



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

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

**Dogger Bank South Offshore
Wind Farms**

**Humber Archaeology Partnership Statement of
Common Ground**

Submission for Deadline 1

Document Date: January 2025

Document Reference: 9.20

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:	Humber Archaeology Partnership Statement of Common Ground				
Document Number:	005403997-01	Contractor Reference Number:	PC2340-RHD-ZZ-ZZ-RP-Z-0160		
<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	8
1.1	Background	8
1.2	Approach to SoCG	9
2	Consultation and Engagement	10
2.1	Introduction	10
2.2	Consultation and Engagement Summary	10
3	Agreement Log	15
3.1	Overview	15
3.2	General	16
3.3	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	18
3.4	Status of Discussions for Matters 'Not Agreed' or 'Under Discussion' ...	28
3.4.1	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.....	28
4	Summary	31
5	References	32

Tables

Table 1-1 - Application Documents of interest to Humber Archaeology Partnership	9
Table 2-1 - Summary of pre-application and post-application consultation with Humber Archaeology Partnership.....	10
Table 3-1 - Agreement logs position status key.....	15
Table 3-2 - General Topics agreed, in discussion or not agreed with Humber Archaeology Partnership	16
Table 3-3 - Topics agreed, in discussion or not agreed in relation to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	18
Table 3-4 - Status of discussions relating to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	28

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.
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.
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

Term	Definition
	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
CEA	Cumulative Effects Assessment
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice
DBS	Dogger Bank South
DCO	Development Consent Order
DMV	Deserted Medieval Village
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
ETG	Expert Topic Group
ExA	Examining Authority
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
PAD	Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries
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 Humber Archaeology Partnership 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, Figure 5-1 [APP-072]**.
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. As Humber Archaeology Partnership are the appointed archaeological advisors to East Riding of Yorkshire Council, this SoCG fulfils that requirement.
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 Humber Archaeology Partnership regarding the Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms DCO that has been submitted to the PINS pursuant to the Planning Act 2008.
6. It is the intention that this document will facilitate further discussions between the Applicants and Humber Archaeology Partnership 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 Humber Archaeology Partnership and address the elements of the Projects that may affect the interests of Humber Archaeology Partnership:

Table 1-1 - Application Documents of interest to Humber Archaeology Partnership

Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter/ Application Document	PINS Reference
ES Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives	AS-017
Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	AS-092
Appendix 22-5 Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment	APP-178
Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation	APP-239
Outline Code of Construction Practice	AS-094
Project Change Request 2 - Onshore Substation Zone	C2.1

8. Humber Archaeology Partnership and the Applicants have been working together to minimise possible impacts of the Projects on Humber Archaeology Partnership’s operations, and so that Humber Archaeology Partnership 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 Humber Archaeology Partnership, this SoCG is focused on matters of material interest and relevance to Humber Archaeology Partnership, 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 Humber Archaeology Partnership to date.
- **Agreement Log:** a record of the Applicants’ position alongside Humber Archaeology Partnership’s position. **Table 3-2** to **Table 3-3** 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 3-4**.

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 Humber Archaeology Partnership.
12. As referenced in **Table 2-1**, the Applicants consulted Humber Archaeology Partnership on Project Change Request 2 between 15th November and 16th December 2024. Humber Archaeology Partnership did not provide any consultation comments on the Project Change Requests.

2 Consultation and Engagement

2.1 Introduction

13. The Humber Archaeology Partnership been consulted on the proposed development throughout the pre-application stage, having engaged in Onshore 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 Humber Archaeology Partnership as statutory or non-statutory consultation during the pre-application and post-application phases. In addition, a number of Technical Notes and draft documents have been issued throughout the pre-application stage of the Projects, for review and comments.

