

DOGGER BANK D WIND FARM

Preliminary Environmental Information Report

Volume 2

Appendix 24.1 Consultation Responses for Onshore
Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Document Reference No: 2.24.1

Date: June 2025

Revision: V1



www.doggerbankd.com

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY
AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Document Title:	Volume 2, Appendix 24.1 Consultation Responses for Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage
Document BIM No.	PC6250-RHD-XX-ON-RP-EV-0134
Prepared By:	Royal HaskoningDHV
Prepared For:	Dogger Bank D Offshore Wind Farm

Revision No.	Date	Status / Reason for Issue	Author	Checked By	Approved By
V1	27/05/2025	Final	SM	AT	RH

Table of Contents

24.1 Consultation Responses for Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.....	5
References	22
List of Tables.....	23
List of Acronyms	23

Glossary

Term	Definition
Design	All of the decisions that shape a development throughout its design and pre-construction, construction / commissioning, operation and, where relevant, decommissioning phases.
Development Consent Order (DCO)	A consent required under Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 to authorise the development of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, which is granted by the relevant Secretary of State following an application to the Planning Inspectorate.
Effect	An effect is the consequence of an impact when considered in combination with the receptor's sensitivity / value / importance, defined in terms of significance.
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	A 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 and includes the publication of an Environmental Statement.
Environmental Statement (ES)	A document reporting the findings of the EIA which describes the measures proposed to mitigate any likely significant effects.
Evidence Plan Process (EPP)	A voluntary consultation process with technical stakeholders which includes a Steering Group and Expert Topic Group (ETG) meetings to encourage upfront agreement on the nature, volume and range of supporting evidence required to inform the EIA and HRA process.
Expert Topic Group (ETG)	A forum for targeted technical engagement with relevant stakeholders through the EPP.
Impact	A change resulting from an activity associated with the Project, defined in terms of magnitude.
Mitigation	Any action or process designed to avoid, prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset potentially significant adverse effects of a development. All mitigation measures adopted by the Project are provided in the Commitments Register.
Project Design Envelope	A range of design parameters defined where appropriate to enable the identification and assessment of likely significant effects arising from a project's worst-case scenario. The Project Design Envelope incorporates flexibility and addresses uncertainty in the DCO application and will be further refined during the EIA process.
Scoping Opinion	A written opinion issued by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State regarding the scope and level of detail of the information to be provided in the Applicant's Environmental Statement.

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY
AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Term	Definition
	The Scoping Opinion for the Project was adopted by the Secretary of State on 02 August 2024.
Scoping Report	A request by the Applicant made to the Planning Inspectorate for a Scoping Opinion on behalf of the Secretary of State. The Scoping Report for the Project was submitted to the Secretary of State on 24 June 2024.
Study Areas	A geographical area and / or temporal limit defined for each EIA topic to identify sensitive receptors and assess the relevant likely significant effects.
The Applicant	SSE Renewables and Equinor acting through 'Doggerbank Offshore Wind Farm Project 4 Projco Limited'.
The Project	Dogger Bank D Offshore Wind Farm Project, also referred to as DBD in this PEIR.

24.1 Consultation Responses for Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

1. **Volume 1, Chapter 28 Major Accidents and Disasters** for the Dogger Bank D Offshore Wind Farm (herein referred to as ‘the Project’ or ‘DBD’) has been informed by consultation with the Planning Inspectorate and stakeholders following the publication of the Scoping Report (Royal HaskoningDHV, 2024) and the comments contained within the Scoping Opinion (Planning Inspectorate, 2024). This appendix contains details of the relevant comments for **Volume 1, Chapter 28 Major Accidents and Disasters** and the Applicant’s responses in **Table 24.1-1**.
2. The Applicant previously submitted a Scoping Report in 2023 based on project parameters at that time. The 2024 Scoping Report (Royal HaskoningDHV, 2024) and adopted Scoping Opinion (Planning Inspectorate, 2024) have superseded the 2023 Scoping Report and as such consultation responses on the 2023 Scoping Report are not considered further in this document except where they are included in the 2024 consultee responses and remain relevant to the Project.

