

Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm

Statement of Common Ground

Historic England



Applicant: Norfolk Vanguard Limited
Document Reference: REP2 – SOCG – 8.1

Date: March 2019
Author: Royal HaskoningDHV

Photo: Kentish Flats Offshore Wind Farm

| Date | Issue No. | Remarks / Reason for Issue | Author | Checked | Approved |
|------------|-----------|--|--------|---------|----------|
| 10/09/2018 | 00 | First draft for Internal review | ST | JA | JA |
| 27/09/2018 | 01D | First draft for Norfolk Vanguard Limited review | ST | JA | JA |
| 10/10/2018 | 02D | Second draft for Norfolk Vanguard Limited review | ST | JA | JA |
| 17/10/2018 | 03D | Third draft for Norfolk Vanguard Limited review | ST | JA | JA |
| 03/12/2018 | 04D | Submission for deadline 1 | ST | GK | GK |
| 25/02/2019 | 05D | Fifth draft | VC/FS | JA/GK | GK |
| 25/02/2019 | 06D | Sixth draft | VC/FS | JA/GK | GK |
| 04/02/2019 | 07D | Seventh draft | VC/FS | JA/GK | GK |
| 12/03/2019 | 08D | Submission for deadline 4 | WF/CP | JA/GK | GK |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | The Development | 1 |
| 1.2 | Consultation with the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (Historic England) | 2 |
| 2 | Statement of Common Ground | 3 |
| 2.1 | Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage | 3 |
| 2.2 | Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage | 11 |

Glossary

| | |
|-------|--|
| ADBA | Archaeological Desk Based Assessment |
| CIA | Cumulative Impact Assessment |
| CRS | Cable Relay Station |
| DCO | Development Consent Order |
| EIA | Environmental Impact Assessment |
| EPP | Evidence Plan Process |
| ES | Environmental Statement |
| ETG | Expert Topic Group |
| HBMCE | Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (Historic England) |
| HDD | Horizontal Directional Drilling |
| HVAC | High Voltage Alternating Current |
| HVDC | High Voltage Direct Current |
| LiDAR | Light Detection and Ranging |
| LVIA | Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment |
| OLEMS | Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Strategy |
| OWF | Offshore Wind Farm |
| PEIR | Preliminary Environmental Information Report |
| SoCG | Statement of Common Ground |
| WSI | Written Scheme of Investigation |

Terminology

| | |
|---|--|
| Array cables | Cables which link the wind turbines and the offshore electrical platform. |
| Landfall | Where the offshore cables come ashore at Happisburgh South. |
| Mobilisation area | Areas approx. 100 x 100m used as access points to the running track for duct installation. Required to store equipment and provide welfare facilities. Located adjacent to the onshore cable route, accessible from local highways network suitable for the delivery of heavy and oversized materials and equipment. |
| National Grid overhead line modifications | The works to be undertaken to complete the necessary modification to the existing 400kV overhead lines. |
| Necton National Grid substation | The existing 400kV substation near Necton, which will be the grid connection location for Norfolk Vanguard. |
| Offshore accommodation platform | A fixed structure (if required) providing accommodation for offshore construction and maintenance personnel. An accommodation vessel may be used instead. |
| Offshore electrical platform | A fixed structure located within the wind farm area, containing electrical equipment to aggregate the power from the wind turbines and convert it into a more suitable form for export to shore. |
| Onshore cable route | The 45m easement which will contain the buried export cables as well as the temporary running track, topsoil storage and excavated material during construction. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Onshore project substation | A compound containing electrical equipment to enable connection to the National Grid. The substation will convert the exported power from High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) to High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC), to 400kV (grid voltage). This also contains equipment to help maintain stable grid voltage. |
| The OWF sites | The two distinct offshore wind farm areas, Norfolk Vanguard East and Norfolk Vanguard West. |
| Trenchless crossing zone | Temporary areas required for trenchless crossing works (e.g. HDD). |

