

Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm

Statement of Common Ground

Broadland District Council

Applicant: Norfolk Vanguard Limited
Document Reference: Rep1 - SOCG - 3.1
Version: 2

Date: March 2019
Author: Royal HaskoningDHV

Photo: Kentish Flats Offshore Wind Farm

Date	Issue No.	Remarks / Reason for Issue	Author	Checked	Approved
23/08/2018	00	First draft for Internal review	CC/ST	JA	JA
07/09/2018	01D	First draft for Norfolk Vanguard Limited review	ST	JA	JA
13/09/2018	02D	Second draft for Norfolk Vanguard Limited review	ST	JA	JA
18/09/2018	03D	Third draft for Norfolk Vanguard Limited review	ST	JA	JA
14/01/2019	04D	Draft submission for Deadline 1	ST	JA	JA
13/03//2019	05D	Update following Deadline 1	ST	JA	JA

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	The Development.....	1
1.2	Consultation with Broadland District Council	2
2	Statement of Common Ground.....	3
2.1	Project-wide considerations	3
2.2	Ground Conditions and Contamination	5
2.3	Noise and Vibration	8
2.4	Above Ground Cultural Heritage.....	12
2.5	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	15
2.6	Tourism and Recreation.....	19
2.7	Socio-economics	22

Glossary

CIA	Cumulative Impact Assessment
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice
DCO	Development Consent Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
ETG	Expert Topic Group
HIA	Health Impact Assessment
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
OCoCP	Outline Code of Construction Practice
OWF	Offshore Wind Farm
PEI	Preliminary Environmental Information
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground

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 personnel. An accommodation vessel may be used instead
Offshore cable corridor	The area where the offshore export cables would be located.
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.
Offshore export cables	The cables which bring electricity from the offshore electrical platform to the landfall.
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 Broadland District Council 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 Broadland District Council on the SoCG is currently outstanding and the Applicant will continue to engage with Broadland District Council to progress this SoCG.
2. This SoCG comprises an agreement log which has been structured to reflect topics of interest to Broadland District Council on the Norfolk Vanguard DCO application (hereafter 'the Application'). Topic specific matters agreed, not agreed and actions to resolve between Broadland District Council 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 Broadland District Council

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

1.2.1 Pre-Application

8. The Applicant has engaged with Broadland District Council 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, Broadland District Council provided comments on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) by way of a letter dated 11th December 2017.
10. Further to the statutory Section 42 consultation, several meetings were held with Broadland District Council through the Evidence Plan Process. These are detailed throughout the SoCG and minutes of the meetings are provided in Appendices 9.15 – 9.26 (pre-Section 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

11. This is a live document that is being updated as the project progresses. The first draft was produced prior to the publishing of the Relevant Representations. As Relevant Representations were received, the document was updated and submitted by the Applicant for Deadline 1. This updated draft takes into account Broadland District Council's Local Impact Report and responses to Examiner's first written questions submitted at Deadline 1, subsequent consultation with Broadland District Council in January 2019 and is submitted for Deadline 4 in accordance with the Rule 8 letter.

2 STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

12. Within the sections and tables below, the different topics and areas of agreement and disagreement between Broadland District Council and the Applicant are set out.
13. In line with Broadland District Council's Local Impact Report and following discussion with Broadland District Council in January 2019, this SoCG does not consider the topics of traffic and transport (with the exception of disturbance effects associated with cumulative traffic), onshore ecology and ornithology (with the exception of hedgerow removal in relation to the historic landscape), onshore archaeology, water resources and flood risk with these matters deferred to Norfolk County Council. The SoCG focuses on ground conditions and contamination, noise and vibration, above ground cultural heritage, landscape and visual impacts, tourism and recreation and socio economics.

