DOGGER BANK D WIND FARM

Preliminary Environmental Information Report

Volume 2
Appendix 26.1 Consultation Responses for Traffic and Transport

Document Reference No: 2.26.1
Date: June 2025
Revision: V1

sse Renewables equinor

www.doggerbankd.com

Document Title:	**Volume 2, Appendix 26.1 Consultation Responses for Traffic and Transport**
Document BIM No.	**PC6250-RHD-XX-ON-RP-EV-0136**
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	23/05/2025	Final	RNE	AT	RH

Table of Contents

Glossary

Term	Definition
Commitment	Refers to any embedded mitigation and additional mitigation, enhancement or monitoring measures identified through the EIA process and those identified outside the EIA process such as through stakeholder engagement and design evolution. All commitments adopted by the Project are provided in the Commitments Register.
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.
Impact	A change resulting from an activity associated with the Project, defined in terms of magnitude.
Landfall	The area on the coastline, south-east of Skipsea, at which the offshore export cables are brought ashore, connecting to the onshore export cables at the transition joint bay above Mean High Water Springs.
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.
Offshore Construction Base Port(s)	The offshore construction base port(s) will be the home for the Project's service vessels, crew transfers and the control centre for managing marine logistics and traffic for offshore construction activities. At this stage, no decision has been made regarding which port(s) would be used for the Project's offshore construction. A decision upon the offshore construction base port(s) would not be made until post DCO determination.
Onshore Converter Station (OCS)	A compound containing electrical equipment required to stabilise and convert electricity generated by the wind turbines and transmitted by the export cables into a more suitable voltage for grid connection into Birkhill Wood Substation.

Term	Definition
Onshore Converter Station (OCS) Zone	The area within which the Onshore Converter Station and Energy Storage and Balancing Infrastructure will be located in vicinity of Birkhill Wood Substation.
Onshore Development Area	The area in which all onshore infrastructure associated with the Project will be located, including any temporary works area required during construction and permanent land required for mitigation and enhancement areas, which extends landward of Mean Low Water Springs. There is an overlap with the Offshore Development Area in the intertidal zone.
Onshore Export Cable Corridor (ECC)	The area within which the onshore export cables will be located, extending from the landfall to the Onshore Converter Station zone and onwards to Birkhill Wood Substation.
Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Base Port	The operation and maintenance (O&M) base port will be the home for the Project's service vessels, crew transfers and the control centre for managing marine logistics and traffic for offshore O&M activities. At this stage, no decision has been made regarding which port(s) would be used for the Project's offshore O&M activities. A decision upon an O&M base port would not be made until post DCO determination.
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. 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 (DBD) Offshore Wind Farm Project, also referred to as DBD in this PEIR.

26.1 Consultation Responses for Traffic and Transport

1. **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** 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 26 Traffic and Transport** and the Applicant's responses in **Table 26.1-1**

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 26.1-1 Consultation Responses for Traffic and Transport

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Hazardous loads - all phases** The Scoping Report seeks to scope out a separate assessment of hazardous loads and instead seeks to use a road safety assessment to investigate the types of vehicles involved in collisions to understand if there are areas where vehicles transporting hazardous loads may be at greater risk. Paragraph 1415 of the Scoping Report states for construction, "it is not envisaged that there would be a significant number of movements of hazardous loads and that such loads would likely comprise of fuel deliveries for plant as well as batteries (or other ESBI technology as required)", and paragraph 1430 notes the potential infrequent replacement of batteries (or other ESBI technology, where required).	A Road Safety - Hazardous Loads assessment methodology has been detailed in **Section 26.5.3.2** and **Section 26.5.3.3** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport**, identifying potential hazardous load routes for battery unit deliveries associated with the Energy Storage and Balancing Infrastructure (ESBI) aspects of the Project. Furthermore, any future mitigation and controls would be undertaken in accordance with existing legislation (Carriage of Dangerous Goods and Use of Transportable Pressure Equipment Regulations (Department for Transport, 2009).

