

# DOGGER BANK D WIND FARM

## Preliminary Environmental Information Report

Volume 2

Appendix 22.1 Consultation Responses for Soils and  
Land Use

Document Reference No: 2.22.1

Date: June 2025

Revision: V1



[www.doggerbankd.com](http://www.doggerbankd.com)

Document Title:	<b>Volume 2, Appendix 22.1 Consultation Responses for Soils and Land Use</b>
Document BIM No.	<b>PC6250-RHD-XX-ON-RP-EV-0132</b>
Prepared By:	<b>Royal HaskoningDHV</b>
Prepared For:	<b>Dogger Bank D Offshore Wind Farm</b>

<b>Revision No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status / Reason for Issue</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Checked By</b>	<b>Approved By</b>
V1	21/05/2025	Final	KD	AG/ EM	AT

Table of Contents

22.1 Consultation Responses for Soils and Land Use ..... 5

References ..... 22

List of Tables..... 23

List of Acronyms ..... 23

## Glossary

Term	Definition
Birkhill Wood Substation	The onshore grid connection point for DBD identified through the Holistic Network Design process. Birkhill Wood Substation which is being developed by National Grid Electricity Transmission and does not form part of the Project.
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.
Energy Storage and Balancing Infrastructure (ESBI)	A range of technologies such as battery banks to be co-located with the Onshore Converter Station, which provide valuable services to the electrical grid such as storing energy to meet periods of peak demand and improving overall reliability.
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.
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.
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.
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.

Term	Definition
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.
Onshore Export Cables	Cables which bring electricity from the transition joint bay at landfall to the Onshore Converter Station zone (HVDC cables) and from the Onshore Converter Station zone onwards to Birkhill Wood Substation (HVAC cables).
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.
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.

## 22.1 Consultation Responses for Soils and Land Use

1. **Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use** 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 22 Soils and Land Use** and the Applicant’s responses in **Table 22.1-1**.
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 22.1-1 Consultation Responses for Soils and Land Use*

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p><b>Disruption to farming practices (soil heating) – all phases</b></p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that the electrical system will be designed to minimise heat loss to a level which is unlikely to affect crop growth. The Inspectorate agrees that significant effects are not likely and this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	Potential impacts associated with soil heating during the operational phase of the Project have been scoped out assessment and not discussed within <b>Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> .
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p><b>Soil degradation and erosion -operation</b></p>	Potential impacts associated with soil degradation and erosion during the operational phase of the Project have been scoped out assessment and not discussed within <b>Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> .

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		The Scoping Report states that soil degradation and erosion is not likely to occur given the reinstatement that will take place following construction. The Inspectorate agrees that the Proposed Development is unlikely to impact on soil resources through degradation and erosion during operation. This matter can be scoped out of the ES.	
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p><b>Impacts on land associated with Stewardship and land management schemes from the landfall and within the onshore ECC – operation</b></p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that land located at the landfall and within the onshore ECC would be reinstated following construction and is unlikely to be significantly impacted as a result of the operation phase. The Inspectorate agrees with this justification and that this matter can be scoped out.</p>	<p><b>Section 22.6.1.3 of Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> discusses the baseline environment in relation to stewardship and land management schemes located within the Onshore Development Area.</p> <p><b>Section 22.7.1.4</b> assess the potential impacts associated with the construction phase of the Project on stewardship and land management schemes for all land located within the Onshore Development Area. <b>Section 22.7.2.3</b> discusses the potential impacts associated with the operational phase for the Onshore Converter Station (OCS) Zones.</p>
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<b>Existing utilities – operation</b>	<p><b>Section 22.6.1.4 of Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> discusses the baseline environment in relation to the utilities which are located within the Onshore Development Area.</p> <p><b>Section 22.7.1.5</b> assess the potential impacts on existing utilities as a result of construction works associated with the Project.</p>