Table 24.1-1 Consultation Responses for Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p>Physical impacts to designated, known and unknown non-designated heritage assets – operation</p> <p>The Scoping Report states that there is limited potential for physical impacts to below ground heritage assets during operation, however no evidence is provided in relation to hydrological changes that may extend into the operational phase or in relation to heating effects from electrical infrastructure. In the absence of information such as evidence demonstrating clear agreement with relevant consultation bodies, the Inspectorate is not in a position to agree to scope this matter out from the assessment at this stage. The ES should include an assessment of physical impacts from changes in preservation conditions during operation, or information demonstrating</p>	<p>Effects arising through change to drainage or heating are considered and assessed in Section 24.7.2 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.</p> <p>The likely significant changes in preservation conditions due to hydrological changes during the construction phase are assessed in Section 24.7.1 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.</p>

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		agreement with the relevant consultation bodies and the absence of a LSE.	
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p>Physical impacts to designated, known and unknown non-designated heritage assets – decommissioning</p> <p>"The Scoping Report states that there would be limited potential for further physical impacts to onshore heritage assets during the decommissioning phase, as these impacts would have occurred during the construction phase.</p> <p>The Inspectorate is content that physical impacts on above ground heritage assets during decommissioning can be scoped out. However, the Inspectorate considers that there is potential for decommissioning stage impacts on buried archaeological resource, such as the potential for harm due to compaction, or potential changes in drainage patterns.</p> <p>In the absence of information such as evidence demonstrating clear agreement with relevant consultation bodies, the Inspectorate is not in a position to agree to scope this matter out from the assessment.</p> <p>Accordingly, the ES should include an assessment of effects on buried archaeology during decommissioning, or information demonstrating agreement with the relevant consultation bodies and the absence of a LSE."</p>	While the potential for effects on buried archaeological remains during decommissioning would be limited by these works being largely, if not entirely contained in areas previously disturbed by construction activities, decommissioning impacts are further discussed in Section 24.7.3 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p>Change to the setting of historic landscapes, which could affect their heritage significance – decommissioning</p> <p>The locations of principal development components within the application site (for example the landfall and the OCS(s)) have not yet been confirmed. The Inspectorate also notes that decommissioning impacts are described as similar (although likely lower in magnitude) to those from construction, which is</p>	While the potential for change to setting during decommissioning is considered no greater than that assessed at construction, decommissioning impacts are further discussed in Section 24.7.3 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		scoped into the assessment. In the absence of information such as evidence demonstrating clear agreement with relevant statutory bodies, the Inspectorate is not in a position to agree to scope this matter out from the assessment. The ES should include an assessment of impacts on the setting of historic landscapes (both from land and sea) during decommissioning, or information demonstrating agreement with the relevant consultation bodies and the absence of a LSE.	The setting assessment is presented in Appendix 24.5 Onshore Heritage Setting Assessment .
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p>Assessment methodology</p> <p>The ES should clearly explain what aspect-specific criteria have been used to define receptor value / sensitivity and magnitude of change for the archaeology and cultural heritage assessment. The approach to determining how these combine to inform the conclusions on the significance of effects should also be described.</p>	The rationale for these assessments which have been developed in line with Historic England guidance – Good Practice Advice in Planning 2: <i>Managing Significance in Decision-Making in the Historic Environment</i> are set out in Section 24.5.3 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage .
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p>Peat deposits – approach to assessment</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes there is potential for peat deposits within the low lying areas of the East Riding. The ES should describe the methodology that will be used to establish the location of these deposits and any heritage assets associated with them, and the approach to the assessment of LSE.</p>	The potential survival of peat deposits within the Onshore Development Area are presented in Appendix 24.6 Onshore Geoarchaeological Desk-Based Assessment . Where potential peat deposits may be impacted by the Project, an approach to record these deposits will be presented in the Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to be submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p>Potential impacts</p> <p>Potential impacts on cultural heritage remains associated with World War One and World War Two should be assessed where significant effects are likely. The Applicant should make effort to discuss and agree these details with relevant consultation bodies.</p>	<p>A description of the surviving WWI and WWII heritage assets located within the Onshore Development Area is presented in Appendix 24.4 Onshore Heritage Walkover Report.</p> <p>An assessment of effect on WWI and WWII heritage assets is presented in Section 24.7 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.</p>
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p>Impacts to setting</p> <p>The Zone of Theoretical Visibility developed for the LVIA assessment should be used to confirm which heritage assets may experience visual impacts from the Proposed Development. The assessment should be supported by appropriate visualisations such as photomontages to help illustrate the likely impacts of the Proposed Development. Effort should be made to agree appropriate viewpoint locations for such visualisations with relevant consultation bodies including local authorities and Historic England. Cross-reference can be made to the LVIA ES assessment to avoid duplication.</p>	<p>The setting assessment, presented in Appendix 24.5 Onshore Heritage Setting Assessment, was informed by the Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) developed by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Consultants, and the heritage viewpoint locations assessed were discussed at the ETG9 (Landscape and Visual Impacts) meeting held on 10th September 2024.</p>
Historic England	Scoping Response Letter (22/07/24)	<p>Assessment of impacts</p> <p><i>"Our initial review indicates that the proposed development could, potentially, have an impact upon a number of designated heritage assets and their settings in the area. In line with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, and National Infrastructure Advice Notes, we would expect the Environmental Statement to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any</i></p>	<p>A detailed baseline which includes data obtained from the Humber Historic Environment Record (HER) and East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) is presented within Appendix 24.2 Onshore Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment.</p>

