience and significance. There is no reference to views from a third location, those views showing both the Converter Station(s) and the heritage asset; and there is no attempt to present or assess dynamic and kinetic views as the viewer moves through the landscape. Therefore, it is not yet possible to understand the full impact of the built elements of the scheme on the setting and significance of listed buildings, conservation areas, the scheduled monument identified above (Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite, 350m west of Butt Farm) and the Registered Park and Garden at Risby Hall.'</i> Historic England are of the position that <i>'solutions can be found through dialogue with the relevant national</i></p>	

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	Historic England's position	Position Status
		<p>battery. These views are necessarily more limited and depend more on static viewpoints than extensive kinetic views where the asset passes in and out of view. These views and have been considered in terms of how they contribute to significance in line with GPA3.</p> <p>At Risby Hall Registered Park and Garden, there no visibility of the Onshore Convertor Station from within the parkland and as a result kinetic views as the viewer moves around the asset would not be affected (section 22.5.6.9.2, Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment [APP-178]. The planting scheme to the boundary of the parkland, in common with other English gardens of the period, blurs the boundary between designed and agricultural landscapes, and in the flat landscape the parkland is readily perceived. In line with best practice, the viewpoint Figure 23.15c Chapter 5 Project Description [APP 193] provided illustrates the '<i>worst-case visibility of the proposed development from the area immediately outside the parkland. This very limited visibility was assessed as not being of a prominence or character that would give rise to any loss of the historic or architectural interests</i></p>	<p><i>and local authority curatorial and statutory bodies'.</i></p>	

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	Historic England's position	Position Status
		<p><i>of the asset and consequently no effect would arise'</i> (section 22.5.6.9.3, Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment [APP-178]).</p> <p>The Applicants are engaging with Historic England to resolve these issues.</p>		

4 Summary

18. This SoCG has outlined the consultation that has taken place between the Applicants and Historic England during the pre-application and pre-examination phases. This SoCG will be updated as discussions progress and made available to PINS as requested through the DCO examination phase.

5 References

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

RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank
South (West) Limited

RWE Renewables UK Dogger Bank
South (East) Limited

Windmill Business Park
Whitehill Way
Swindon
Wiltshire, SN5 6PB

RWE

MASDAR 