



# The Sizewell C Project

## 9.10.25 Statement of Common Ground - National Trust

---

Revision: 3.0  
Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(q)  
PINS Reference Number: EN010012

---

September 2021

Planning Act 2008  
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed  
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009





## CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1	Status of the SOCG .....	1
1.2	Purpose of this document .....	1
1.3	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground .....	2
1.4	Structure of this Statement of Common Ground .....	3
2	POSITION OF THE PARTIES .....	3

## TABLES

Table 2.1:	Position of the Parties – SZC Co. and National Trust .....	4
Table 2.2	SOCG meetings held between SZC Co. and the National Trust .....	12

## PLATES

None provided

## FIGURES

None provided

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	ENGAGEMENT ON THE SOCG .....	12
-------------	------------------------------	----



## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Status of the SOCG

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (**‘SoCG’**) has been prepared in respect of the application for a development consent order (**‘DCO’**) to the Planning Inspectorate (**‘PINS’**) under the Planning Act 2008 (**‘the Application’**) for the proposed Sizewell C Project.

1.1.2 This fifth draft SoCG (Revision 05) has been prepared by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited (**‘SZC Co.’**) as the Applicant and the National Trust (**‘the Trust’**) and agreed on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2021 for submission to the ExA at Deadline D8 of the examination programme.

1.1.3 This SoCG has evolved through a programme of engagement and series of versions as detailed in Section 2.

### 1.2 Purpose of this document

1.2.1 The purpose of this SoCG is to set out the position of the parties, so far as they relate to the matters of concern ("uncommon ground") for the National Trust, arising from the application for development consent for the construction and operation of the Sizewell C nuclear power station and together with the proposed associated development (hereafter referred to as **‘the Sizewell C Project’**).

1.2.2 This SoCG has been prepared in accordance with the ‘Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent’ published in March 2015 by the Department of Communities and Local Government (hereafter referred to as ‘DCLG guidance’).

1.2.3 Paragraph 58 of the DCLG Guidance states:

*jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it is also useful if a statement identifies those areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should “A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence”*

1.2.4 The aim of this SoCG is therefore to inform the Examining Authority and provide a clear position of the state and extent of discussions and agreement between SZC Co. and the National Trust on matters relating to the Sizewell C Project.

1.2.5 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the DCO application documents. All documents are available on the Planning Inspectorate website <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/the-sizewell-c-project/>.

### 1.3 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.3.1 SZC Co. has submitted an application for development consent to build and operate a new nuclear power station, Sizewell C, along with the associated development required to enable construction and operation.

1.3.2 The National Trust (The Trust) is an independent charity that looks after beautiful countryside and historic buildings in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Should the Trust acquire land or buildings that it considers to be of outstanding quality, Parliament has created a statutory mechanism that enables our Trustees to declare that land “inalienable”. This means that the land is so important to the nation that it cannot be sold or mortgaged, rather it must remain in the care of the Trust, in perpetuity. Once declared inalienable this designation cannot be reversed. This is one way in which the Trust is able to deliver on its charitable purpose of preserving some of the nation’s most treasured places for everyone, for ever. The Trust owns 140 hectares of land at Dunwich Heath and Beach, which is located approximately 3 kilometres north of the proposed Sizewell C site. Dunwich Heath is a surviving fragment of lowland heath – one of the UK’s rarest habitats. It is subject to international and national designations. The majority of the land was declared inalienable in 1967 demonstrating the importance of the land and the Trust’s commitment to care for it permanently for the nation.

1.3.3 Collectively SZC Co. and the Trust are referred to as ‘the parties’.

1.3.4 This SoCG focuses on "uncommon ground" / concerns of the Trust and this third draft is based on responses submitted in the relevant representation to PINS, received by PINS on TBC and published here: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/the-sizewell-c-project/?ipcsection=relreps&relrep=41494> and feedback provided

by the Trust to SZC Co's second draft of the SoCG dated 21<sup>st</sup> May 2021 received by SZC Co on 2 August 2021.

## 1.4 Structure of this Statement of Common Ground

1.4.1 Chapter 2 provides schedules which detail the matters of concern to The Trust and SZC Co.'s response. It also identifies where discussions are ongoing.

1.4.2 **Appendix A** provides a summary of engagement undertaken to establish this SoCG.