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		<p><i>contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.</i></p> <p><i>We would draw your, and the applicant's attention, in particular, to the following designated heritage assets:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Scheduled Monuments</i> • <i>Listed Buildings</i> • <i>Registered Parks and Gardens</i> <p><i>We recommend that the applicant should contact the relevant local authority Historic Environment Record for further information on designated heritage assets, and including the relevant local authority(s) for the location of conservation areas.</i></p> <p><i>We reiterate that this is not an exhaustive list and other heritage assets may also be identified as part of the assessment process which would require appropriate consideration. In particular, we would expect the assessment to clearly demonstrate that the extent of the proposed study area is of the appropriate size to ensure that all heritage assets likely to be affected by this development have been included and can be properly assessed. Methodologies that can help to inform the extent of the study area include a Visual Impact Assessment and the production of a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) in line with current guidance. The ZTV of the proposed development should initially be based on topographical data before the impact of existing trees and buildings etc. on lines of sight is assessed.</i></p>	<p>A ZTV, developed by the LVIA Consultants, was used to inform the setting assessment presented in Appendix 24.5 Onshore Heritage Setting Assessment.</p> <p>The size of the Study Areas used to inform the baseline and assessment were agreed at the ETG7 (Onshore Archaeology) meeting held on 28th August 2024.</p> <p>An assessment of the effects of the Project on the significance of the identified heritage assets and their settings is presented in Section 24.7 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.</p>

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		<i>Given the heights of the structures associated with the proposed development and the surrounding landscape character, this development is likely to be visible across a large area and could, as a result, affect the significance of heritage assets at some distance from this site itself"</i>	
Historic England	Scoping Response Letter (22/07/24)	<p>Non-designated heritage assets</p> <p>We would also expect the Environmental Statement to consider the potential impacts which the proposals might have upon those heritage assets which are not designated. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) defines a heritage asset as “a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest”. This includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing). This information is available via the local authority Historic Environment Record (www.heritagegateway.org.uk) and relevant local authority staff.</p>	Noted. The HER has been contacted and non-designated heritage data has been acquired as outlined in Section 24.5.2 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage .
Historic England	Scoping Response Letter (22/07/24)	<p>Consultation</p> <p>We recommend that the applicant involve the Conservation Officers of East Riding of Yorkshire Council and City of Kingston Upon Hull Council and the archaeological staff at Humber Archaeology Partnership, Hull in the development of this assessment. They are best placed to advise on: local historic environment issues and priorities; how the proposal can be tailored to avoid and minimise potential adverse impacts on the historic environment; the nature and design of any required mitigation measures; and opportunities for securing wider benefits for the future conservation and management of heritage assets.</p>	Section 24.3 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage details the meetings taken to date with ETG7 (Onshore Archaeology), which includes the ERYC Conservation Officer and Humber Archaeology Partnership (HAP). Consultation will continue as part of the EIA process.