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		The Inspectorate agrees that a separate assessment of hazardous loads does not need to be prepared, however the Environmental Statement (ES) should provide clarification regarding the potential number of hazardous loads and where there is potential for hazardous loads that could give rise to significant effects, an assessment should be undertaken and presented in the ES. Additionally, the road safety assessment should provide information on how the routes of hazardous loads may be amended in light of findings regarding collision sites.	Potential impacts from hazardous loads have been considered on traffic and transport receptors in **Section 26.7.1.5** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** for the construction phase and **Section 26.7.2.2** for the operation and maintenance (O&M) phase. Measures to mitigate significant effects have further been proposed.
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Traffic impacts during operation (onshore activities)** The Scoping Report seeks to scope out traffic impacts relating to maintenance of the onshore substations during operation, on the basis that maintenance checks will be infrequent and subject to low vehicle demand. With the exception of hazardous loads (please see point above), the Inspectorate agrees that significant effects are unlikely and is content to scope these matters out of the ES. The description of the Proposed Development in the ES should explain the anticipated type and number of vehicle movements to provide confidence for excluding these matters from more detailed assessment.	**Section 26.7.2.1** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** sets out the forecast traffic movements and vehicle types associated with O&M activities, including scheduled replacement of the battery units required for the ESBI. The forecast traffic movements are at a level where no significant traffic and transport effects are anticipated during the O&M phase and as agreed with the relevant highway authorities through the second traffic and transport Expert Topic Group (ETG8) meeting. Thus, apart from the road safety and hazardous loads assessment, no other operational scenarios impacts have been assessed within the traffic and transport impact assessment.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Onshore impacts of traffic and transport associated with offshore construction, operation and maintenance, decommissioning and any associated cumulative effects** The Scoping Report states that the preferred base port (or ports) for the offshore construction of the Proposed Development is not known, and any decision would not be expected until post-consent. It is also stated that such facilities would typically be provided or brought into operation by means of one or more planning applications or as port operations with permitted development rights. On this basis, the Applicant is seeking to scope out the onshore impacts of the traffic and transport associated with offshore construction, operation and maintenance decommissioning and any associated cumulative effects. The Inspectorate notes that paragraph 1451 of the Scoping Report states that as a worst-case scenario it is assumed that the majority of construction traffic would be by road, albeit, potentially originating from one of the existing ports or rail freight facilities. Given that the base port (or ports) is not currently known, and in the absence of the anticipated type and number of road vehicle movements, potential impacts are not fully understood. The Inspectorate does not agree to scope this matter out from the assessment. Accordingly, the ES should include an assessment of these matters, or evidence demonstrating agreement with the relevant consultation bodies and the absence of Likely Significant Effects (LSE).	It was agreed with relevant highway stakeholders (Hull City Council, East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) and National Highways) as part of the second ETG8 meeting (held on the 30th September 2024) that a Port Access Management Plan(s) (PAMP) (see **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport,** Commitment ID CO102 in) would be developed post-consent (and included as a Development Consent Order (DCO) requirement) if required once the location(s) of the preferred offshore construction base port(s) / O&M base port has been confirmed. The PAMP will provide an assessment of the traffic movements due to port operations associated with offshore construction and O&M activities and detail mitigation measures as required. Potential onshore impacts of traffic associated with offshore construction and O&M activities, are covered within **Section 26.7.1.9** (construction) and **Section 26.7.2.3** (O&M) of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** respectively, and provide further details on the approach outlined above.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Decommissioning phase assessment** The Scoping Report states that no decision has been made regarding the final decommissioning policy for the infrastructure within the Onshore Converter Station (OCS) Zone, as it is recognised that industry best practice, rules and legislation change over time. The Scoping Report anticipates that decommissioning impacts would be similar in nature to those of construction and that the magnitude of effects from decommissioning would be lower than that of construction impacts. On this basis the Applicant proposes that the construction phase assessment serves as a 'proxy' for the decommissioning phase and no additional assessment is undertaken. In the absence of information to demonstrate that decommissioning of the Proposed Development would not lead to significant effects in terms of Traffic and Transport, the Inspectorate does not agree to scope this matter out. The ES should include an assessment of these matters or provide information demonstrating agreement with the relevant consultation bodies and the absence of an LSE.	It was agreed with relevant stakeholders (Hull City Council, ERYC and National Highways) that an Onshore Decommissioning Plan (see **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport,** Commitment ID CO56) will be developed post-consent and prior to the commencement of onshore decommissioning activities in a timely manner based on the relevant available guidance and legislative requirements at the time of decommissioning. This will be secured as a DCO requirement. Further details are provided in **Section 26.7.3** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport.**

