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## 1 INTRODUCTION

1. This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) and Norfolk Vanguard Limited (hereafter 'the Applicant') to set out the areas of agreement and disagreement in relation to the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm (hereafter 'the project').
2. This SoCG comprises an agreement $\log$ which has been structured to reflect topics of interest to the MCA in the Norfolk Vanguard DCO application (hereafter 'the Application'). Topic specific matters agreed, not agreed and actions to resolve between the MCA and the Applicant are included.
3. The Applicant has had regard to the Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent (March 2015) when compiling this SoCG. Points that are not agreed will be the subject of ongoing discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties.

### 1.1 The Development

4. The Application is for the development of the Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm (OWF) and associated infrastructure. The OWF comprises two distinct areas, Norfolk Vanguard (NV) East and NV West ('the OWF sites'), which are located in the southern North Sea, approximately 70 kilometres $(\mathrm{km})$ and 47 km from the nearest point of the Norfolk coast, respectively. The location of the OWF sites is shown in Chapter 5 Project Description Figure 5.1 of the Application. The OWF would be connected to the shore by offshore export cables installed within the offshore cable corridor from the OWF sites to a landfall point at Happisburgh South, Norfolk. From there, onshore cables would transport power over approximately 60 km to the onshore project substation and grid connection point near Necton, Norfolk.
5. Once built, Norfolk Vanguard would have an export capacity of up to 1800 Megawatts (MW), with the offshore components comprising:

- Wind turbines;
- Offshore electrical platforms;
- Accommodation platforms;
- Met masts;
- Measuring equipment (LiDAR and wave buoys);
- Array cables;
- Interconnector cables; and
- Export cables.


### 1.2 Consultation with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency

6. This section briefly summarises the consultation that the Applicant has had with the MCA. For further information on the consultation process please see the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application).

### 1.2.1 Pre-Application

7. The Applicant has engaged with the MCA on the project during the pre-Application process, both in terms of informal non-statutory engagement and formal consultation carried out pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008.
8. During formal (Section 42) consultation, the Maritime and Coastguard Agency provided comments on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) by way of a letter dated 11th December 2017.
9. Table 1 provides an overview of meetings and correspondence undertaken with the MCA. Minutes of the meetings are provided in Appendices 9.15-9.26 (preSection 42) and Appendices 25.1-25:9 (post-Section 42) of the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application).

### 1.2.2 Post-Application

10. During the formal planning process, the MCA provided comments on the Environmental Statement (ES) by way of a relevant representation dated 14th September 2018.

## 2 STATEMENT OF COMIMON GROUND

11. Within the sections and tables below, the different topics and areas of agreement and disagreement between the MCA and the Applicant are set out.

### 2.1 Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation

12. The project has the potential to impact upon Shipping and Navigation. Chapter 15 of the Norfolk Vanguard ES (document reference 6.1 of the Application) provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
13. Table 1 provides an overview of meetings and correspondence undertaken with the MCA regarding Shipping and Navigation.
14. Table 2 provides areas of agreement (common ground) and disagreement regarding Shipping and Navigation.

Table 1 Summary of Consultation with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency