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Historic England	Scoping Response Letter (22/07/24)	<p>Assessment of impacts</p> <p><i>"In general terms, Historic England advises that a number of considerations will need to be taken into account when proposals for wind energy and its associated infrastructure are assessed. This includes consideration of the impact of ancillary infrastructure, such as tracks and grid connections, as well as the turbines themselves:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The potential impact upon the historic character of the landscape, including landscape features which positively contribute to character.</i> <i>• Direct impacts on heritage assets (buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas, landscapes), whether designated or not.</i> <i>• Impacts on the settings of heritage assets since elements of setting can contribute to the significance of a heritage asset. An assessment of the impact on setting will be proportionate to the significance of the asset and the degree to which the proposed changes enhance or detract from its significance and the ability to appreciate the asset. In the consideration of setting a variety of views may make a contribution to significance to varying degrees. These can include long-distance views as well as the inter-visibility between heritage assets or between heritage assets and natural features. For further advice see The Setting of Heritage Assets.</i> <i>• The potential for archaeological remains.</i> <i>• Effects on landscape amenity from public and private land.</i> <p><i>The cumulative impacts of the proposal."</i></p>	<p>The potential impacts considered as part of the Project are detailed within Appendix 6.2 Impacts Register and assessed within Section 24.7 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.</p> <p>The effects on landscape amenity, however, will be assessed in the LVIA (see Volume 1, Chapter 27 Landscape and Visual Impacts).</p> <p>Cumulative effects are assessed and presented in Section 24.8 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.</p>

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Historic England	Scoping Response Letter (22/07/24)	<p>Assessment methodology</p> <p><i>"It is important that the assessment is designed to ensure that all impacts are fully understood. Section drawings and techniques such as photomontages are a useful part of this.</i></p> <p><i>Consideration should also be given to undertaking a practical exercise with either a crane or balloons erected at the height of the proposed structures so that all parties are to better able to understand the landscape impact of the proposals. We have been engaged in other major developments where this technique has been used and it greatly assisted the identification of the key issues and impacts from which the resulting EIA was able to focus its assessment.</i></p> <p><i>The assessment should also take account of the potential impact which associated activities (such as construction, servicing and maintenance, and associated traffic) might have upon perceptions, understanding and appreciation of the heritage assets in the area. The assessment should also consider, where appropriate, the likelihood of alterations to drainage patterns that might lead to in situ decomposition or destruction of below ground archaeological remains and deposits, and can also lead to subsidence of buildings and monuments"</i></p>	<p>Effects arising through change to setting are assessed in Section 24.7 (Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage) in line with the advice included in Historic England Guidance – Good Practice Advice in Planning 3: <i>The Setting of Heritage Assets</i> and draws upon appropriate visualisations to be agreed with Historic England, ERYC, and Hull City Council as appropriate.</p> <p>Effects arising through change to drainage are considered and assessed in Section 24.7 (Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage) where the potential for such an effect is identified.</p>
Historic England	Scoping Response Letter (22/07/24)	<p>2023 Scoping comments</p> <p>We have previously provided comments on the first iteration of the Scoping Report in May 2023. Historic England has the following comments in addition to those previously set out</p>	<p>Noted. Comments on the 2023 Scoping Report were considered in the production of the 2024 Scoping Report (see Chapter 8.7 of the 2024 Scoping Report (document reference: PC3991-RHD-ZZ-ZZ-RP-Z-0006)) as far as practicable.</p>