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Impacts to rail infrastructure** Paragraph 1405 of the Scoping Report identifies port and rail freight terminals to the south of the study area which could provide the potential for the import / export of Project cargoes to the wider study area by road. The ES should include an assessment of any potential disruption to the railway network, where LSE could occur.	**Section 26.7** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** contains an assessment of the potential effects on the transport network associated with the Project, which includes that all materials associated with the onshore elements of the Project are transported via the road network derived from the ports of Hull (where the rail head facilities are located). This is considered a worst-case scenario for assessment purposes. No adverse effects upon other transport services or infrastructure are anticipated (including rail facilities).
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Consultation with key stakeholders** The Applicants attention is drawn to Hull City Council's scoping consultation response (Appendix 2 of this Opinion) regarding the study area, receptors, data sources and the requirement for a Construction Port Traffic Management Plan. Effort should be made to agree the study area, receptors, scope of assessment and data sources utilised with relevant consultation bodies including the Local Planning Authorities.	Discussions on the Traffic and Transport Study Area were held with stakeholders at the second ETG8 meeting held on 30th September 2024 as part of the Evidence Plan Process (EPP). Agreements on the Traffic and Transport Study Area, receptors and data sources were reached with the key stakeholders. A PAMP will be developed post-consent (if required) once the location(s) of the preferred offshore construction base port(s) and O&M base port for the Project has been confirmed and agreed with the relevant authorities prior to commencement of construction and operation respectively. See **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport,** Commitment ID CO102**.**