1 INTRODUCTION

1. This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared by Norfolk Vanguard Limited (hereafter ‘the Applicant’) to set out the areas of agreement and disagreement with the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (which trades under the name Historic England) in relation to the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm (hereafter ‘the project’) based on consultation to date. Detailed input from the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (HBMCE) on the SoCG is currently outstanding and the Applicant will continue to engage with HBMCE to progress this SoCG.
2. This SoCG comprises an agreement log which has been structured to reflect topics of interest to HBMCE on the Norfolk Vanguard DCO application (hereafter ‘the Application’). Topic specific matters agreed, not agreed and actions to resolve between HBMCE and the Applicant are included.
3. The Applicant has had regard to the Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent (Department for Communities and Local Government, 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 70km and 47km 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 60km 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 1800MW, 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.
6. The key onshore components of the project are as follows:
- Landfall;
 - Onshore cable route, accesses, trenchless crossing technique (e.g. Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD)) zones and mobilisation areas;
 - Onshore project substation; and
 - Extension to the existing Necton National Grid substation and overhead line modifications.

1.2 Consultation with the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (Historic England)

7. This section briefly summarises the consultation that the Applicant has had with HBMCE. For further information on the consultation process please see the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application). In addition, consultation on offshore archaeology is outlined in ES Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage. With respect to primarily onshore related consultation, detailed pre-application consultation responses are presented in ES Appendix 28.2.

1.2.1 Pre-Application

8. The Applicant has engaged with HBMCE 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.
9. During formal (Section 42) consultation, HBMCE provided comments on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) by way of an email and letter dated 11th December 2017.
10. Further to the statutory Section 42 consultation, several meetings were held with HBMCE through the Evidence Plan Process.

2 STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

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

2.1 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

12. The project has the potential to impact upon offshore archaeology and cultural heritage. Chapter 17 of the Environmental Statement (ES), (document reference 6.1.17 of the Application), provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
13. Table 1 provides an overview of meetings and correspondence undertaken with HBMCE regarding offshore archaeology and cultural heritage.
14. Table 2 provides areas of agreement and disagreement regarding offshore archaeology and cultural heritage.

Table 1 Summary of Consultation with HBMCE regarding offshore archaeology and cultural heritage

| Date | Contact Type | Topic |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Pre-Application | | |
| 26 th January 2016 | Meeting | Introduction to the project and Evidence Plan Process (EPP). |
| 4 th March 2016 | Email to Historic England | Provision of the Site Investigation Survey – Archaeology Position Paper. |
| 11 th March 2016 | Letter to Historic England | Formal launch of Norfolk Vanguard. |
| 21 st March 2016 | Letter from Historic England | Feedback on the Site Investigation Survey – Archaeology Position Paper and discussions from the January 2016 meeting. |
| 6 th October 2016 | Email to Historic England | Update on offshore survey and vibrocore analysis. |
| 4 th November 2016 | Email to Historic England | Draft Terms of Reference of EPP for review. |
| 11 th November 2016 | Email from Historic England | Feedback on the Terms of Reference and proposed approach for the EPP. |
| 25 th January 2017 | Email to Historic England | Provision of method statements. |

| Date | Contact Type | Topic |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 st February 2017 | Evidence Plan Process Expert Topic Group Meeting | Project introduction, development of site selection, project design and approach to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Happisburgh, geophysical and geotechnical survey update. |
| 2 nd February 2017 | Feedback form returned via email from Historic England | Feedback on offshore archaeology method statement. |
| 22 nd June 2017 | Email to Historic England | Provision of Offshore Archaeology Technical Report (Appendix 17.1 of the ES). |
| 6 th July 2017 | Meeting | Project update, initial assessment results in the draft PEIR. |
| 24 th July 2017 | Letter delivered via email from Historic England | Comments on Offshore Archaeology Technical Report (Appendix 17.1 of the ES). |
| 11 th November 2017 | Letter from Historic England | Regarding participation in the Evidence Plan Process. |
| 28 th November 2017 | Letter to Historic England | Response to Comments on Offshore Archaeology Technical Report. |
| 11 th December 2017 | Letter delivered via email from Historic England | Comments on the PEIR. |
| 8 th March 2018 | Meeting | Project update, PEIR comments. |
| Post-Application | | |
| 14 th September 2018 | Relevant Representation from Historic England | Registration to participate in the examination and initial feedback on the DCO application. |
| 16 th January 2019 | Written Representation from Historic England | Detailed comments on the draft DCO, Chapter 17 of the ES (and associated appendices) Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (offshore) and the In Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (document 8.12). |
| 17 th January 2019 | Written Representation from Historic England | Additional submission regarding the definition of “commence” in the draft DCO application. |
| 15 th February 2019 | Action from Issue Specific Hearing 1 on 5 th February 2019 | Confirmation that discussions are ongoing with the Applicant regarding the consultation period for the offshore WSI |