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Historic England	Scoping Response Letter (22/07/24)	<p>Do you agree with the characterisation of the existing environment?</p> <p><i>"We agree with the generality of the characterisation of the existing environment as presented, but we do not fully understand the statement 'The earliest evidence of human occupation on the Holderness plain can be traced to the Neolithic period' (para 1261).</i></p> <p><i>What is meant by 'evidence'? Mesolithic material has been discovered in the area, and given that the statement at para 1261 continues: 'At this time the area would likely have consisted of lakes, marshes, islands and woodland', it would be sensible to assume that such an environment - and particularly the wetland / dryland zone - would have been ideal for Mesolithic use, and therefore of archaeological potential. This is hinted at in para 1262 but needs to be made explicit.</i></p> <p><i>The characterisation exercise would benefit from some initial, high level research questions being posed.</i></p> <p><i>The chronological approach is straightforward, but it would be useful if themes could be identified - not least the possibility of looking at landscape change and evolution at landscape scale</i></p> <p><i>The content of the Scoping Report provides a general and very summarised description of the area in which these developments are proposed, but we feel such detail fall short of being considered to offer a "characterisation". It is our understanding that this would be formulated within the PEIR and ES synthesising such data to present an assessment to support an application"</i></p>	<p>The baseline description is presented at Section 24.6 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage and will be further developed as the Project progresses.</p> <p>The baseline characterisation will inform the initial research agenda for the Project.</p>

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Historic England	Scoping Response Letter (22/07/24)	<p>Have all the onshore archaeology and cultural heritage impacts resulting from the Project been identified in the Scoping Report?</p> <p>Unfortunately, we are not in a position to agree that the onshore archaeology and cultural heritage impacts resulting from the Project have been identified in the Scoping Report</p>	Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage sets out an assessment of the effects (Section 24.7) of the Project identified through baseline development for further consultation with Historic England before production of the ES.
Historic England	Scoping Response Letter (22/07/24)	<p>Do you agree with the onshore archaeology and cultural heritage impacts that have been scoped in for / out from further consideration within the EIA?</p> <p>As we have stated above, the PEIR and ES should consider scoping in the full suite of impacts on significance once the characterisation exercise has been fully completed</p>	Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage sets out an initial assessment of the effects of the Project at Sections 24.7, 24.8 and 24.9 for further consultation with Historic England before production of the ES to allow this scope to be fully defined on the basis of a fuller understanding of the baseline.
Historic England	Scoping Response Letter (22/07/24)	<p>Have all the relevant data sources been identified in the Scoping Report?</p> <p>No. The report authors should look at the Skipsea Castle Landscape Project, being conducted by the University of York. This provides an up to date assessment of the archaeological potential of a significant part of this landscape.</p>	This source has been consulted during baseline development as detailed in Section 24.5.2 of Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage and relevant information received has informed Appendix 24.6 Onshore Geoarchaeological Desk-Based Assessment and the assessment of effects presented in Section 24.7 .