## 2 POSITION OF THE PARTIES

**Table 2.1: Position of the Parties – SZC Co. and National Trust**

RAG score aims to indicate where there are still outstanding matters to be agreed. **Green** = matters agreed, **Amber** = matters still under discussion and **Red** = matter not agreed and no longer being discussed.

Ref.	Matter	National Trust Position	SZC Co. Position	RAG	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress <sup>1</sup>
<b>Overarching</b>					
NT_Ov1	Principle of development	<b>Ov1.1</b> The Trust does not object to the principle of the development as we acknowledge the NPS for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6) identifies Sizewell as a potentially suitable site for a nuclear power station.	The NT's position on the principle of the development is noted and welcomed.		Agreed
<b>Recreation and Tourism (Book 6, Volume 2, Chapters 9 (Socio-economics) and 10 (Amenity and Recreation plus Shadow HRA (Doc Ref. 5.10))</b>					
NT_RT1	Recreational Displacement: impact on visitor capacity, enjoyment and infrastructure at Dunwich Heath and Beach	<b>RT1.1</b> The NT believes that recreational displacement will occur as a result of the proposed development and will impact on the NT's land at Dunwich Heath and the Beach.	It is agreed that recreational displacement could occur as a result of the proposed development which could give rise to adverse impacts on the NT's 'visitor experience' at coastguard cottages, Dunwich Heath and the Beach, as well as having the potential to cause adverse ecological effects.		Agreed
		<b>RT1.2</b> The NT consider that the approach taken to the assessment of impacts arising from visitor displacement are underestimated and not precautionary. We are currently not agreed on the degree of recreational displacement as assessed by the applicant. We provided detail on our views on this matter at D7.	This remains a point of disagreement. The positions of the National Trust and SZC Co. are provided in the Statement on Recreational Disturbance Numbers [REP7-087]. Our position is that the conclusions of the shadow HRA would not change regardless of which estimates are used. We await a response from NT on this.		In Progress
		<b>RT1.4</b> The NT considers that additional mitigation is required to enable it to manage and engage with additional visitors and improve its visitor infrastructure to cope with increased demand. The NT considers that its proposed resilience fund included in Schedule 13 (Third Party Resilience Funds) of the Deed of Obligation should reduce residual impacts in respect of Coastguard cottages and Dunwich Heath to a manageable level.	SZC Co. agrees that additional mitigation is required to enable NT to manage and engage with additional visitors and improve its visitor infrastructure to cope with increased demand, as well as to mitigate and enhance its 'visitor experience' to compensate for visual impacts. It is agreed that the proposed resilience fund would provide appropriate and proportionate mitigation to reduce residual impacts to acceptable levels.		Agreed
		<b>RT1.5</b> The NT notes the proposed 'Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for Minsmere - Walberswick European Sites and Sandlings (North) European Site', and the 'Monitoring	SZC Co. appreciates the constructive discussions with NT on this matter through a number of workshops and meetings. It is understood that the principles of the plans		In Progress

<sup>1</sup> This column does not need to be filled out in the initial stages, the principal purpose at this stage is to set out the position of the parties