Table 2 Offshore archaeology and cultural heritage

| Topic | Norfolk Vanguard Limited position | Historic England position |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Existing Environment | Sufficient survey data has been collected to provide an accurate characterisation of the archaeological potential of the study area. | We agree that the ES presents analysis of marine survey data as necessary to characterise the proposed development area |
| | The analysis of the offshore geophysical data is presented in Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Norfolk Vanguard ES. | We agree that the ES presents analysis of marine survey data as necessary to characterise the proposed development area in reference to the Project Design Envelope principles advocated by the Applicant in ES Volume 1, Chapter 6 (Environmental Impact Assessment methodology), section 6.4 |
| | The analysis and recommendations for the offshore geotechnical samples is ongoing. | Under Discussion. A defined programme of geotechnical analysis is presently on-going |
| Assessment methodology | The impact assessment methodologies used for the assessment provide an approach to assessing potential impacts of the project. | Agreed |
| | Definitions of sensitivity and importance are consistent across onshore and offshore assessment for Norfolk Vanguard and are sufficient to ensure that potential impacts to heritage assets are adequately assessed. Preliminary judgements on the heritage significance of heritage assets (or groups of heritage assets) will be subject to revision if more information becomes available post-consent and as necessary to inform the design of the proposed project. | Agreed |
| | The worst-case scenario is presented in Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Norfolk Vanguard ES. | Agreed |

| Topic | Norfolk Vanguard Limited position | Historic England position |
|---------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | The Marine Archaeological Technical Report (Appendix 17.1 of the ES) is used to inform the assessment. | Agreed |
| Assessment findings | The assessment characterises the baseline environment in terms of offshore archaeology and cultural heritage. | Agreed |
| | The assessment of impacts for construction, operation and decommissioning is presented in Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Norfolk Vanguard ES and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described and commitment to further evaluation post-consent, impacts on offshore archaeology and cultural heritage are considered non-significant in EIA terms. | Agreed |
| | The assessment regarding Historic Seascape Character in reference to: “aquaculture”; “inshore fisheries”; and “offshore fishing grounds” recognises that perceptions of historic seascape character may change. However, loss of fishing grounds is identified as being the primary concern of fishermen and mitigation measures will be established, where appropriate as outlined in ES Chapter 14 Commercial fisheries. | Agreed |
| | The assessment considers the extent to which setting contributes to the significance of individual heritage assets and adequately identifies the potential for change; although no change has been identified which could cause harm to the significance of those heritage assets. To provide full clarity, there will be a change to that setting in terms of the presence of the export cable, but this will not harm the significance of those wrecks. | Agreed |
| | It is understood that by reference to potential changes to ‘perceptual values’ associated with specific Historic Seascape Character types, this specifically refers to a perception of historic character as might be associated with a spatially identifiable location. | Agreed |

| Topic | Norfolk Vanguard Limited position | Historic England position |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | Sufficient detail on how samples have been taken from the acquired cores in order to ensure validity of the OSL dating techniques will be provided in the Stage 4 report. This report will also include sufficient detail so as to inform a post-consent strategy for further geoarchaeological assessment to be undertaken post-consent, as detailed in the Outline WSI (offshore). | Awaiting Stage 4 report |
| | The assessment of cumulative effects is presented in Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Norfolk Vanguard ES and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, cumulative impacts on offshore archaeology and cultural heritage are considered non-significant in EIA terms. | Agreed |
| Approach to mitigation | The embedded mitigation is presented in section 17.7.2 of ES Chapter 17. | Agreed |
| | The nature and extent of Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZs) will be finalised and agreed in consultation with Historic England prior to construction based upon the archaeological assessment of pre-construction data with regard to a refined design footprint and to any other information which may come to light. | Agreed |
| | The inclusion of an AEZ (50m around the wreck extent as seen in the geophysical data) for wreck 71480 (a submarine (UKHO ID 79542) identified in geophysical data in 2014) which lies just outside the study area, is sufficient to ensure that activities undertaken by any project contractor or sub-contractor that might impact the seabed are sufficiently informed through project documentation to avoid this wreck. | Agreed |