Table 2-1 - Summary of pre-application and post-application consultation with Humber Archaeology Partnership

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
Pre – Application			
04/02/2022	Email	Historic Environment	Monuments, Events, and Historic Landscape Characterisation for the 2km search radius sent to Humber Archaeology Partnership.
04/02/2022	Email	Historic Environment	Humber Archaeology Partnership and Royal HaskoningDHV signed the completed data agreement.
06/10/2022	Email	Historic Environment	The Applicant shared the draft Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for priority geophysical surveys with Humber Archaeology Partnership

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
20/10/2022	ETG Meeting	Onshore Archaeology – Survey Update	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide ETG with a project update; • Provide an update on the Scoping Report/Scoping Opinion; • Provide an update on data collection to date; • Review the programme for collection of data; and • Review the Geophysics WSI and progress to date.
06/01/2023	Email	Heritage Strategy Document	<p>The Applicant shared the EIA Onshore Heritage Strategy for the Projects, alongside an updated Geophysical WSI</p>
25/05/2023	ETG Meeting	Onshore Heritage ETG – Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project update; • Site selection update; • Current DCO status; • Assessment scenarios; • Documents shared with the ETG; • Data provided at PEIR; • Update on data collected to date; • Nunkeeling DMV; • Geoarchaeological desk-based assessment; • WSI for investigation for trial; trenching and trench plans; • Contingencies; and • Trench plan review.
01/06/2023	Email	Historic Environment	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed the WSI for the watching brief is acceptable.</p>
29/06/2023	Email	Trial Trenching Locations	<p>Issue of Onshore Export Cable Corridor Trial trenching locations and Technical Note, for Humber Archaeology Partnership approval.</p>
13/07/2023	Email	Trial Trenching Locations	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership response to trial trenching locations Technical Note / data, requesting</p>

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
			additional information and suggesting community outreach work begin.
16/07/2023	Section 42 Consultation	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	Humber Archaeology Partnership's response to Section 42 consultation on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR). See Appendix G of the Consultation Report [APP-044].
26/07/2023	Email	Historic Environment	Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed they agree with the approach to trial trenching as set out in the Trial Trenching WSI (not submitted with the application).
01/08/2023	Teams Meeting	Historic Environment	Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed agreement with the WSI for trial trenching.
05/12/2023	ETG Meeting	Onshore Historic Environment ETG	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project Overview; ● S42 Consultation responses and feedback; ● Feedback on ES progress; ● Programme for ES chapter drafting and further ETG; and ● To achieve agreements for Agreement Log.
07/11/2023	Email	Trial trenching reporting strategy	Confirmation from Humber Archaeology Partnership that it is acceptable to base the ES reporting on Interim Trial Trenching Reporting (landfall and substation).
23/01/2024	Email	Historic Environment – meeting notes	<p>The Applicant issued:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meeting notes from the ETG on 05/12/24; and ● Agreement Log for comment.
07/03/2024	Email	ES Chapter and Draft Outline Onshore WSI	The Applicant issued Humber Archaeology Partnership with the draft Outline Onshore WSI and draft Onshore Archaeology ES Chapter, for comment in the meeting 19/03/2024.

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
19/03/2024	ETG Meeting	Onshore Historic Environment ETG	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and Introductions; • Project Update; • Environmental Statement Update; • Feedback on Environmental Statement and Outline WSI; • Agreement Log; and • Summary and Next Steps.
28/03/2024	Email	Historic Environment – meeting notes	<p>The Applicant issued:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting notes from 19/03/2024; • Post-meeting Memo; and • Agreement Log for comment.
Post – Application			
23/08/2024	Email	Geophysical Survey Report	<p>The Applicant issued the Interim Update Geophysical Survey Report to Humber Archaeology Partnership. This provides results on additional areas surveyed since DCO Submission.</p>
24/09/2024	Email	Phase 1 Trial Trenching Post-Excavation Report	<p>The Applicant issued the full post excavation report for the Phase 1 archaeological trial trenching undertaken at the Landfall and the Substation to Humber Archaeological Partnership and Historic England.</p>
26/09/2024	Email	SoCG	<p>The Applicants issued a draft revision of the SoCG to Humber Archaeology Partnership</p>
03/10/2024	Meeting	SoCG and Relevant Representation (RR)	<p>The following topics were discussed during the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCO Examination Update; • Statement of Common Ground; • Next Steps; • Relevant Representation; • LVIA; and • Nature Conservation.