Ref.	Matter	National Trust Position	SZC Co. Position	RAG	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress <sup>1</sup>
		and Mitigation Plan for Sandlings (Central) and Alde-Ore Estuary European Sites'. Discussions are ongoing regarding the scope of the MMP mitigation, triggers and funding. This is yet to be agreed.	and many of the details of the plans, such as monitoring approaches and locations are broadly agreed with the NT, as they are with other parties, but the NT has concerns over the level of warden resource proposed in the plan. SZC Co. notes that Natural England consider that two full time wardens plus one seasonal warden would be an appropriate resource level from the outset (the current plan proposes two full time wardens from the outset).		
		<b>RT1.6</b> The NT is satisfied that the quantum proposed and agreed for its proposed resilience fund as part of recent discussions with the applicant would reduce residual impacts on NT land and assets at Coastguard cottages, Dunwich heath and the Beach to manageable levels. This is subject to this agreed quantum appearing in a revised Deed of Obligation as well as appropriate mechanisms for enforcing the terms of the DoO, timescales for payment and any issues of conditionality being resolved.	SZC Co. appreciates the constructive discussions with NT on this matter. It is agreed that the proposed resilience fund would provide appropriate and proportionate mitigation to reduce residual impacts to acceptable levels.		In Progress
<b>Impacts on Ecology (Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 14) and Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment Report (Doc Ref. 5.10)</b>					
NT_E1	Recreational Displacement: impacts on ecology and designated sites at Dunwich Heath and Beach and the wider SPA	<b>E1.1</b> The NT believes as set out in our Written Representation that recreational displacement arising from the proposed development has the potential to adversely impact upon UK and European protected species and habitats at Dunwich Heath and Beach and at a landscape scale across the wider SAC and SPA.	SZC Co.'s position is that recreational displacement could arise due to the proposed development but adverse effects on the integrity of European designated sites would not occur subject to appropriate mitigation measures.		Agreed
		<b>E1.2</b> The NT considers that the impacts arising from the displacement of visitors have not been adequately assessed in the ES and HRA against ecological receptors with some ecological receptors not having been considered. The NT does not agree with EDF's assumptions on visitor behaviours.	SZC Co.'s ES and sHRA have been informed by robust and highly precautionary assessment of recreational disturbance by displaced people and construction workers and through an extensive screening and scoping approach to define then assess the ecological receptors. We await clarification from NT as to whether this is now agreed or is a point of disagreement.		In Progress
		<b>E1.5</b> The NT considers monitoring and mitigation is required to ensure that the ecological importance of Dunwich Heath is not impacted by increased footfall. The NT are in discussions with EDF about the Monitoring and	This is covered in RT1.5 above.		In Progress

Ref.	Matter	National Trust Position	SZC Co. Position	RAG	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress <sup>1</sup>
		Mitigation Plan for Minsmere – Walberswick and Sandlings (North) and access to funding. Discussions are ongoing regarding the scope of the MMP mitigation, triggers and funding. This is yet to be agreed.			
NT_E2	Recreational Displacement: provision of alternative greenspace	E2.1 The NT believes that recreational displacement arising from the development should not all be directed to designated sites.	SZC Co. agrees that recreational displacement arising from the development should not all be directed to designated sites.		Agreed
		E2.2 The NT acknowledges the provision and enhancement of Kenton Hills and Aldhurst Farm. We have provided comments at D7 on this matter. We remain of the review that the NT has not seen any evidence of the assessment of the capacity and adequacy of these sites in mitigating recreational visits to European sites.	At D7 <a href="#">[REP7-137]</a> the National Trust commented on the Aldhurst Farm Technical Note that SZC Co. submitted at D5 <a href="#">[REP5-126]</a> . Natural England's SANG calculation for the provision of alternative green space for permanent residents in new residential development does not apply to temporary displaced people or temporary construction workers. However, the 27ha of new Open Access land at Aldhurst Farm would be sufficient for the equivalent of more than 3,000 permanent residents, which exceeds the number of construction workers present at the accommodation campus and caravan site the peak of the Sizewell C Project construction. SZC Co. emphasises that permanent residents are very different to temporary construction workers staying in the accommodation campus and caravan site, who would recreate at informal outdoor locations such as European sites less than typical residents, for reasons discussed in SZC Co.'s Responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) - Volume 3 - Appendices Part 1 of 7 Chapter 6, Appendix 6A Response to AR.1.12 <a href="#">[REP2-108]</a> (sections 3.7 and 3.8, pdf pages 556, and 560, and section 3.2 on pdf page 550). A key reason why construction workers at the accommodation campus and caravan site would not need the same hectareage of open space as applied by Natural England's SANGS calculation for residential development is that they would not have dogs that need regular daily dog walks and larger areas of land to exercise in.  The adequacy of the Aldhurst Farm site as alternative green space following Natural England's SANG guidelines has been acknowledged by the RSPB in their submission at Deadline 6 <a href="#">[REP6-046]</a> which SZC Co. responded to at		In Progress