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Historic England	Scoping Response Letter (22/07/24)	<p>Do you agree with the proposed assessment approach?</p> <p>As raised above, we are of the opinion that a full and adequate archaeological assessment, an assessment of impact, and full suite of mitigation needs to be set out within the PEIR and ES.</p>	<p>Volume 1, Chapter 24 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage sets out an initial assessment of the effects of the Project at Sections 24.7, 24.8 and 24.9 for further consultation with Historic England before production of the ES.</p>
Historic England	Onshore Site Selection ETG Meeting Minutes (Meeting held on 07/08/24)	<p>OCS Zone 4</p> <p>Being located directly due south of Beverley Minster and within the A1079 ring road, there is the potential for impacts on the setting of Beverley Minster. However, given that this zone is surrounded on 3 sides by main roads, this might well reduce any harmful impacts. I would draw attention to the ground of 3 x Grade II listed Building at Woodmansey Old Hall and the Grade II listed White Hall to the east of Zone 4. Careful attention would need to be paid to the screening of these heritage assets.</p>	<p>Noted. These heritage assets have been considered as part of the heritage setting assessment for OCS Zone 4 (Appendix 24.5 Onshore Heritage Setting Assessment).</p> <p>Further engagement with Historic England on heritage setting impacts will be undertaken as part of ETG7 (Onshore Archaeology), and heritage viewpoints discussed as part of ETG9 (Landscape and Visual Impacts).</p>
Historic England	Onshore Site Selection ETG Meeting Minutes (Meeting held on 07/08/24)	<p>OCS Zone 8</p> <p>This is very close to Risby Park RPG and there are a number of public footpaths running through and around this area. I would therefore be concerned about any potential impacts on landscape character and how these heritage assets are appreciated and experienced. I would also draw attention to the Grade II* listed Church of All Hallows in Walkington – to the north of this zone. The church is located on the Southern edge of the village – which is also a Conservation Area, and has a wide landscape setting to the south, in the direction of Zone 8.</p>	<p>Noted. These heritage assets and their relationship with the surrounding landscape have been considered as part of the heritage setting assessment for OCS Zone 8 (Appendix 24.5 Onshore Heritage Setting Assessment).</p> <p>Further engagement with Historic England on heritage setting impacts will be undertaken as part of ETG7 (Onshore Archaeology), and heritage viewpoints discussed as part of ETG9 (Landscape and Visual Impacts).</p>

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Historic England	Email dated 29 th August 2024 following ETG7 Meeting 02 (Onshore) (Meeting held on 28/08/24)	Geophysical Survey My only comment on the documents is that it would be good if section 3.3 (Geophysical survey) of the EIA strategy made reference to how the geoarchaeological work will be used to inform the choice of geophysical survey technique, as magnetometry might not be the most appropriate technique in all instances.	Noted. The WSI for Geophysical Survey (issued to attendees of ETG7 Meeting 02 document reference PC6250-RHD-XX-ON-RP-EV-0116) highlights that alternative methods may be used should the geoarchaeological desk-based assessment identify areas in which this would be more beneficial to establishing the archaeological potential.
Historic England	Letter dated 29 th August 2024 following ETG7 Meeting 02 (Onshore) (Meeting held on 28/08/24)	Approach to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Strategy The suggested approach all seems very sensible and straightforward, and clearly follows a well-established process; in this sense, therefore, it looks fit for purpose.	Noted.
Historic England	Letter dated 29 th August 2024 following ETG7 Meeting 02 (Onshore) (Meeting held on 28/08/24)	Benefit to the public My major problem with the document, and the implied approach, is that I cannot see any public benefit in it, and this goes back to my comments in the AOB section of the DBD ETG meeting on 28th August 2024. Please bear in mind that my comments were in reference to all the NSIPs currently on my desk, not just DBD. As I said in the meeting, I know that the client, the consulting and contracting bodies have to address and meet demands on compliance, but the focus on compliance for the sake of compliance has generated a very sterile and narrow archaeological response in all of the proposed schemes.	Noted. In terms of the strategy for public engagement and outreach, the Applicant will consider the approach to the public engagement as part of the EIA process and present an approach at future ETG7 meetings.

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Historic England	Letter dated 29 th August 2024 following ETG7 Meeting 02 (Onshore) (Meeting held on 28/08/24)	There is nothing in the DBD Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage document [Strategy for Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (Environmental Impact Assessment)] which tells me how the gathering and distribution of the survey information might or could be used (beyond compliance), so in this sense I see it as a very limited 'strategy'. 'Strategy' implies beginning and end points, and potentially directions for further work; it should include road signs to further opportunities.	Noted. The Applicant will present the public engagement approach to ETG7 in future meetings as the Project progresses. Proposals for public engagement will be detailed within the Outline Onshore WSI, which will be submitted with the DCO application.
Historic England	Letter dated 29 th August 2024 following ETG7 Meeting 02 (Onshore) (Meeting held on 28/08/24)	<p>The ideas of public benefit, participation, engagement, community, of co-creation are recognised to be key to good cultural heritage practice, but I do not see the public or these ideas anywhere in the document.</p> <p>I really think you should talk to AOC (if it is they who are going to carry out some or all of the survey work). They have a good track record of community work and they could suggest ways to make that survey work more useful, inclusive and more beneficial. I would be happy to join any meetings you might organise to help develop the approach.</p> <p>At the very least, you might want to consider how you get schools involved in the work, either practically or by using the results from both terrestrial and marine survey.</p>	The Applicant has appointed an archaeological contractor and is discussing the approach to public engagement and outreach work. The approach will be presented at future ETG7 meetings.