Date	Form of Consultation	Meeting Title / Topic	Summary of Consultation
			The Applicants requested that Humber Archaeology Partnership return comments on the SoCG post this meeting.
18/10/2024	Email	SoCG	Richard Newman confirmed he agrees with the current situation concerning agreements as reflected in the SoCG and that it accurately reflects Humber Archaeology Partnership's position.
21/10/2024	Email	SoCG	The Applicants thanked Humber Archaeology Partnership for confirming their agreement with the SoCG.
15/11/2024	Email	Project Change Request 2	The Applicants followed up after the issue of the Project Change Request 2 and offered a meeting to discuss the change.
10/12/2024	Email	SoCG	The Applicants reissued the draft revision of the SoCG with minor updates.
07/01/2025	Email	Project Introduction	The Applicants an emailed James Goodyear introducing him to the project and SoCG, provided recent materials, and offered a meeting to bring him up to date.
08/01/2025	Email	Project Introduction	James Goodyear accepted the offer of a meeting.
20/01/2025	Meeting	Project Introduction	<p>The Applicants met with James Goodyear to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Welcome and Introductions; ● Project Overview; ● DCO Examination Timetable; ● SoCG; ● Key Archaeology Updates; ● AOB

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 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 3.4.

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 Applicant or Humber Archaeology Partnership 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 Applicant or Humber Archaeology Partnership 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 Humber Archaeology Partnership

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's Position	Position Status Colour
EIA – Consultation			
1.	<p>The Applicants have adequately consulted with Humber Archaeology Partnership 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 Applicant's position that Humber Archaeology Partnership have been appropriately engaged throughout the Application process by the Applicant.</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
EIA – Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives			
2.	<p>The site selection and route refinement outlined Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [AS-017] has properly considered the alternatives for the relevant elements of the Projects.</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they agree with the approach taken site selection.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's Position	Position Status Colour
		Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
3.	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>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they agree with the rationale behind the Onshore Substation Zone placement.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	