| Topic | Norfolk Vanguard Limited position | Historic England position |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | The margin of error for microsites A2 geophysical anomalies and A3 records of existing sites not seen in geophysical data will be established post-consent following archaeological assessment of the pre-construction geophysical data and based upon the final design footprint. | Agreed |
| | The depth of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) at the landfall will be determined post-consent based on a range of factors, including consideration of suitable depths to avoid archaeology. | Agreed |
| Approach to mitigation | The approach to mitigation as set out in the Outline WSI (Offshore) (document reference 8.6) adequately provides for the delivery (post-consent) of the embedded mitigation presented in section 17.7.2 of ES Chapter 17. Additional detail will be provided through a final detailed WSI (based on the Outline WSI) to be prepared post-consent and formally submitted to the MMO. | Agreed |
| | The Outline WSI (offshore) allows for the completion of data acquisition programmes to the highest data quality standards possible, including a methodological approach that will utilise the most effective data generation programmes that will be commissioned post-consent. Specific instruction regarding data acquisition will be included in the final detailed WSI and accompanying, survey specific method statements, once further information is available post-consent. | Agreed |

| Topic | Norfolk Vanguard Limited position | Historic England position |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| | The Outline WSI (Offshore) provides sufficient attention to those anomalies interpreted as 'A2' and the approach presented for the assessment of marine geophysical survey data will enable detailed analysis to be completed, including whether additional data demonstrates if any A2 anomalies can be removed from consideration in the WSI (i.e. identified as non-anthropogenic, or of no archaeological interest) or more added, if identified as present within the refined design footprint post-consent. | Agreed |
| | The Outline WSI (Offshore) provides sufficient assurance that where avoidance is not possible, methodological approaches to further investigations of specific sites would be agreed in consultation with Historic England and set out in Method Statements as necessary to ensure the delivery of any agreed mitigation. | Agreed |
| Information sharing, data management and archiving | The Outline WSI (Offshore) includes provision for information sharing, data management and archiving. This is secured through the DCO and DML Schedule 9 and 10, Part 4, Requirement 14 (1) (h) and will be finalised in the final detailed WSI (Offshore). The mitigation strategy will therefore include analysis programmes, within defined time periods, to accepted professional standards with publication and access through public archives. | Agreed |
| Project documentation | The Outline WSI (offshore), IPMP (document 8.12) and draft DCO together are sufficient to ensure that any subsequent survey programmes required to deliver Norfolk Vanguard (should consent be obtained) will be adequately informed by archaeological objectives. The monitoring outlined in the IPMP would be delivered through the offshore WSI, to be agreed with the MMO in consultation with Historic England prior to construction in accordance with the DCO (Schedules 9 and 10 Part 4 Condition 14(1)(h) and Schedules 11 and 12 Part 4 Condition 9(1)(h)). | Agreed |

| Topic | Norfolk Vanguard Limited position | Historic England position |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Wording of Requirement(s) | Part 4 of Schedules 9, 10, 11 and 12 of the draft DCO appropriately reflects the commitments made in the ES. This includes Condition 14(1)(h) for Schedules 9 and 10 and Condition 9(1)(h) for Schedules 11 and 12 which states that the archaeological WSI (offshore) must be agreed with the MMO in consultation with the statutory historic body. | Agreed |
| | The submission of the subsequent (post-consent) detailed WSI (offshore) at least four months prior to commencement (as conditioned within the DMLs) is appropriate and proportionate to allow the MMO, in consultation with stakeholders where relevant, sufficient time for stakeholder consultation and the provision of comments, whilst ensuring no unnecessary delay to the commencement of development. | Under discussion |
| | The wording of the DCO and DMLs provides sufficient clarity with reference to the submission of the WSI four months prior to 'commencement' that it is understood by all parties that the WSI must be submitted at least four months prior to the commencement of pre-construction surveys and investigations which, in accordance with the Outline WSI, will incorporate archaeological objectives. | Under discussion |