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Historic England	Letter dated 29 th August 2024 following ETG7 Meeting 02 (Onshore) (Meeting held on 28/08/24)	<p>All of the several current green energy infrastructure projects focused on Yorkshire represent a real opportunity, perhaps a once in a lifetime opportunity to get people really enthused about the bigger archaeological and cultural narratives at play in Yorkshire and beyond.</p> <p>For example, whilst the forthcoming ES might say that there is relatively little potential for Mesolithic archaeology onshore, we know that there is a massive Mesolithic landscape just beyond the coastline, and that the coastline itself is only a temporary phase in a changing world - changed and changing because of climate change. Talk to people about what land and marine survey can do, how it can build stories, how you can think holistically and provide people with the raw material to produce art, or poetry or literature, or reinforce STEM projects in schools, or get involved in archaeology.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Applicant will consider an approach to coordinating the onshore and offshore archaeological elements and how this could support the approach to public engagement and outreach work. The approach will be presented at future ETG7 meetings.</p>
Historic England	Letter dated 29 th August 2024 following ETG7 Meeting 02 (Onshore) (Meeting held on 28/08/24)	<p>I would urge your team to think beyond the usual pattern of assess, survey, evaluate, dig, do nothing. There is no public benefit in such an approach, and the last thing any of the communities in the affected areas need is incomprehensible grey literature.</p> <p>I will be happy to discuss an alternative approach to the archaeological and cultural heritage component of the project(s) with you and your clients, but you should be aware that I will be restating my concerns on public benefit to PINS.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant will consider the approach to the public engagement as part of the EIA process and present an approach at future ETG7 meetings.</p>
Humber Archaeology Partnership (representing ERYC)	Email dated 9 th September 2024 following ETG7 Meeting 02 (Onshore)	<p>Written Scheme of Investigation for Onshore Geophysical Survey</p> <p>As noted in the meeting, I can confirm that I am happy with the Written Scheme of Investigation for Onshore Geophysical Survey document distributed prior to the meeting.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
	(Meeting held on 28/08/24)		
Humber Archaeology Partnership (representing ERYC)	Email dated 9 th September 2024 following ETG7 Meeting 02 (Onshore) (Meeting held on 28/08/24)	Public benefit, engagement and outreach I have also now had a look through the EIA Strategy for Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage and am happy with the suggested approach outlined in the document. However, I would agree with the Historic England position regarding the need for public benefit, engagement and outreach to be given further thought and a strategy to address this developed.	In terms of the strategy for public engagement and outreach, the Applicant will consider the approach to the public engagement as part of the EIA process and present an approach at future ETG7 meetings.
Humber Archaeology Partnership (representing ERYC)	Email dated 9 th September 2024 following ETG7 Meeting 02 (Onshore) (Meeting held on 28/08/24)	Defence of Britain It was asked in the meeting if the HER information contained the Defence of Britain data and I confirmed that I would check with our HER officers as whether this data was included. I have now spoken to the Senior HER Officer, who has confirmed that the Defence of Britain data is not included in the HER data and will need to be obtained from another source.	Noted. The Defence of Britain data has been obtained to inform the baseline presented in Appendix 24.2 Onshore Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment .