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that any maintenance works required during the operation of the Proposed Development would be undertaken following consultation with potentially affected utility providers, with the location of existing services identified prior to commencement of any works. On this basis, the Inspectorate agrees that significant effects are unlikely to occur and this matter can be scoped out of further assessment in the ES.	Embedded mitigation measures to reduce the potential impacts on existing utilities are included in <b>Table 22-4</b> , for example undertaking utility crossings in accordance with industry standard practice and safety guidance (Commitment ID CO58). Details with regards to the crossing techniques to be adopted during the construction phase are recorded within the Project's Onshore Crossing Schedule.
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p><b>Public Rights of Way (PRoW), Cycle Routes and Countryside and Rights of Way (buried infrastructure) – operation</b></p> <p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope this matter out on the basis that buried infrastructure is not likely to have an impact on PRoW, Cycle Routes and Countryside and Rights of Way during operation. No long-term diversions of these routes are anticipated. On this basis, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out of the ES.</p>	<p><b>Section 22.6.1.2.3 of Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> discusses the baseline environment in relation to Public Rights of Way, National Trails and National Cycle Network routes located within the Onshore Development Area.</p> <p><b>Section 22.7.1.6</b> assesses the potential impacts associated with the construction phase of the Project on recreational routes within the Onshore Development Area. Potential impacts associated with the operational phase of the Project on recreational routes are discussed in <b>Section 22.7.2.4</b>.</p>

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
			<p>Embedded mitigation measures to reduce the potential impacts on the identified recreational routes are included in <b>Table 22-4</b>, including the production of a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (Commitment ID CO57). Engagement through consultation with relevant stakeholders, including for example, the British Horse Society and East Riding of Yorkshire &amp; Kingston upon Hull Joint Local Access Forum, are ongoing with recommendations provided as part of this process to be incorporated into the Public Rights of Way Management Plan.</p>
The Planning Inspectorate	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p><b>Impacts to agricultural land</b></p> <p>The Scoping Report states that the presence of infrastructure within the OCS Zone and other above ground infrastructure will result in the long-term loss of land, including the potential loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the Written Ministerial Statement (UIN HCWS466) issued on 15th May 2024. The ES should contain a clear tabulation of the areas of land in each BMV classification to be temporarily or permanently lost as a result of the Proposed Development, with reference to accompanying map(s) depicting the grades. Specific justification for the use of the land by grade should be provided.</p>	<p><b>Section 22.6.1.1.1 of Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> discusses the baseline environment in relation to agricultural land cover within the Onshore Development Area. The total areas of each ALC grade, based on Natural England's Provisional ALC data, are tabulated in <b>Table 22-14</b>.</p>

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
			<p>Impacts associated with the temporary loss of agricultural land, including BMV, are assessed in <b>Section 22.7.1.2 of Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b>. Potential impacts associated with the permanent loss of agricultural land are assessed in <b>Section 22.7.2.2</b>. Embedded mitigation measures aimed at reducing the potential impacts to agricultural land are included in <b>Table 22-4</b> of the chapter, for example, the undertaking of Agricultural Land Classification and soil condition surveys and the production of a Soils Management Plan (Commitment ID CO46).</p> <p>The Written Ministerial Statement (UIN HCWS466) issued on 15th May 2024 has been reviewed. Although it is mainly focused on solar energy, the overall statement relates to food security and protecting the country's BMV agricultural land. The impact assessment included within <b>Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> discusses the potential impacts on BMV land as a result of the Project, and potential mitigation measures to reduce those impacts.</p>

## APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
Natural England	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	Natural England encourages any proposal to incorporate measures to help encourage people to access the countryside for quiet enjoyment. Measures such as reinstating existing footpaths together with the creation of new footpaths and bridleways are to be encouraged. Links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored to help promote the creation of wider green/blue infrastructure. Relevant aspects of local authority green/blue infrastructure strategies should be incorporated where appropriate.	Noted. Pre-construction and post-construction PRow surveys will be undertaken by a suitably qualified expert to record conditions and inform the reinstatement of routes temporarily affected by construction (Commitment ID CO57, <b>Table 22-5 of Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> ).
Natural England	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	<p>(Ref: Annex A 2.11) Impacts from the development on soils and best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land should be considered. Further guidance is set out in the Natural England Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land.</p> <p>The following issues should be considered and, where appropriate, included as part of the ES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The degree to which soils would be disturbed or damaged as part of the development.</li> <li>• The extent to which agricultural land would be disturbed or lost as part of this development, including whether any BMV agricultural land would be impacted.</li> </ul> <p>This may require a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey if one is not already available.</p>	<b>Section 22.6.1.1 of Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> discusses the baseline environment in relation to agricultural land cover, soil types and distribution within the Onshore Development Area. Within this chapter, the total areas of each Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grade, based on Natural England's Provisional ALC data, are tabulated in <b>Table 22-14</b> . <b>Table 22-15</b> describes the soil types present within the Onshore Development Area and is based on Cranfield University's Soilscape mapping.