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Hull City Council	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Do you agree with the characterisation of the existing environment?** Hull City Council is generally in agreement with the characterisation as set out, subject to the following: Fig. 8.22 Recommend that the study area map is nudged southwards to take in the full extent of the major road transport routes identified (i.e. including A63, A1033, A164), rather than land to the north of the Onshore Scoping Area where no such key routes are shown. Para.1373 The A63 constitutes the main highway route into the city from the west, rather than from the east, as stated. The eastern stretches of the Port of Hull (Alexandra, Queen Elizabeth, and King George Docks specifically) are served by the A1033, also part of the Strategic Road Network, in addition to the A63 to the west. Para.1386 Not all sections of the A165 are dualled.	Hull City Council's study area requests and amendments have been incorporated into the Traffic and Transport Study Area, as detailed in **Section 26.4.1** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** and presented on **Figure 26-1.**
Hull City Council	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Have all the traffic and transport impacts resulting from the Project been identified in the Scoping Report?** Hull City Council believes that this is the case, with the exception of those dependent on the identification of the port or ports to be utilised for the import of materials and other items required for the construction phase, a matter of particular relevance to potential impacts within the Council's administrative area.	**Section 26.2.6.4.2.1** of **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** provides details on Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) assignments and identifies the likely ports that would be utilised for import of construction materials for the onshore elements of the Project.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Hull City Council	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Do you agree with the traffic and transport impacts that have been scoped in for / out from further consideration within the Environmetnal Impact Assessment (EIA)**? Para.1413 It will be important that the spatial extent of the A63 route to be scoped out in connection with the A63 Castle Street Improvement Scheme. Para.1418 It is not clear whether the 30 two-way movement threshold applies to individual legs of junctions, or total traffic movements at those junctions. Para.1437 In order for the potential impacts, including cumulative effects of port-generated construction traffic to be captured, a Construction Port Traffic Management Plan requirement would need to be imposed.	**Section 26.7.1.6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** considers impact on Driver Delay (Capacity) and confirms that 30 total two-way peak hour movements or more per junction would provide a starting point for further discussions as agreed with highway stakeholders at the second ETG8 meeting held on 30th September 2024. In addition, it was agreed with relevant highway stakeholders (Hull City Council, ERYC and National Highways) as part of the second ETG8 meeting (held on the 30th September 2024) that a PAMP would be developed post-consent (and included as a DCO requirement) if required once the location(s) of the preferred offshore construction base port(s) / O&M base port has been confirmed. See **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport,** Commitment ID CO102**.** The PAMP would provide an assessment of the traffic movements due to port operations associated with offshore construction and O&M activities and detail mitigation measures as required.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Hull City Council	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Have all the relevant data sources been identified in the Scoping Report?** The majority of the relevant data sources have been identified, with the following exceptions: Para.1442 It is not clear whether or not the collection of baseline data will include collection of classified turning count data for the assessment of junction delay at agreed junctions. Fig. 8.23 The Marfleet Lane / Maybury Road route identified as a major road transport route on sheet 5 / 5 appears to be devoid of any survey points. Table 8.26 The Tempro parameters identified are considered to be appropriate in principle, but differential growth to traffic approaching junctions on highway authority boundaries may cause issues if / when peak-hour junction delay assessments are undertaken, in balancing junction inflows.	**Section 26.7.1.6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** considers Impact on Driver Delay (Capacity) and the requirement for further assessment discussions with relevant stakeholders post-PEIR. **Section 26.2.4** and **Annex 26.2** of **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment,** provide full details of obtained traffic flow data which underpins the traffic and transport impact assessments contained within **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport**. The datasets include Automatic Traffic Count (ATC) data for Marfleet Lane / Maybury Road (Link 51) as agreed within the second ETG8 meeting held on 30th September 2024. **Section 26.2.4.2** and **Annex 26.2.3** of **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** provide full details of TEMPro growth factors.
Hull City Council	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Do you agree with the proposed assessment approach?** Overall, the approach outlined in the Scoping Report is considered to be appropriate.	Noted.