Ref.	Matter	National Trust Position	SZC Co. Position	RAG	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress <sup>1</sup>
			Deadline 7 [REP7-060] (paragraphs 3.3.6 and 3.3.7), demonstrating that Aldhurst Farm provides excellent alternative green space. We await NT's response on these submissions.		
		<b>E2.3</b> The NT considers that monitoring of these sites to deliver mitigation for recreational displacement is required. The NT is now aware that there are proposals to undertake visitor surveys at Aldhurst Farm both pre-construction and during construction however these are not reflected in Section 4 of the MMP or in the proposed survey locations. As such we would expect to see these and further measures included in the monitoring plan to establish the sites relative success or otherwise in achieving its purpose. If the monitoring of these sites is not to be included in the MMP we would want to know where it will be set out and how this commitment would be secured.	Visitor surveys at Aldhurst Farm, Kenton Hills Car Park and Leiston Common are being undertaken pre-construction and will be continued during the construction phase, to monitor the use and effectiveness of the locations as alternative green space. SZC Co. will advise how these surveys are secured through the DCO.		In Progress
		<b>E2.4</b> Should the assessment or monitoring show that further mitigation is required to protect the ecological robustness and integrity of protected habitats and species, provision of additional destination greenspace should be provided on undesignated land in close proximity to Sizewell.	SZC Co's position is that impacts associated with potential increases in recreational pressure have been adequately mitigated through a combination of the Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for Walberswick and Sandlings (North), the Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for Sandlings (Central) and Alde-Ore Estuary, the enhanced Kenton Hills / Aldhurst farm, enhancements to the wider PRow network being agreed with SCC and ESC, and the Suffolk RAMS payment made to ESC (in respect of campus and caravan site based workers) for the reasons stated above. We await confirmation from NT as to whether this is accepted or is an area of disagreement.		In Progress
<b>Landscape and Visual Impacts (Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 13)</b>					
NT_LV1	Landscape and Visual Impacts on our land at Dunwich Heath and Beach and the wider AONB	<b>LV1.1</b> The elevated position of the National Trust's site provides the best vantage point for the Sizewell C site. The development will significantly and adversely impact on the setting and views from Dunwich Heath and the wider AONB both during construction and operation, as demonstrated in the submitted LVIA. NT is awaiting additional computer generated images and photomontages	SZC Co. has given careful consideration to the request for additional day and night time construction phase visualisations and in accordance with the commitment reported in its response following ISH 5 [REP5-117] it has prepared illustrative construction phase day and night-time visualisations (the visualisations) from four selected representative viewpoint locations. The visualisations will be submitted at Deadline 8.		In Progress

Ref.	Matter	National Trust Position	SZC Co. Position	RAG	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress <sup>1</sup>
		of the craneage as discussed at ISH5 (Landscape, Visual Impact and Design).			
		<b>LV1.2</b> As stated within our Written Representation and at ISH5 the Trust does not agree with the assessment conclusion that landscape and visual effects would only occur over localised sections of the AONB and Heritage Coast and that the effects during operation on these designations is not significant. The impacts that are experienced from that viewpoint are full east to west impacts on the AONB and this highlights the importance of the AONB as a single entity. The integrity of the AONB is its ability to deliver its statutory purposes based on it being a single entity.	SZC Co. considers that the Sizewell C Project's impacts on landscape and visual receptors, Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast have been assessed appropriately and robustly in the Environmental Statement.		Not Agreed
		<b>LV1.4</b> The Trust's view is that many of the visual impacts of the development impacts cannot be mitigated at Dunwich Heath and Beach for the lifetime of the development. There are a lot of impacts that the applicant will not be able to mitigate.	SZC Co. agrees that not all effects arising from Sizewell C can be fully mitigated. The landscape and visual impact assessment has identified the nature, extent and scale of residual impacts and highlights the role of the Natural Environment Fund in mitigating residual effects (refer to LV1.5).		Agreed
		<b>LV1.5</b> The NT notes that we will be able to access the Natural Environment Improvement Fund as set out in the Deed of Obligation. The NT also notes the proposed Resilience fund for our site that includes provision to deliver small scale on site mitigation measures to detract from views of the construction site.	SZC Co. welcomes NT's comments and agrees that the proposed funds within the Deed of Obligation provide appropriate and proportionate mitigation to reduce residual impacts to acceptable levels.		Agreed
<b>Coastal Geomorphology and Long-Term Change (Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 20)</b>					
NT_CP1	Impacts on NT land and infrastructure at Dunwich Heath and Beach from accelerated coastal change arising from the development.	<b>CP1.1</b> As set out in our Written Representation the National Trust is concerned about impacts on its land and infrastructure at Dunwich Heath and Beach from accelerated coastal change arising from the development.	SZC Co. acknowledges the NT's concerns; detailed assessment has been carried out, but no plausible effects are predicted at Dunwich Heath and the Beach. A full written response to the NT's detailed Written Representation on this matter [REP3-070] is provided in [REP6-025] Appendix G.		Not Agreed