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where an ALC and soil survey of the land is required, this should normally be at a detailed level, e.g. one auger boring per hectare, (or more detailed for a small site) supported by pits dug in each main soil type to confirm the physical characteristics of the full depth of the soil resource, i.e. 1.2 metres. The survey data can inform suitable soil handling methods and appropriate reuse of the soil resource where required (e.g. agricultural reinstatement, habitat creation, landscaping, allotments and public open space).</li> <li>The ES should set out details of how any adverse impacts on BMV agricultural land can be minimised through site design/masterplan.</li> <li>The ES should set out details of how any adverse impacts on soils can be avoided or minimised and demonstrate how soils will be sustainably used and managed, including consideration in site design and master planning, and areas for green infrastructure or biodiversity net gain. The aim will be to minimise soil handling and maximise the sustainable use and management of the available soil to achieve successful after-uses and minimise off-site impacts.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Section 22.7.1.2 of Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> assesses the potential impacts associated with the temporary loss of agricultural land. Potential impacts associated with the permanent loss of agricultural land are assessed in <b>Section 22.7.2.2</b>. Natural England's Guide to Assessing Development Proposals on Agricultural Land, and all other relevant guidance, will be reviewed and incorporated into the assessment where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Section 22.7.1.3</b> assesses the potential impacts associated with soil degradation and erosion during the construction phase of the Project.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures aimed at reducing the potential impacts to agricultural land and soil resources are included in <b>Table 22-4</b> of the chapter.</p> <p>The embedded mitigation measures included within <b>Table 22-4</b> state that there is a commitment (Commitment ID CO46) to undertake ALC and soil condition surveys post consent and prior to construction.</p>

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
			<p>Survey results will inform the Soil Management Plan (SMP) and reinstatement methodology in the Code of Construction Practice to be developed prior to the commencement of the relevant stage of construction works. The SMP (including survey results) will be reviewed by relevant authorities prior to the commencement of the relevant stage of construction works.</p> <p>The approach to soil surveys was discussed during Expert Topic Group 6, Meeting 2 (2<sup>nd</sup> October 2024). During this meeting the approach to surveying was accepted by Natural England.</p>
Natural England	Scoping Opinion (02/08/24)	(Ref: Annex A 4.1) We follow an approach set out in the approved Coastal Access Scheme and all proposals have to be approved by the Secretary of State. We would encourage any proposed development to include appropriate provision for the England Coast Path (ECP) to maximise the benefits this can bring to the area. We suggest that the development includes provision for a walking or multi-user route, where practicable and safe. This should not be to the detriment of nature conservation, historic environment, landscape character or affect natural coastal change. Consideration for how best this could be achieved should be made within the Environmental Statement.	<b>Section 22.6.1.2.3 of Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> discusses the baseline environment in relation to PRow, National Trails and National Cycle Network routes located within the Onshore Development Area. It should, however, be noted that although the ECP is located at the landfall, no direct interactions between the ECP and the Project's construction and operational phases are anticipated, as it is proposed that trenchless techniques will be employed at the landfall.