Hull City Council	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	Table 8.30 LTN 1/20 (Cycling Infrastructure Design) could also be referenced to cater for workers travelling sustainably to site.	**Section 26.2.2.1.6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** references LTN 1/20.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
National Highways	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	While not identified within the Scoping Report, Jacobs Systra Joint Venture (JSJV) would highlight the role that Department for Transport (DfT) Circular 01/2022 should play with regards to how National Highways will engage with the development industry, public bodies and communities to assist the delivery of sustainable development.	**Section 26.2.2.1.6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** details the main points of the DfT Circular 01/2022, which are addressed throughout the chapter and within **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment.**
National Highways	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	The proposed methodology for determining the potential construction / operational impact of the proposed development upon key environmental receptors (severance, delay, fear and intimidation, etc.) is considered to be generally sufficient for the scope of the EIA as required. Moreover, with regards to the methodology of the assessment of the magnitude of highway impact, JSJV acknowledge that the parameters presented within the EIA are appropriate for the scope of assessment necessitated by EIA requirements.	Noted.
National Highways	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Potential Impacts during construction** "While not discussed in detail within the Scoping Report, moving forward JSJV would expect that an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [CTMP] would be prepared in support of any DCO submission. At a high level, JSJV would recommend that the following points are taken into consideration at the point of CTMP preparation:	An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** (CTMP) (document reference 8.15) is provided in with the PEIR. The Outline CTMP will be developed further post-PEIR in consultation with Hull City Council, ERYC and National Highways and submitted with the DCO application.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		(1) With regards to the detailed assessment of the scheme construction at the Strategic Road Network (SRN), the impact of the proposed development over the construction phase must be understood in terms of absolute two-way flows during both weekday morning and evening network peak hours. A daily expected profile of construction vehicle movements should be provided for the lifecycle of the construction phase. (2) Detail as to proposed construction staff shift patterns, staff numbers, staff residence / distribution and staff modal habits will need to be confirmed as part of an outline CTMP. (3) Should the Applicant be willing to commit to ensuring that minimal construction trips (HGV or staff) be undertaken over the AM / PM network peak hours, this would ensure minimal impact on the SRN. The CTMP will need to ensure that any network peak hours considered for avoidance align to the peak hour(s) operation of the SRN immediate to each respective construction site. Any commitments regarding the arrival / departure times of construction vehicles and staff can be secured through a final CTMP. (4) JSJV would strongly recommend that any final CTMP contain a detailed construction staff / vehicle trip monitoring methodology which will provide detail on how the adherence to any secured staff shift periods / movements will be monitored, in addition to detail as to what adjustive / remedial measures will be implemented should construction movements be considered to materially breach any imposed shift period movement restriction.	The Outline CTMP will inform the CTMP, which will be secured in a DCO requirement and developed post-consent to be agreed with the relevant authorities prior to the commencement of the relevant stage of construction works (see **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport,** Commitment ID CO73). In regard to the specific points 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 raised, these are addressed throughout **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** and within **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment.** Further work in relation to absolute two-way flows during both weekday morning and evening network peak hours are outlined in **Section 26.7.1.6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** and will be further developed at the ES stage.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		(5) The appropriateness of any network baseline flows will only be commented on by JSJV at such a point whereby the proposed development is considered to incur a material impact at an SRN junction (via operational or construction phase), and subsequent junction modelling and / or consideration of the network's safety record is required, if such scenarios arise (6) At the point at which development highway impact can be agreed with National Highways, the composition of any junction specific modelling, if necessary (inclusive of future year growth rates, inter alia), can be agreed at this stage. JSJV maintain however that should a final CTMP contain sufficient commitment to securing construction shift times and peak hour staff movements associated with the development construction, the need to undertake any detailed junction impact modelling at the SRN may not necessarily be required."	