2.1 Project-wide considerations

14. Table 1 provides areas of agreement and disagreement for project-wide considerations.

Table 1 Project-wide considerations

Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
Policy and legislation		
The legislation adopted for Norfolk Vanguard is relevant and interpreted appropriately.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the legislation has been interpreted appropriately.
The principle of offshore renewable energy is supported, and will be permitted unless environmental impacts outweigh social, economic and environmental benefits. This was noted in Broadland District Council's PEIR response in December 2017.	Agreed	It is agreed that both parties support offshore renewable energy projects in principle.
Site selection		
The principles adopted in undertaking the site selection (Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives) for Norfolk Vanguard are appropriate and robust.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the site selection principles are appropriate and robust
The search areas used for the site selection process and the methodology used for refining these areas is considered robust and appropriate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the site selection process is robust and appropriate.
Health Impact Assessment (HIA)		

Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
The methodology adopted for the HIA (Chapter 27 Human Health) is appropriate and robust, and the outcome of the assessment is suitable.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the methodology for HIA is appropriate and robust.

2.2 Ground Conditions and Contamination

15. The project has the potential to impact upon ground conditions and contamination. Chapter 19 Ground Conditions and Contamination of the ES (document reference 6.1.19) provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
16. Table 2 provides an overview of meetings and correspondence undertaken with Broadland District Council regarding ground conditions and contamination.
17. Table 3 provides areas of agreement and disagreement regarding ground conditions and contamination.
18. Further details on the Evidence Plan for ground conditions and contamination can be found in Appendix 9.20 and Appendix 25.2 of the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application).

Table 2 Summary of Consultation with Broadland District Council regarding ground conditions and contamination

Date	Contact Type	Topic
Pre-Application		
11 th December 2017	Letter	PEIR feedback.

Table 3 Statement of Common Ground - ground conditions and contamination

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
Existing Environment	Sufficient data has been collected to inform the assessment.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that sufficient data was collected to inform the assessment.
Assessment methodology	The impact assessment methodologies used for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) represent an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts of the project.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment methodology is appropriate.
	The worst-case scenario presented in the assessment is appropriate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the worst case scenario presented is appropriate.
Assessment findings	The assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment in terms of ground conditions and contamination.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment.
	The assessment of impacts for construction, operation and decommissioning presented is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the embedded mitigation described, impacts on ground conditions and contamination are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that impacts on ground conditions and contamination are likely to be non-significant.
	The assessment of cumulative impacts is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the embedded mitigation described, cumulative impacts on ground conditions and contamination are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that cumulative impacts on ground conditions and contamination are likely to be non-significant.

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
Approach to mitigation	The development of an approved Materials Management Plan (MMP) is considered suitable to control impacts on Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSA).	Agreed although approval of the MMP is for Norfolk County Council	It is agreed by both parties that an approved MMP is considered suitable to control impacts on Mineral Safeguarding Areas. Although it is Norfolk County Council who would approve an MMP.
	Given the identified impacts of the project, the mitigation proposed for ground conditions and contamination is considered appropriate and adequate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the mitigation proposed for ground conditions and contamination is considered appropriate and adequate.
Wording of Requirement(s)	The wording of Requirement 20 provided within the draft DCO (and supporting outline Code of Construction Practice) for the mitigation of impacts associated with ground conditions and contamination are considered appropriate and adequate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the wording of Requirement 20 is appropriate.

2.3 Noise and Vibration

19. The project has the potential to generate noise and vibration effects. Chapter 25 Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference 6.1.25) provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
20. Table 4 provides an overview of meetings and correspondence undertaken with Broadland District Council regarding noise and vibration.
21. Table 5 provides areas of agreement and disagreement regarding noise and vibration.
22. Further details on the Evidence Plan for noise and vibration can be found in Appendix 9.25 and Appendix 25.10 of the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application).