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		<p>As part of the development of the ECP a 'coastal margin' is being identified. The margin includes all land between the trail and the sea. It may also extend inland from the trail if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it's a type of coastal land identified in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act), such as beach, dune or cliff.</li> <li>there are existing access rights under section 15 of the CROW Act.</li> <li>Natural England and the landowner agree to follow a clear physical feature landward of the trail.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Section 22.7.1.6</b> assesses the potential impacts associated with the construction phase of the Project on recreational routes within the Onshore Development Area. Potential impacts associated with the operational phase of the Project on recreational routes are discussed in <b>Section 22.7.2.4</b>.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures to reduce the potential impacts on the identified recreational routes are included in <b>Table 22-4</b>, which includes the production of a Public Rights of Way Management Plan (Commitment ID CO57).</p> <p>Engagement through consultation with relevant stakeholders, including for example, the British Horse Society and East Riding of Yorkshire &amp; Kingston upon Hull Joint Local Access Forum, are ongoing with recommendations provided as part of this process to be incorporated into the Public Rights of Way Management Plan.</p>
		<p>(Ref: Annex A 4.2) The EIA should consider potential impacts on access land, public open land, rights of way and coastal access routes in the vicinity of the development. The National Trails website <a href="http://www.nationaltrail.co.uk">www.nationaltrail.co.uk</a> provides information including contact details for the National Trail Officer. Appropriate mitigation measures should be incorporated for any adverse impacts. We also recommend reference to the relevant Right of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP) to identify public rights of way within or adjacent to the proposed site that should be maintained or enhanced.</p>	

## APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
	ETG6 Meeting 02 (02/10/24)	Suitable handling techniques during construction will need to be implemented. Caveat that the DCO should secure a requirement for Natural England to review the final soil management plan prior to commencement of construction. Natural England do recommend a front-loaded approach with soil surveys as this can also help inform site design/masterplan.	<p><b>Sections 2.6.1.1.1</b> and <b>22.6.1.1.2</b> of <b>Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> discusses the baseline environment in relation to agricultural land cover, soil types and their distribution within the Onshore Development Area.</p> <p>Impacts to soil resources associated with the construction phase are assessed in <b>Section 22.7.13</b>. Embedded mitigation measures aimed at reducing the potential impacts to the soil resource are included in <b>Table 22-4</b> of the chapter, for example, the undertaking of Agricultural Land Classification and soil condition surveys prior to construction and the production of a Soil Management Plan (Commitment ID CO46). The survey results will be reviewed as part of the Soil Management Plan by relevant authorities prior to the commencement of the relevant stage of construction works.</p>

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
East Riding of Yorkshire & Kingston upon Hull Joint Local Access Forum	Response to Non-Statutory Consultation (letter dated 20/09/24)	<p>The East Riding of Yorkshire and Kingston upon Hull Joint Local Access Forum (JLAF) is a statutory body that safeguards Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and promotes their use for the benefit of both countryside access and public health through exercise and the enjoyment of countryside amenity. PRoW are part of the King's Highway and, as such, are protected in law.</p> <p>The proposed SSE &amp; Equinor Dogger Bank D onshore cable corridor intersects numerous PRoW (including the King Charles III England Coast Path). PRoW are recorded on the Definitive Map held by the Definitive Map Team of the East Riding of Yorkshire Council. The Joint Local Access Forum (JLAF) does not object to the proposed development, but will ask that the following issues be addressed during the review and deliberation of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Details of each PRoW which interacts with the Onshore Development Area has been included within <b>Section 22.6.1.2.3 of Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b>. Details on how each of these PRoWs will be crossed will be included within a crossing schedule, which will evolve as the project design progresses. This will highlight those PRoW that may require temporary management measures, including those needing temporary diversions. The management measures will be developed in consultation with all relevant stakeholders.</li> </ol>