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
National Highways	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Abnormal Loads** In line with discussions to date and the content of the Scoping Report, JSJV acknowledge that the Applicant has provided suitable comfort that the correct abnormal loads procedure will be followed with respect to National Highways requirements at the SRN. Moving forward, it is advised that the applicant directly discusses any further matters pertaining to AIL movements with the National Highways Abnormal Indivisible Loads team (AbnormalIndivisibleLoadsTeam@nationalhighways.co.uk).	**Appendix 26.3 Abnormal Indivisible Load Access Report** presents an Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) study assessing the effects of transporting the transformers to inform the traffic management measures required for the transportation of AIL for the Project. **Section 26.5.3.1.1** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** provides details on the Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads (ESDAL) process.
National Highways	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Potential impacts during operation** The Scoping Report confirms that any inspections / maintenance of the onshore export cables will be infrequent and subject to very low vehicle demand. Infrastructure within the on-shore zone is proposed to be manned by two operatives or potentially unmanned. In both cases a minimal staff presence is expected to carry out routine maintenance. Moving forward, JSJV acknowledge that any highway impacts associated with the site operation can be scoped out of further assessments.	Noted.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
National Highways	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	**Potential impacts during decommissioning** At a high level, the impact of the decommissioning phase is expected to reflect that of the construction phase. Moving forward, JSJV note that any traffic flows / development impacts arising from future site decommissioning would need to be confirmed with National Highways before this matter can be scoped out of any future assessments. Accordingly, a suitable planning requirement (on any permission granted) securing the production of a Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan, as and when necessary, would be considered appropriate.	It was agreed with relevant stakeholders (Hull City Council, ERYC and National Highways) that an Onshore Decommissioning Plan (see **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport,** Commitment ID CO56) will be developed post-consent and prior to the commencement of onshore decommissioning activities in a timely manner based on the relevant available guidance and legislative requirements at the time of decommissioning. This will be secured as a DCO requirement. Full details are provided in **Section 26.7.3** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport.**
Network Rail	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	In reference to the protection of the railway, the Environmental Statement (ES) should consider any impact of the scheme upon the railway infrastructure and operational railway safety. In particular, if deemed relevant for operational railway safety, the ES should include a Glint and Glare Study assessing the impact of the scheme upon train drivers (including, distraction from glare and potential for conflict with railway signals). We note that this is referenced in the scoping document. The ES should also include a Transport Assessment to identify any HGV traffic / haulage routes associated with the construction and operation of the developer's site that may utilise railway assets, such as bridges and level crossings, during the construction and operation phases of the development.	Rail infrastructure usage is addressed within **Table 26.2-6** in **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment.** **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** provides details of ongoing consultation with Network Rail in regard to the Project's construction traffic interaction with Network Rail infrastructure. Details on trenchless crossing techniques where rail infrastructure is required to be crossed by the Project's onshore export cable corridor (ECC) is also provided.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		Please note that if the intention is to install cabling under, through or above railway land, the developer will need an easement from Network Rail, and in turn, we would recommend that the developer engages with us early in the planning of their scheme to discuss and agree this particular element of the proposal.	Early engagement with Network Rail was undertaken on 25th June 2024 on construction traffic utilising level crossings. This engagement is ongoing and will continue as part of the preparation of the DCO application.
National Highways	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG have any feedback on the proposed locations of the construction compounds and their respective access points?** Will not materially change the impact on the SRN. Access to individual compounds is not from the SRN.	Noted.
National Highways	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG have any feedback on the proposed access options for OCS Zones 4 and 8?** Access to individual compounds is not from the SRN.	Noted.
National Highways	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with utilising traffic count data collected by damaged ATC for baseline characterisation?** **If not, what would be required to supplement these partially collected data?** These ATCs are on the local road network not adjacent to the SRN. As such this is an issue for the local highway authority.	Noted.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
National Highways	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the approach to collecting highway safety data?** **If not, what changes to the approach are recommended?** Yes, agreed to five-year collision data excluding the COVID-19 restriction period from March 2020 to July 2021.	**Section 26.5.2** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** provides details on the data and information sources utilised in support of the assessments. **Section 26.2.5** of **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** details the agreed study periods for collision data collection utilised for the traffic and transport assessments.
National Highways	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the distribution methodology?** **If not, what changes to the methodology are recommended?** CTMP will need to be updated once contractor is on board to allow for actuals. There will need to be monitoring to ensure numbers of trips are in line with proposals, timing of trips are in line with proposals and impact of trips at SRN (peak hour) is controlled.	The **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** (document reference 8.15) is provided with the PEIR and contains details of measures to control, monitor and enforce HGV movements as proposed and assessed within the **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport**. Further refinement of the Outline CTMP will be undertaken post-PEIR, and the Outline CTMP will be submitted with the DCO application. Following the appointment of the Principal Contractor(s) post-consent, the CTMP (which will be secured in a DCO requirement) will be developed in accordance with the Outline CTMP post-consent prior to the commencement of the relevant stage of construction works (see **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport,** Commitment ID CO73). The CTMP will include updated worst-case traffic and transport assumptions for the stage of works.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