3.3 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

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

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's Position	Position Status
EIA – Planning and Policy			
4.	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.	Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
EIA – Baseline Environment			
5.	The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in of the Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage risks as detailed in Section 22.5 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092]. Discussed and agreed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023).	Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they agree with the baseline scope for the ES Onshore Development Boundary, including areas that are outside the previous PEIR Development Boundary limits. Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
6.	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].	Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) they agree with the geophysical	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's Position	Position Status
		<p>survey coverage and the effects of availability of access to land.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
EIA – Assessment Methodology			
7.	<p>The study areas identified in Section 22.3.2 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] are appropriate.</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the confirmed in the Onshore Archaeology – Survey Update ETG (20/10/2022) that they agree with the priority areas identified for assessment within the ES.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
8.	<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>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
9.	<p>The embedded mitigation measures in Table 22-3 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] are appropriate.</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's Position	Position Status
10.	<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 on the Projects.</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Heritage – Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update ETG (25/05/2023) that they agree with the approach to the EIA strategy.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
11.	<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>Humber Archaeology Partnership did not raise any issues on this subject throughout the ETG process, as part of their Section 42 response, as part of a RR. It is therefore considered by the Applicant that the matter is agreed.</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
12.	<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>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
13.	<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>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's Position	Position Status
14.	The assessment of cumulative effects, as detailed in Section 22.8 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] is consistent with the agreed methodologies.	Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
15.	The approach and objectives of the geophysical surveys as set out in Section 22.4 of Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] are appropriate and acceptable.	Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Archaeology – Survey Update ETG (20/10/2022) that they agree with the approach to and objectives of the geophysical surveys. Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
16.	The approach to pre-application Trial Trenching Written Scheme of Investigations (WSI) (not submitted with the Application) is appropriate and acceptable. Section 8.2 of the Trial Trenching WSI sets out that the movement of trenches will not be allowed without consultation with Humber Archaeology Partnership.	Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Heritage – Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update ETG (25/05/2023) that they agree with the Trial Trenching approach. Humber Archaeology Partnership noted in this ETG they should be consulted when a trench needs to be moved. Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
17.	The method of consulting the CiTIZAN dataset is appropriate and acceptable.	Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's Position	Position Status
		<p>(05/12/2023) that they agree with the method of consulting the CiTIZAN dataset.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
EIA - Assessment Conclusions			
18.	<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>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
EIA – Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) Conclusions			
19.	<p>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.</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring			
20.	<p>The draft Requirement No.18 'Onshore Archaeology' as detailed in Draft Development Consent Order (APP-027) Schedule 2 Part 1 is appropriate and acceptable.</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's Position	Position Status
21.	<p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [AS-094] includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Projects on archaeological receptors.</p> <p>Requirement 19 of the Draft DCO to submit a CoCP to the planning authority for approval post-consent is appropriate.</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
22.	<p>The Watching Brief on Ground Investigations set out in the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239] is appropriate and acceptable.</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Heritage – Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update ETG (25/05/2023) that that they agree with the approach to the Watching Brief on Ground Investigations as set out in the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239].</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
23.	<p>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.</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership 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 approving trenching plans on a rolling basis.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's Position	Position Status
		Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
24.	The refined regional research objectives within Section 7.3 of the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239] relating to Trial Trenching are appropriate and acceptable.	Humber Archaeology Partnership 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]. Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
25.	The approach to the Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment [APP-178] regarding the Beverley Minster is appropriate and acceptable.	Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they agree with the approach the Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment [APP-178] takes to Beverley Minster. Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.	
26.	The approach to the Onshore Infrastructure Settings Assessment [APP-178] regarding the AA Battery at Butt Farm is appropriate and acceptable.	See Table 3-4 .	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's Position	Position Status
27.	The Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (PAD) as set out in Section 8.5 of the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239] is appropriate and acceptable.	See Table 3-4 .	
Other Matters as Required			
28.	<p>The upstanding earthworks at Nunkeeling Deserted Medieval Village (DMV) and the associated buried remains are of high archaeological potential.</p> <p>The Onshore Export Cable Corridor has been diverted around the DMV to avoid impacts to the Heritage Asset.</p>	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Heritage – Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update ETG (25/05/2023) they believe the asset group is of schedulable quality and should be avoided if possible.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
29.	The approach to invoking contingency set out in the Trial Trenching WSI (not submitted with the Application) is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Heritage – Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update ETG (25/05/2023) that they agree with the approach to invoking contingency.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's Position	Position Status
30.	The approach to Outreach and Engagement as set out in Section 9 of Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239] is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) that they that they agree with the approach to Outreach and Engagement.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
31.	The technicality of reporting and illustrations in Chapter 22 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [AS-092] is appropriate and acceptable.	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (19/03/2024) that they agree with the approach to pre-examination fieldwork.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
32.	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.	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership 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.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	

SoCG ID	The Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's Position	Position Status
33.	The approach to pre-examination field work is acceptable and appropriate.	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (19/03/2024) that they agree with the approach to pre-examination fieldwork.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	
34.	An interim Trial Trenching Report will be provided to Humber Archaeology Partnership during the examination process. This is currently being drafted and will be submitted to Humber Archaeology Partnership during the examination process.	<p>Humber Archaeology Partnership confirmed in the Onshore Heritage– Onshore Archaeology and Heritage Update ETG (25/05/2023) that they agreed given the timescales the Projects face it is acceptable to provide reports for packages of trenching as they are complete, noting that Humber Archaeology Partnership will also work in an iterative way on site with AOC Archaeology to monitor and sign off trenches.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership further confirmed in an email 18/10/2024 that this matter is agreed.</p>	