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is a need for specific details about PRow diversions where the cable corridor intersects PRow. The JLAF will ask that temporary diversion routes be defined by the Applicant after consulting the East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Countryside Access Team. Permissions will need to be sought from landowners. The same procedure should be adopted where permanent PRow diversions are proposed except that, in these cases, the Applicant is asked to liaise with the Definitive Map Team of East Riding of Yorkshire Council. The Definitive Map Team will consult the JLAF for its collective opinion to avoid unintended complications along the proposed diversion route. In each and all cases, JLAF will ask that diversions be in place before temporary or permanent diversion is effected.</li> <li>2. Temporary closure of each PRow where diversion cannot be installed should be limited in time in order to minimise, as much as possible, the interruption of public rights of access and the physical and mental public health benefits that accrue to countryside access. JLAF considers that such temporary closure should be limited to a maximum of three months. The Applicant is asked to liaise with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Countryside Access Team regarding temporary closure of PRowS.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. A draft version of the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan</b> (document reference 8.9) forms an appendix to the Outline Code of Construction Practice which has been provided along with the PEIR for consultation. This plan will evolve as the Project design progresses. A commitment has been made for a Public Rights of Way Management Plan to be produced post-consent with any required mitigation measures, including potential temporary closures of PRow, implemented prior to construction (Commitment ID CO57). This will be developed in consultation with all relevant stakeholders.</li> <li>3. Details in relation to the construction methods that will be adopted by the Project are included within <b>Volume 1, Chapter 4 Project Description</b>. This includes that the onshore export cable corridor will be split into sections for construction. As the design process progresses, more detail will be available on the proposed installation methods and duration of each phase of works.</li> </ol>

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		<p>3. The JLAF will ask that the Applicant gives an outline schedule of the way the installation will proceed. It wishes to be assured that the work will progress on a 'rolling' geographical basis i.e. that work will shift progressively along the proposed corridor in defined lengths and that there is no intention to divert or close all affected PRoW from landfall to the converter station proximal to the Birkhill Wood sub-station for the duration of the installation.</p> <p>4. The alignment of The King Charles III England Coast Path (KCIIIIECP) – a new National Trail – is currently being established along the Holderness Coast and this intersects the planned landfall of the Dogger Bank D cable corridor. The KCIIIIECP alignment agreements with cliff-top landowners allow for coastal erosion (which is estimated to average a rate of 2 m/year). The Applicant should consult with Natural England and ERYC's Countryside Access Team about the KCIIIIECP alignment and issues regarding access, especially where cable installation involves trenching or any activity that weakens of the sea cliff.</p>	<p>4. Noted. Details in relation to the King Charles III England Coast Path, including details of spreading room and rollback, are included in both <b>Section 22.6.1.2.3 of Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> and within the draft version of the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan</b> (document reference 8.9) which forms an appendix to the Outline Code of Construction Practice which has been provided along with the PEIR for consultation. Consultation will be undertaken with the relevant stakeholders through Expert Topic Groups and, where required, smaller working groups.</p>

## APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

		<p>5. JLAF will ask that the Applicant, and/or subsequent owners of the cables, be required to adopt medium/long-term responsibility for restoration of surface settlement where PRow cross ground that has been disturbed. JLAF is particularly concerned about this issue for the good of not only current residents, but generations to come. Given the easily-poached, heavy-clay soils of Holderness, the depth of cable burial, and typical dilated and consolidated soil bulk densities, soil settlement is eventually likely to be around 15 - 25 cm (6 – 10 inches). This will attract pools of water and plasticise the soil, resulting, de facto, in cul-de-sac PRow because of unfavorable ground conditions, particularly in winter, thereby severely reducing usage and the public health benefits of countryside access. JLAF suggests a watch-period of at least seven years to allow time for soil settlement. With regard to this matter, the cable owner would best deal with the ERYC Countryside Access Team which, ordinarily, would receive reports of access issues from members of the public and/or be aware of such issues through the field experience of its own officers. These reports and observations could be evaluated and passed directly to the company for action. When ground restoration works take place, permissions will have to be sought beforehand and restoration carried out to standards set by ERYC's Countryside Access Team.</p> <p>6. The National Planning Policy Framework (2023 Revision, para. 104) indicates that development should enhance PRow affected.</p>	<p>5. Following completion of construction works, soils will be reinstated in line with a Soil Management Plan ensuring appropriate reinstatement methods are adopted and appropriate best practice and guidelines are followed. As noted in the draft version of the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan</b> (document reference 8.9) pre and post construction surveys will be undertaken for each impacted recreation route. This will aid in reinstatement works to ensure that deterioration of the route as a result of construction will not occur. Details in relation to the ongoing responsibility of maintaining the route post-construction with regards to settlement are not yet available.</p> <p>6. Details in relation to the enhancement of recreational routes and / or contributing to a developer fund are not yet available.</p> <p>7. Noted.</p>
--	--	---	---