National Highways	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the scope of the traffic and transport assessment?** **If not, what changes to the scope are recommended?** 1. Yes, agreed to the proposed scope of assessment. 2. Operational assessment scoped out. 3. Construction to be undertaken later and the need for this assessment included within CTMP. Peak hour traffic should be controlled at source either through further information on actual trip distribution demonstrating no impact or through timings of trips to avoid SRN perk periods. 4. Decommissioning plan also required to understand traffic impact at the time of decommissioning. This should be a requirement.	1. Noted. 2. Noted. 3. The **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** (document reference 8.15) (see **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport,** Commitment ID CO73) is provided with the PEIR and contains details of measures to control, monitor and enforce HGV movements as proposed and assessed within the **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** 4. It was agreed with relevant stakeholders (Hull City Council, ERYC and National Highways) that an Onshore Decommissioning Plan (see **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport,** Commitment ID CO56) will be developed post-consent and prior to the commencement of onshore decommissioning activities in a timely manner based on the relevant available guidance and legislative requirements at the time of decommissioning. This will be secured as a DCO requirement.
National Highways	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the proposed assessment methodology for driver delay (capacity)?** **If not, what changes to the methodology are recommended?** In part - Driver Delay (30 two way trips) Agree	**Section 26.7.1.6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** considers impact on Driver Delay (Capacity) and confirms that 30 total two-way peak hour movements or more per junction would provide a starting point for further discussions as agreed with highway stakeholders at the second ETG8 meeting held on the 30th September 2024.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
National Highways	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the proposed assessment methodology for driver delay (highway constraints)?** **If not, what changes to the methodology are recommended?** Driver Delay (Highway Constraints) Assumed to be on the local network rather than the SRN and therefore not relevant to National Highways	Noted.
National Highways	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the proposed assessment methodology for Highway safety (including hazardous loads)?** **If not, what changes to the methodology are recommended?** Highways Safety – collision rates for links needs to also be done by accident severity. Clusters definition needs to include severity.	**Annex 26.2.5** of **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** provides details of all collision rates (including accident severity) for each link within the Traffic and Transport Study Area. **Section 26.2.5.3** of **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** details collision cluster baseline information, including the severity of the collisions within each cluster.
National Highways	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the proposed assessment methodology for Severance, amenity, fear and intimidation?** Severance, more likely to be an issue on Local network rather than SRN, therefore not an issue for National Highways	Noted.
National Highways	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the methodology for assessing cumulative impacts?** **If not, what changes to the methodology are recommended?**	**Section 26.2.4.2** of **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** provides details on the use of TEMPro which provides growth factors which account for sub-regional growth in housing and employment.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		Consideration may need to be given to the cumulative impacts of other developments that are not NSIPs. Local Plan allocations for example. East Riding / Hull should confirm sites which may impact on the area for consideration within the cumulative assessment.	**Section 26.8** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** provides details of the cumulative assessment methodology and proposed cumulative projects scoped in for the cumulative effects assessment at ES stage.
National Highways	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the approach to scoping out the onshore traffic and transport impacts associated with offshore construction and O&M activities?** **If not, what changes to the approach are recommended?** Yes, agreed to scope out decommissioning impacts from the EIA subject to a DCO requirement for an Onshore Decommissioning Plan.	It was agreed with relevant stakeholders (Hull City Council, ERYC and National Highways) that an Onshore Decommissioning Plan (Commitment ID CO56, see **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport**) will be developed post-consent and prior to the commencement of onshore decommissioning activities in a timely manner based on the relevant available guidance and legislative requirements at the time of decommissioning. This will be secured as a DCO requirement. Full details are provided in **Section 26.7.3** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport.**
ERYC	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG have any feedback on the proposed locations of the construction compounds and their respective access points?** Yes - ERYC are in receipt of the KMZ file and will review and provide further comments.	Further comments were provided by ERYC on all access points and haul road crossing locations. These comments will help inform the access designs to be incorporated into the Outline CTMP to be submitted with the DCO application. **Section 26.2.7.4** of **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** provides details of access design development.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
ERYC	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG have any feedback on the proposed access options for OCS Zones 4 and 8?** Yes - OCS4 should take access from AP49c and OCS8 should take access from AO42a with TM mitigation in place, ERYC have some concerns about the use of Coppleflat Lane and may need some significant highway improvements for HGVs along with swept path analysis.	**Section 26.2.6.4** of **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** details the access strategy at PEIR stage, incorporating ERYC preferred access points to the OCS zones. **Figure 26.2.2** in **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** shows the location of all proposed access and haul road crossing locations. **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** contains swept path analysis drawings for Coppleflat Lane with potential mitigation measures proposed where appropriate. This will allow for further consultation post-PEIR submission.
ERYC	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with utilising traffic count data collected by damaged ATC for baseline characterisation?** **If not, what would be required to supplement these partially collected data?** Yes, for ATC29, 31 and 33. It is difficult to understand exactly where these are on the slide, but ERYC hold some substitute data along this section of the A1035 in respect of ATC12. This data (quote traffic count USRN: 45901858) can be requested by emailing Transport.Policy@eastriding.gov.uk. This data is chargeable. However, ATC 8 would need to be redone as ERYC have no suitable alternative.	Since the second ETG8 meeting on 30th September 2024, the project design has been developed further resulting in the refinement of the Traffic and Transport Study Area in the PEIR. ATC8 and ATC12 are now no longer required as the associated links have been removed from the assessment. **Section 26.4.2.1** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** provides details of the agreed Traffic and Transport Study Area and shown graphically on **Figure 26-1.**