Ref.	Matter	National Trust Position	SZC Co. Position	RAG	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress <sup>1</sup>
		<p><b>CP1.2</b> The NT acknowledges that the assessment of long-term coastal change involves a high degree of uncertainty. The NT believes the application does not adequately assess the potential range of impacts the proposal may have on long term coastal geomorphological processes. The detail of our concerns is set out in our responses.</p>	See response to CP1.1		Not Agreed
		<p><b>CP1.3</b> The NT notes there is still outstanding information to be submitted. We are concerned that the piecemeal submission of documents will impact on our ability to fully review the applicants proposal.</p>	<p>See response to CP1.1</p> <p>SZC Co. has explained the purpose, scope and timescales for submission of the additional information relating to coastal processes which concern the proposed Soft Coastal Defence Feature (SCDF). Revised versions of the storm erosion modelling and design and maintenance reports were submitted at Deadline 7 (see [REP7-045] &amp; [REP7-101], respectively). These submissions demonstrate that it will be feasible to construct and maintain the SCDF in front of the hard defences for the full lifetime of Sizewell C, including decommissioning, which will therefore provide effective mitigation to minimise effects on coastal processes. A further and final update to the storm erosion modelling report is to be submitted at or before Deadline 10. No further engagement is envisaged with NT on this matter.</p>		Not Agreed
		<p><b>CP1.4</b> The NT notes an updated version of the Sizewell C Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CPMMP) has been submitted to the Examining Authority and that the ExA has issued questions on this matter. The NT has not been engaged in any specific discussions about this plan. Having reviewed this the NT notes that there is no provision for monitoring, mitigating or compensating impacts arising from the development's influence on NT land or designated sites extending more than 1.5 km beyond the centre of the development site. We believe the current monitoring and mitigation extent is far too limited. We consider that this plan should include our frontage at Dunwich Heath and that we should be a</p>	<p>SZC Co.'s position is that impact extent has been identified and assessed in Volume 2 Chapter 20 of the ES [APP-311]. This demonstrates that there is no plausible impact of the development on NT land. The proposed CPMMP therefore doesn't extend to NT land at Dunwich Heath / the Beach.</p> <p>Refer also to response to CP1.1 above.</p>		Not Agreed

Ref.	Matter	National Trust Position	SZC Co. Position	RAG	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress <sup>1</sup>
		stakeholder in its development and review. This is a point of uncommon ground with the applicant.			
		<b>CP1.5</b> The NT believes EDF should monitor coastal change for the lifetime of the development (through to full decommissioning) and include the designated sites to the north of the development site up to the northern boundary of our land. We have set out our views and requests in our response at D7. Should this element not be agreed we believe this matter will become an area of disagreement and should be marked Red (not agreed). If however the applicant agrees to include the NT requests in the CPMMP then this matter has the potential to turn Green.	SZC Co's position is that proposed monitoring and mitigation measures should be necessary and proportionate to the impacts. Our position is that there is no plausible risk of coastal change caused by the proposed development affecting third party land, including that belonging to NT. No further engagement is envisaged with NT on this matter. See also response to CP1.1 above.		Not Agreed
		<b>CP1.7</b> The NT is concerned that there is no provision in the <b>draft Deed of Obligation</b> for mitigation/compensation should the monitoring show that there is an impact on third party land from the development.	Revised versions of the storm erosion modelling and design and maintenance reports were submitted at Deadline 7 (see [REP7-045] & [REP7-101], respectively). These submissions demonstrate that it will be feasible to construct and maintain the SCDF along the SZC frontage over the full lifetime of the power station, including decommissioning. SZC Co's position is therefore that the CPMMP would provide effective mitigation to avoid significant adverse effects on neighbouring shorelines.		Not Agreed
<b>Tourism</b>					
NT_T1	Impact on tourism on the Suffolk Coast	<p><b>T1.1</b> The NT believes that the proposed development will impact on tourism on the Suffolk Coast. As a tourist destination and the operator of holiday cottages within the Coastguard Cottages building, the NT are concerned there will be changes in audience segments and behaviours.</p> <p><b>T1.2</b> The NT acknowledges EDF's assessment and conclusions and agrees that there is a need for a Tourism Fund.</p> <p><b>T1.4</b> The NT notes that Schedule 15 (Tourism) of the <b>draft Deed of Obligation</b> makes provision for a Tourism Fund and the principle that the National Trust would have access to this fund subject to confirmation of appropriate mechanisms and conditionality.</p>	SZC Co. understands that all of NT's concerns in relation to residual impacts on tourism have been addressed by the proposed Tourism Fund set out in Schedule 15 of the Deed of Obligation; SZC Co's position is that this fund provides appropriate and proportionate mitigation for the residual impacts.		Agreed