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Humber Archaeology Partnership (representing ERYC)	Email dated 9 th September 2024 following ETG7 Meeting 02 (Onshore) (Meeting held on 28/08/24)	Portable Antiquities Scheme I also believe that there was some question regarding the Portable Antiquities Scheme information, I have again checked with our HER team and they have informed me that we have this data in the HER and that it was obtained from the scheme directly.	Data from the Portable Antiquities Scheme has been obtained to inform the baseline presented in Appendix 24.2 Onshore Archaeological Desk Based Assessment .
ERYC Conservation Officer	Agreement log received 6 th November 2024 following ETG9 Meeting 01 (Meeting held on 10/09/24)	Does the ETG agree with the proposed landscape and visual and heritage viewpoints? If not, which other viewpoints are recommended? Conditional yes – following review of Revision 02 (issued 11.10.2024) and further discussion with RB, ERYC consider an additional heritage viewpoint should be sited on the Beverley Westwood, to take account of the Grade II Listed Black Mill and wider reaching views towards the OCS locations and the Grade I Listed Beverley Minster.	The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) shows limited visibility of OCS Zone 4 and almost none of OCS Zone 8 from Black Mill at Westwood Common. Following a site visit to Westwood Common and Black Mill, it was noted that vegetation and buildings restrict views towards these areas from ground level. A panoramic photograph is included in Appendix 24.5 Onshore Heritage Setting Assessment to support this. It was also noted that the windows from the upper levels of the mill were boarded up, not allowing for photography to be taken from this viewpoint.
Historic England	ETG7 Meeting 03 (Onshore) Minutes (Meeting held on 10/03/25)	Risby Deer Park Historic England advised to compare and contrast with the Deer Park located to the West of Beverley Bishop Burton college as although it's described as a Deer Park, it looks to be something else, perhaps used to raise and farm deer.	This will be researched further at ES stage should OCS Zone 8 be taken forward.

APPENDIX 24.1 CONSULTATION REPONSES FOR ONSHORE ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Historic England / Humber Archaeology Partnership (representing ERYC)	ETG7 Meeting 03 (Onshore) Minutes (Meeting held on 10/03/25)	Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Trial Trenching and Geoarchaeological Investigation Historic England and Humber Archaeology Partnership requested that a sample of square or wider trenches are included.	An updated version of the WSI which included a selection of wider trenches was approved by Humber Archaeology Partnership on 22 nd April 2025.
Historic England	ETG7 Meeting 03 (Onshore) Minutes (Meeting held on 10/03/25)	Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Trial Trenching and Geoarchaeological Investigation Historic England suggested taking samples from Withow Mere to establish a complete sequence and obtain rangefinder dates for assessing the palaeoenvironmental resource.	An updated version of the WSI which included a selection of wider trenches was approved by Historic England's Science Advisor on 22 nd April 2025.
Humber Archaeology Partnership (representing ERYC)	Agreement Log received 22/04/25 following ETG7 Meeting 03 (Onshore) (Meeting held on 10/03/25)	Does the ETG agree with the initial research themes? Yes	The research themes will be further developed as the Project progresses and detailed within the Outline Onshore WSI to be submitted with the DCO application.

References

Royal HaskoningDHV (2024). Dogger Bank D Scoping Report (Part 1 & 2). Available at:
<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010144/EN010144-000069-EN010144%20-%20Scoping%20Report%20-%20Part%201.pdf> &
<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010144/EN010144-000070-EN010144%20-%20Scoping%20Report%20-%20Part%202.pdf> [Accessed September 2024].

The Planning Inspectorate (2024). Scoping Opinion adopted by the Secretary of State on 02 August 2024. Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010144/EN010144-000071-EN010144%20-%20Scoping%20Opinion.pdf> [Accessed September 2024].

List of Tables

Table 24.1-1 Consultation Responses for Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage . 5

List of Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
DBD	Dogger Bank D
DCO	Development Consent Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ERYC	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
ES	Environmental Statement
ETG	Expert Topic Group
HAP	Humber Archaeology Partnership
HER	Humber Historic Environment Record
LSE	Likely Significant Effect
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
OCS	Onshore Converter Station
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation
ZTV	Zone of Theoretical Visibility