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
ERYC	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the approach to collecting highway safety data?** **If not, what changes to the approach are recommended?** Yes, agreed to five-year collision data excluding the COVID-19 restriction period from March 2020 to July 2021.	**Section 26.5.2** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** provides details on the data and information sources utilised in support of the assessments. **Section 26.2.5** of **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** details the agreed study periods for collision data collection utilised for the traffic and transport assessments.
ERYC	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the distribution methodology?** **If not, what changes to the methodology are recommended?** More detail is required but in principle this is acceptable.	**Section 26.2.6** of **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** provides full details on the construction trip generation and assignment methodology for both materials and personnel demand.
ERYC	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the proposed assessment methodology for:** • **Driver delay (capacity);** • **Driver delay (highway constraints);** • **Highway safety (including hazardous loads); and** • **Severance, amenity, fear and intimidation?** **If not, what changes to the methodology are recommended?** Yes - please contact Abnormal.Loads@eastriding.gov.uk for any AILs including agreed routes.	The AIL study is provided as **Appendix 26.3 Abnormal Indivisible Load Access Report.** **Section 26.5.3.1.3** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** provides details on the ESDAL process.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
ERYC	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the methodology for assessing cumulative impacts?** **If not, what changes to the methodology are recommended?** Yes, in principle - Additional sites such as Yorkshire Energy Park and the Hedon Haven (HIEP) freeport sites along the A1033 should be included in the assessments. – other than that, it is acceptable.	**Section 26.8** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** provides details of the preliminary cumulative assessment methodology, and the projects scoped in for the cumulative assessment at ES stage. The two projects requested by ERYC have been included within the preliminary cumulative assessment.
ERYC	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the approach to scoping out the onshore traffic and transport impacts associated with offshore construction and O&M activities?** **If not, what changes to the approach are recommended?** Yes, agreed to scope out traffic and transport impacts associated with offshore activities from the EIA subject to a DCO requirement for a PAMP.	It was agreed with relevant highway stakeholders (Hull City Council, ERYC and National Highways) as part of the second ETG8 meeting (held on the 30th September 2024) that a PAMP would be developed (and included as a DCO requirement) post-consent if required once the location(s) of the preferred offshore construction base port(s) / O&M base port has been confirmed. See **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport,** Commitment ID CO102**.** The PAMP would provide an assessment of the traffic movements due to port operations associated with offshore construction and O&M activities and detail mitigation measures as required. **Section 26.7.1.9** (construction) and **Section 26.7.2.2** (O&M) of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** provides further details.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
ERYC	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the approach outlined for decommissioning impacts?** Yes, agreed to scope out decommissioning impacts from the EIA subject to a DCO requirement for an Onshore Decommissioning Plan	It was agreed with relevant stakeholders (Hull City Council, ERYC and National Highways) that an Onshore Decommissioning Plan (see Commitment ID CO56 in **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport**) will be developed post-consent and prior to the commencement of onshore decommissioning activities in a timely manner based on the relevant available guidance and legislative requirements at the time of decommissioning. This will be secured as a DCO requirement. Full details are provided in **Section 26.7.3** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport.**
Hull City Council	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the approach to collecting highway safety data?** **If not, what changes to the approach are recommended?** Yes, agreed to five-year collision data excluding the COVID-19 restriction period from March 2020 to July 2021.	**Section 26.5.2** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** provides details on the data and information sources utilised in support of the assessments. **Section 26.1.5** of **Appendix 26.2 Transport Assessment** details the agreed study periods for collision data collection utilised for the traffic and transport assessments.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Hull City Council	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the approach to scoping out the onshore traffic and transport impacts associated with offshore construction and O&M activities?** **If not, what changes to the approach are recommended?** Yes, agreed to scope out traffic and transport impacts associated with offshore activities from the EIA subject to a DCO requirement for a PAMP.	It was agreed with relevant highway stakeholders (Hull City Council, ERYC and National Highways) as part of the second ETG8 meeting (held on the 30th September 2024) that a PAMP would be developed post-consent (and included as a DCO requirement) if required once the location(s) of the preferred offshore construction base port(s) / O&M base port has been confirmed. See **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport,** Commitment ID CO102**.** The PAMP would provide an assessment of the traffic movements due to port operations associated with offshore construction and O&M activities and detail mitigation measures as required. **Section 26.7.1.9** (construction) and **Section 26.7.2.2** (O&M) of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport** provide further details.
Hull City Council	ETG8 Meeting 02 Agreement Log (Meeting held on 30/09/2024)	**Does the ETG agree with the approach outlined for decommissioning impacts?** Yes, agreed to scope out decommissioning impacts from the EIA subject to a DCO requirement for an Onshore Decommissioning Plan	It was agreed with relevant stakeholders (Hull City Council, ERYC and National Highways) that an Onshore Decommissioning Plan (see Commitment ID CO56 in **Table 26-6** of **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport**) will be developed post-consent and prior to the commencement of onshore decommissioning activities in a timely manner based on the relevant available guidance and legislative requirements at the time of decommissioning. This will be secured as a DCO requirement.

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
			Full details provided in **Volume 1, Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport, Table 26-6** and in **Section 26.7.3.**

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

List of Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
ATC	Automatic Traffic Count
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
DBD	Dogger Bank D
DCO	Development Consent Order
DfT	Department for Transport
ECC	Export Cable Corridor
ERYC	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
ES	Environmental Statement
ESDAL	Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads
ESBI	Energy Storage and Balancing Infrastructure
EPP	Evidence Plan Process
ETG	Expert Topic Group
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicles
JSJV	Jacobs Systra Joint Venture
LSE	Likely Significant Effects
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
OCS	Onshore Converter Station
PAMP	Port Access Management Plan
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
SRN	Strategic Road Network