3.4 Status of Discussions for Matters ‘Not Agreed’ or ‘Under Discussion’

3.4.1 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Table 3-4 - Status of discussions relating to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants’ Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership’s position	Position Status
26.	Setting Assessment approach to the AA Battery at Butt Farm	The Setting Assessment provides a clear explanation of the impacts to the onsite experience and the mitigation that the tree and hedgerow screening would provide. The Settings Assessment was shared with Humber Archaeology Partnership after the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (19/03/2024).	At the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (05/12/2023) Humber Archaeology Partnership expressed concern over the onsite experience of the monument. Humber Archaeology Partnership raised concerns over the use of vegetation as screening as it is seasonal and noted that vegetation planting still alters the land in which it the monument appreciated. Humber Archaeology Partnership also noted that it is a well visited site and is popular within Hull and Beverley.	
27.	The PAD set out in the Outline WSI	The Applicant notes the PAD would not supersede or replace any formal archaeological investigation and would stand as an opportunity to engage with the workforce and to allow reporting of remains that were recovered out with archaeological investigation in line with the Applicant’s	At the Onshore Historic Environment ETG (19/03/2024) Humber Archaeology Partnership strongly disagreed with the PAD and	

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's position	Position Status
		<p>wider commitment to environmentally responsible development. This has been clarified within Section 8.5 of the Outline Onshore WSI [APP-239].</p> <p>Further to the clarification of the role of the PAD above, it is the Applicant's view that any archaeological fieldwork must be appropriately targeted on identified archaeological remains or defined areas of archaeological potential in line with research aims agreed on a project level. Archaeological watching brief will be provided for within the Outline WSI, and like all other works would be recommended where the appropriateness of that intervention is determined by an assessment of an area's specific archaeological potential.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to a staged programme of archaeological investigation that will identify discrete archaeological 'sites' and areas of higher archaeological potential, allow research aims to be developed within the context of the overarching research agenda set out in the OWSI and inform the development of specific areas of archaeological mitigation. This will allow archaeological works to be more effectively planned and delivered within the context of the wider construction programme to fulfil the requirement for proportionate mitigation set out in NPS EN-1 section 5.9.17 and allow for appropriate investigation of areas where there is a 'high probability</p>	<p>highlighted that an agreement would not be made with them on the matter.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership noted concern that the proposal to put a Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries in place might be inappropriately used to replace appropriate formal archaeological investigation.</p> <p>Humber Archaeology Partnership stated they would only agree on full presence watching briefs unless it can be shown that any archaeology within that zone has been destroyed or will not be impacted during soil stripping.</p>	

SoCG ID	Discussion Point	Applicants' Position	Humber Archaeology Partnership's position	Position Status
		<p>(based on an adequate assessment) that a development site may include, as yet undiscovered heritage assets with archaeological interest' (NPS EN-1 section 5.9.21).</p> <p>It is likely that a watching brief, either as a recording exercise or an opportunity to deploy specific techniques (e.g. soil sampling, finds recovery) to identified areas of potential would form appropriate archaeological mitigation in circumstances such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where archaeological investigation would not be reasonably practicable out with an established construction scheme, for example where service outages or road closures are required for safety purposes or where practical constraints set specific time constraints on restoration (e.g. works within an existing access route); • To offer opportunities for specific problem solving or sampling of discrete features of limited value such as field boundary ditches and banks; • Where groundworks would be limited in extent and prior evaluation would not be proportionate, e.g. some access, service or drainage works; and • To monitor compliance of agreed measures to prevent disturbance in areas of archaeological interest. 		

4 Summary

18. This SoCG has outlined the consultation that has taken place between the Applicants and Humber Archaeology Partnership during the pre-application and 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 