| Date | Conthg $4 \sin$ | 10pic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-Application |  |  |
| MCA and Trinity House $(\mathrm{TH})$ | 12tḥ January 2016 <br> Consultation meeting with MCA and TH. | Overview of initial proposed project and agreement on guidance to be used including Marine Guidance Note (MGN) 54 4́3. |
| MCA | November 2016 Scoping Opinion | The MCA noted that the ES should supply detail on the possible impacts on navigational issues for both commercial and recreational craft. <br> A Navigation Risk Assessment (NRA) will need to be submitted in accordance with MGN 543 (and MGN 372) and the MCA Methodology for Assessing the Marme Navigation Safety \& Emergency Response Risks of Offshore Renewable Energy installations (OREI). |
| MCA and TH | 24th May 2016 <br> Consuitation meeting with MCA and TH. | Agreement was reached on the survey methodology proposed by Norfolk Vanguard including dates and time period. |
| MCA | 17th March 2017 <br> Consultation meeting with MCA and TH. | MCA noted the MGN requirement for two lines of orientation but would consider a safety case for one line of orientation, where appropriate. <br> MCA noted that synchronisation between East Anglia Three, Norfolk Vanguard East and Norfolk Boreas would be required. |
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| Dats | $\operatorname{contht} 4 y 2$ | Thich |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MCA | 11th December 2017 PEIR Response | MCA noted that the development area carries a significant amount of through traffic, and attention needs to be paid to routeing; particularly in heavy weather ensuring shipping can continue to make safe passage without significant large scale deviations: <br> The possible cumulative and in combination effects on shipping routes should be considered. <br> Hydrographic surveys should fulfil the requirements of MGN 543. <br> A cable burial risk assessment will be reguired. <br> The turbine layout design will require MCA approval prior to construction to minimise the risks to surface vessels, including rescue boats, and Search and Rescue (SAR) aircraft operating within the site. <br> Safety zones during the construction, maintenance and decommissioning phases are supported. <br> An Emergency Response Cooperation Plan (ERCoP) is required to meet the requirements of MGN 543 . |
| Post-Application |  |  |
| MCA | 14th September 2018 <br> Relevant Representation | The project has undertaken a detailed NRA in accordance with MCA guildance (MGN 543 and its supporting annexes, and risk assessment methodology), and we are satisfied that all aspects of the NRA have been adequately addressed, includirg the traffic surveys. However, there are still aspects of the project that will need to be discussed beyond consent, and concerns which will need to be addressed and agreed with the MCA, as follows: <br> - Layout design; <br> - Deep Water Routes; <br> - Marking and lighting; <br> - ERCOPS; <br> - Construction șenarios; <br> - Mooring arrangements; <br> - Hydrographic surveys; <br> - Cable routes; and <br> - Safety zones: |
| MCA | 12th September 2018 Consultation Meeting | Approach to post consent layout development discussed including the consideration of development rules to: guide array design. <br> Agreement on the process for the completion of the SOCG. |
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| 142 C |  | Muthtin crasis AECHy | Hial bosilen |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | The worst case scenarios identified for each effect are appropriate based on the information presented in the Project Description. | Agreed | It is agreed that the design parameters of the project presented in Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation of the ES would result in a worst case scenario for Shipping and Navigation impacts. |
| Navigational Risk Assessment | The NRA (Chapter 15.1) has been undertaken in line with required guidance including MGN 543. | Agreed | It is agreed that the NRA has been undertaken in accordance with MCA guidance (MGN 543 and its supporting anriexes, and risk assessment methodology), and all aspects of the NRA have been adequately addressed, including the traffic surveys. |
| Assessment findings | The definitions used for magnitude and sensitivity are appropriate. | Agreed | It is agreed that the definitions used for magnitude and sensitivity are appropriate for Shipping and Navigation as shown in Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation of the E.S. |
|  | The assessinent of potential changes to Shipping and Navigation is appropriate and no impacts from the construction, operation and maintenance and/or decommissioning of the Project will be significant in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms. | Agreed | It is agreed that, in accordance with the outcome of the assessment presented in Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation of the ES that the adopted measures for impacts on shipping and navigation receptors are sufficient to bring risk to tolerable levels. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety zones | The Applicant will undertake an application for safety zones of up to 500 metres (m) during construction, major maintenance and decommissioning phases; and 50 m pre commissioning. | Agreed | The post consent use of construction, major maintenance and decommissioning safety zones are noted and supported by the MCA. |
| Emergency response | An ERCoP is an embedded mitigation. | Agreed | It is agreed that an ERCoP will need to be in place and agreed with the MCA prior to any offshore construction (and during the operation and maintenance phase) being undertaken to mitigate risk associated with increased activity and coordinating responses. |
|  | A SAR Checklist will be completed post consent to ensure that the development, where applicable, complies with the recommendations. | Agreed | It is agreed that a SAR checklist will be completed post consent. |


| 10pic |  | yhintine anc cotusuth <br>  | intol $\operatorname{Dosinin}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Layout design | The project is currently consulting with the MCA on Development Rules that will ensure that the post consent layout approval process is undertaken effectively. The intention of the rules is to ensure effective layout approval in conjunction with the MCA. | Under Discussion | It is agreed that the final turbine fayout design will require MCA approval prior to construction (post. consent) to minimise the risks to surface vessels, including rescue boats, and SAR aircraft operating within the site. <br> It is agreed that the NRA considers the 'worst case scenario' with a minimum of one line of orientation possible; however the MCA's requirement is for at least two lines of orientation for the purposes of safe navigation for surface vessels, and SAR capabilities unless a developer can clearly demonstrate that fewer is acceptable as per MGN 543. <br> The MCA require turbines to be in straight lines but understand that micro-siting is likely necessary. <br> Discussions are on-going between the Applicant and the MCA to agree a set of design principles in line with MGN 543. This discusșion will also include agreement on how this is secured in the DMLs in accordance with DML 1411). |
| Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) | The cumulative (and in-combination) assessment of potential changes to Shipping and Navigation is appropriate and no cumulative impacts will be signfificant in EIA terms. | Agreed | Based on the information provided within Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation of the $E S$ it is agreed that cumulative impacts including main route deviations caused by the project cumulatively are unikely to be significant on the understanding that appropriate mitigation measures (as noted in the Chapter 15: Shipping and Navigation) are implemented. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction scenario | It is agreed that a design plan will form part of the post consent documentation. The potential for linear development will be discussed at this point. | Agreed | DML Condition 14(1)a requires a design plan to be submitted and approved by the MMO in consultation with the MCA and Trinity House prior to licensed activities commencing. <br> A cable specification, installation and monitoring plan will also be submitted as per DML Condition 14(1)(g) and will consider any changes to under keel ciearance depths. |
| Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) |  |  |  |
| Standard conditions | Standard conditions have been included within the Norfolk Vanguard DCO application, where applicable: | Under discussion | MCA are content that all DCO and DML conditions are included, where applicable. |
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The undersigned agree to the provisions within this SOCG

| Signed |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Printed Name | $H E C E N$ CROXBON |
| Position | MREI AOVISOR |
| On behalf of | Maritime and Coastguard Agency |
| Date | $10 / O 1 / 9$ |


|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Signed | R Sherwood |
| Printed Name |  |
| Position | Rebecca Sherwood |
| On behalf of | Norfolk Vanguard Ltd (the Applicant) |
| Date | 11 January 2019 |