2.2 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

15. The project has the potential to impact upon onshore archaeology and cultural heritage. Chapter 28 of the ES, (document reference 6.1.28 of the Application), provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
16. Table 3 provides an overview of meetings and correspondence undertaken with Historic England regarding onshore archaeology and cultural heritage.
17. Table 4 provides areas of agreement and disagreement regarding onshore archaeology and cultural heritage.

Table 3 Summary of Consultation with Historic England regarding onshore archaeology and cultural heritage

| Date | Contact Type | Topic |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Pre-Application | | |
| 26 th January 2016 | Meeting | Introduction to the project and EPP. |
| 11 th March 2016 | Letter | Formal launch of Norfolk Vanguard. |
| 1 st November 2016 | Letter delivered via email from Historic England via PINS. | Comments on the Scoping Report, as part of PINS Scoping Opinion. |
| 25 th January 2017 | Email to Historic England | Provision of EPP method statements. |
| 1 st February 2017 | Meeting | Project introduction, development of site selection, project design and approach to EIA. Including discussion of main archaeological considerations and data sources. |
| 20 th March 2017 | Email to Historic England | Provision of draft Written Scheme of Investigation: Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (Terrestrial Archaeology). |
| 25 th April 2017 | Email to Historic England | Circulation of viewpoint locations for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and cultural heritage assessment. |
| 17 th May 2017 | Email from Historic England | Collated comments on EPP method statement and WSI for Archaeological DBA. |
| 26 th May 2017 | Email to Historic England | Provision of draft WSI for Geoarchaeological Monitoring of Site Investigation works (landfall and key crossing locations). |
| 21 st June 2017 | Email from Historic England | Comments on WSI for Geoarchaeological Monitoring of Site Investigation works. |

| Date | Contact Type | Topic |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| 30 th June 2017 | Email to Historic England | Provision of updated WSI for Geoarchaeological Monitoring of Site Investigation works. |
| 19 th July 2017 | Meeting | Project update and initial assessment results in the draft PEIR. Included discussion on high-level approach to priority geophysical survey and an update on the geoarchaeological monitoring of site investigation works. |
| 11 th August 2017 | Email to Historic England | Provision of Onshore Substation and Cable Relay Station (CRS) viewpoint locations for comment. |
| 21 st September | Email from Historic England | WSI Priority Geophysical Survey. Stating / acknowledging Norfolk County Council (NCC) lead on agreements in this regard and interested to see outcomes. |
| 11 th December 2017 | Letter delivered via email from Historic England | Comments on the PEIR. |
| 24 th January 2018 | Meeting | PEIR feedback, assessment results to date and next steps. Included heritage setting and cross-correlation with LVIA, priority geophysical survey update, geoarchaeological monitoring of SI update and the mitigation strategy approach / Outline WSI. |
| 2 nd March 2018 | Email to Historic England | Provision of project design update. Related to project commitment to HVDC, and removal of CRS requirement. |
| Post-Application | | |
| 14 th September 2018 | Relevant Representation from Historic England | Registration to participate in the examination and initial feedback on the DCO application. |
| 16 th January 2019 | Written Representation from Historic England | Detailed comments on the draft DCO, Chapter 28 of the ES (and associated appendices) and Outline WSI (onshore). |
| 17 th January 2019 | Written Representation from Historic England | Additional submission regarding the definition of “commence” in the draft DCO application. |