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		<p>JLAF will therefore request that the DCO places an obligation on the Applicant to identify clearly how it will enhance rights of way and public access in the onshore project area. Alternatively, JLAF will ask that the Applicant gives a reasonable developer contribution (eg. Section 106 or similar agreement) to East Riding of Yorkshire Council, this fund being used to deliver improvements to public rights of way and access in parishes crossed by the cable corridor, in accordance with NPPF para 104 and with Rights of Way Improvement Plan priorities in the East Riding. Given the national discussion about compensating local communities for inconvenience (here, potentially five or six years of installation work and seven years of post-installation settlement) or loss of visual amenity during and after major infrastructure development, JLAF believes that the DCO should specify that there is an obligation placed on the Applicant and any subsequent owner of the cables to effect both an enhancement of affected PRow and a monetary developer contribution benefitting local communities.</p>	

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
		<p>7. JLAF will draw attention to the Secretary of State for the Environment's extension of the deadline to the year 2031 for submission of claims of historical rights of way that are not recorded on the Definitive Map. Were such claims under Schedule 14 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to emerge within the project area during the period of construction, JLAF will ask that the East Riding of Yorkshire Council's Definitive Map Team be required by the DCO to inform the Applicant and that the Applicant will be required by the DCO to make reasonable accommodation of any proven claim to PRoW, whether or not involving agreed diversion of alignment, with any costs of establishing the PRoW borne by the Applicant.</p>	
The British Horse Society	Response to Non-Statutory Consultation (letter dated 26/09/24)	<p>It is not clear from the plans how any Public Rights of Way will be affected.</p> <p>We would like to see plans which show all the rights of way differentiated so that horse riders and carriage drivers will be able to see how these proposals will affect them and hence be in a position to make meaningful comment.</p> <p>Bridleways are a precious resource for horse riders and due consideration must be given to them. Restricted Byways &amp; Byways are used by carriage drivers who will also need to see how and where these Public Rights of Way are affected by these plans.</p>	<p><b>Figure 22-4</b> within <b>Volume 1, Chapter 22 Soils and Land Use</b> illustrates the Public Rights of Way overlapping with the Onshore Development Area. This includes differentiation between types of recreational route as appropriate. These are also listed within <b>Section 22.6.1.2.3</b> of the chapter and within the draft version of the <b>Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan</b> (document reference 8.9).</p>

# APPENDIX 22.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSES FOR SOILS AND LAND USE

Stakeholder	Document / Meeting, Date	Comment	How and Where Addressed in the PEIR
			Updated versions of these figures/ tables will be provided with the DCO application for the Order Limits of the Project. The Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan at DCO stage will include further details of how recreational routes overlapping with the Project will be managed. A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will be produced post-consent as part of the Code of Construction Practice (Commitment ID CO57).

## References

Royal HaskoningDHV (2024). Dogger Bank D Scoping Report (Part 1 & 2). Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/EN010144/EN010144-000069-EN010144%20-%20Scoping%20Report%20-%20Part%201.pdf> & <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/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/uploads/projects/EN010144/EN010144-000071-EN010144%20-%20Scoping%20Opinion.pdf> [Accessed September 2024].

## List of Tables

Table 22.1-1 Consultation Responses for Soils and Land Use .....	5
--	---

## List of Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification
BMV	Best and Most Versatile
CROW	Countryside and Rights of Way
DBD	Dogger Bank D Offshore Wind Farm Project
DCO	Development Consent Order
ECC	Export Cable Corridor
ECP	England Coast Path
ERYC	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
ES	Environmental Statement
JLAF	Joint Local Access Forum
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
OCS	Onshore Converter Station
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PRoW	Public Right of Way
ROWIP	Right of Way Improvement Plan
SMP	Soil Management Plan