Ref.	Matter	National Trust Position	SZC Co. Position	RAG	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress <sup>1</sup>
<b>Historic Environment</b>					
NT_HE1	Impacts from the development on the non-designated heritage assets	<p><b>HE1.1</b> As set out in our Written Representation the NT believes that there will be impacts from the development and industrialisation of this part of the Heritage Coast on the setting and community value (past and present) of the NT owned Coastguard Cottages and their environs.</p> <p><b>HE1.2</b> The NT and East Suffolk Council consider that Coastguard Cottages are a 'Non-Designated Heritage Asset' and are part of the character and heritage of this part of the East Suffolk coastline. This also acknowledges the important use of this site during World War 2.</p> <p><b>HE1.3</b> The NT has confirmed its position on this matter in its Written Representation and answers to ExQ1 and ExQ2.</p> <p><b>HE1.4</b> The NT notes that the Dunwich Heath and Coastguard Cottages Resilience Fund would include provision of funding for enhancements of the setting of coastguard cottages (such as the provision of a coastal beacon, indoor or outdoor interpretation) subject to appropriate mechanisms for enforcing the terms of the DoO, timescales for payment and any issues of conditionality being resolved.</p>	SZC Co. understands that the NT is satisfied that the proposed Resilience Fund set out in Schedule 13 of the Deed of Obligation would reduce residual impacts of the development on non-designated heritage assets to acceptable levels.		Agreed
NT_HE2	Impacts from the development on archaeology	<p><b>HE2.1</b> The NT believes there may be the potential for direct impacts on archaeology on its site at Dunwich Heath arising from mitigation works which require ground works. This includes mitigation arising from provisions within the Dunwich Heath and Coastguard Cottages Resilience Fund.</p> <p><b>HE2.2</b> The NT agrees that should ground works be required as part of delivering any agreed mitigation measures, then the cost of any archaeological investigation should be costed into the scope of the proposal.</p>	SZC Co's position is that the proposed resilience fund provides for any and all archaeological mitigation that may be required associated with delivery of mitigation works subject to the fund. The NT should liaise directly with SCC Archaeology Service on the scope of any works required.		Agreed

## APPENDIX A: ENGAGEMENT ON THE SOCG

A.1.1. The preparation of this SoCG has been informed by a programme of discussions between SZC Co. and the Trust. The relevant meetings are summarised in Table 2.2.

**Table 2.2 SOCG meetings held between SZC Co. and the National Trust**

Date	Details of the Meeting
7 July 2020	Intro to new NT lead and agree way forward for engagement
5 August 2020	Meeting to address landscape questions / issues
7 September 2020	Meeting to address recreational disturbance questions / issues
9 September 2020	Meeting to address coastal processes questions / issues
17 September 2020	Follow up discussion on recreational disturbance questions / issues
5 October 2020	Meeting to address tourism questions / issues plus follow up discussion on coastal
3 November 2020	Meeting to discuss the resilience fund and approach to the statement of common ground
18 February 2021	Discussion on the draft Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for Minsmere and Dunwich Heath (recreational disturbance)
22 February 2021	A meeting to discuss mitigation for recreational disturbance
18 March 2021	Progress meeting to develop SoCG for D2
6 July 2032	Progress meeting to develop SoCG for D6. Matters discussed included updated positions on coastal processes, recreational displacement & the Minsmere MMP, LVIA impacts and coastguard cottages, and tourism
28 July 2021	Meeting on recreational displacement – displacement calculations and MMP
18 August 2021	Meeting to discuss resilience fund



**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>Details of the Meeting</b>
1 September 2021	Meeting to discuss resilience fund and SoCG update for D7
20 September	Meeting to discuss resilience fund and SoCG update for D8

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**