Table 4 Onshore archaeology and cultural heritage

| Topic | Norfolk Vanguard Limited position | Historic England position |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Policy and Legislation | The legislation, policy and guidance adopted for Norfolk Vanguard with respect to onshore archaeology and cultural heritage is relevant and in line with overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) and National Policy Statement: Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3). | Agreed |
| Existing (Baseline) Environment | Survey data (re. extent) has been collected to inform the assessment of the archaeological potential of the onshore project and study area. This was agreed at/after the Expert Topic Group (ETG) meeting in January 2018. | Agreed |
| | The required scope of the detailed Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (which was a key source of information for the Application) was documented in a WSI, which was reviewed and agreed by NCC and HE. This was agreed after the Expert Topic Group (ETG) meeting in February 2017. | Agreed |
| | Priority geophysical survey areas were selected to help inform the assessment of impacts. This was undertaken through discussion with NCC with HE kept apprised of discussions and agreements. This was agreed after the ETG meeting in July 2017. | Agreed |
| | The use of detailed magnetometry is an appropriate methodology for archaeological geophysical survey on large linear schemes is. This was agreed after the ETG meeting in July 2017. The Applicant has committed to investigating further and alternative methodologies alongside additional magnetometer survey, where appropriate and warranted, based upon existing/future information in the post-consent stages of the project. | Agreed |
| | Outstanding geophysical surveys (scheme-wide) would be undertaken post-consent. This was agreed after the ETG meeting in February 2017. | Agreed |
| | Onshore heritage setting viewpoint locations have been provided. These ultimately focused on the onshore project substation location and surrounds, following the decision by the Applicant to commit to HVDC technology. Viewpoints were presented, discussed and agreed at and following the ETG meeting in January 2018. | Agreed |

| Topic | Norfolk Vanguard Limited position | Historic England position |
|------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| | Archaeological/geoarchaeological approaches were adopted and implemented alongside the engineering-led geotechnical site investigation surveys undertaken at the landfall and key crossing locations. | Agreed |
| | Archaeological trial trenching was not undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts pre-application. Further evaluation (to be referred to as initial informative stages of mitigation) will be completed post-consent, as secured through the Outline WSI (Onshore) and draft DCO Requirement 23. This was agreed after the ETG meeting in February 2017. | Agreed |
| Assessment methodology | Impact assessment methodologies used for the assessment (alongside the reasoned narrative) were provided as an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts of the project. This was agreed after the ETG meeting in February 2017. | Agreed |
| | The assessment has presented the worst-case scenario. This was accepted following the ETG meeting in February 2017. | Agreed |
| | The assessment provides a characterisation of the baseline environment in terms of onshore archaeology and cultural heritage. This was accepted after the ETG meetings in July 2017 and January 2018. | Agreed |
| | The scope of the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (ADBA) was accepted following the ETG meetings in February 2017 and July 2017. | Agreed |
| Assessment findings | An assessment of impacts for construction, operation and decommissioning presented was provided. | Agreed |
| | An assessment of cumulative effects was provided. | Agreed |

| Topic | Norfolk Vanguard Limited position | Historic England position |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| | There are limited views of the onshore project substation from heritage receptors. | Agreed |
| | An Errata document was submitted to the examination in December 2018 [Pre-ExA; Errata; 9.4], which identifies an impact of minor adverse significance to The Church of St Andrew, Bradenham (Grade I Listed). The onshore project substation is visible from the church yard. This was verbally agreed by Historic England during the Issue Specific Hearing held on 5 th February 2019. | Agreed |
| Approach to mitigation | An Archaeological Written Schemes of Investigation (WSI) (Onshore) (based on the outline WSI, document reference 8.5) will be provided post-consent based on the outline WSI. | Agreed |
| | The mitigation proposed for potential impacts on buried and above-ground archaeological remains is detailed in the Outline WSI (Onshore). | Agreed |
| Wording of Requirement(s) | The wording of Requirement 23 provided within the draft DCO (and supporting certified documents) for the mitigation of impacts to onshore archaeology and cultural heritage is adequate. | Agreed |

The undersigned agree to the provisions within this SOCG

| | |
|--------------|------------------|
| Signed | |
| Printed Name | |
| Position | |
| On behalf of | Historic England |
| Date | |

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| Signed | R. Sherwood |
| Printed Name | Rebecca Sherwood |
| Position | Norfolk Vanguard Consents Manager |
| On behalf of | Norfolk Vanguard Ltd (the Applicant) |
| Date | 13/03/19 |