Table 4 Summary of Consultation with Broadland District Council regarding noise and vibration

Date	Contact Type	Topic
Pre-Application		
14 th January 2017	Email	Provision of the Noise and Vibration Method Statement.
25 th January 2017	Meeting	Method statement, project updates and approach to the assessment (methodology, impacts, data collection etc).
19 th March 2017	Email	Provision of the proposed locations for the onshore noise and vibration monitoring survey.
29 th March 2017	Email	Provision of the proposed locations for the onshore noise and vibration monitoring survey.
31 st March 2017	Email from Broadland District Council	Approval of the proposed locations for the onshore noise and vibration monitoring survey.
11 th December 2017	Letter	PEIR feedback.
4 th April 2018	Email	Request for confirmation of projects to be included in the CIA.
Post-Application		
16 th January 2019	Submissions to PINS	Broadland District Council's position as set out in their Local Impact Report and response to Examiner's first questions submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 5 Statement of Common Ground - noise and vibration

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
Existing Environment	Sufficient survey data (extent/duration) has been collected in appropriate locations to characterise the noise environment to undertake the assessment. This was agreed via email communications from Broadland District Council in March 2017.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the noise and vibration monitoring survey collected sufficient data in appropriate locations to undertake the noise assessment.
Assessment methodology	The impact assessment methodologies used for the assessment represent an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that that the assessment methodology is appropriate.
	The worst-case scenario presented in the assessment is appropriate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the worst case scenario presented is appropriate.
	The assessments adequately characterise the baseline environment in terms of noise and vibration.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment.
Assessment findings	The assessment of impacts for construction, operation and decommissioning presented is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, impacts from noise and vibration are non-significant in EIA terms.	Not agreed further assessment of impacts of noise and vibration are required and consideration by BDC given.	
	The assessment of cumulative effects, other than cumulative traffic associated with Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea Project Three, is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, cumulative impacts from noise and vibration are non-significant in EIA terms.	Not agreed, further assessment of cumulative impacts of noise and vibration are required and consideration by BDC given.	

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
	<p>The assessment of cumulative noise and vibration effects associated with Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea Project Three is in progress and will be submitted to the examination at Deadline 5.</p>	<p>The cumulative impacts of the two proposals need to be considered. Both operators are proposing to use The Street in Oulton Street to connect to the B1149, which is a narrow country lane. There are also concerns about the impact on The High Street, Cawston. There are concerns about whether the construction programmes will overlap and therefore cause significant disruption in these villages and the surrounding area. Reference is made to a previous planning application (ref: 20130860 and the subsequent appeal decision) for an Anaerobic Digestion plant on part of the former Oulton Airfield which was refused and dismissed at appeal on grounds that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and convenience and be likely to result in material harm to the living conditions of residential occupiers of The Old Railway Gatehouse with reference to noise and disturbance.</p>	
<p>Approach to mitigation</p>	<p>The production of a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), including a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (based on the OCoCP, document reference 8.1) will provide sufficient controls for potential noise and vibration impacts.</p>	<p>Agreed in principle and the wording of the CoCP will need to be agreed with BDC.</p>	

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
	<p>The production of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) based on the Outline TMP document reference 8.8) will provide sufficient controls for potential traffic related noise and vibration impacts. Measures set out in the OTMP include delivery timing constraints (e.g. school arrival/departure times) which are set out in Table 1.5 of the OTMP.</p>	<p>Agreed in principle and the wording of the TMP will need to be agreed with BDC.</p>	
	<p>The consented normal construction hours will be restricted to 07.00 to 19.00 on Mondays to Fridays and 07.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays, with no work taking place Sunday or bank holidays.</p> <p>Construction works outside of these hours may only be undertaken for essential continuous activities. When this is required permission must be agreed with the relevant planning authority in advance. This is set out in Requirement 26 of the draft DCO.</p> <p>These restrictions to the working hours will provide sufficient control for potential disturbance (noise and vibration) impacts associated with evening and weekend working.</p>	<p>Not agreed construction work outside of the normal construction hour may be undertaken for essential and specified non-intrusive activities which must be agreed with the LPA in advance of the activities taking place (Requirement 26)</p>	
Wording of Requirement(s)	<p>The wording of Requirements 20, 21 and 26 provided within the draft DCO (and supporting certified documents) for the mitigation of impacts associated with noise and vibration are considered appropriate and adequate.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>It is agreed by both parties that the wording of Requirements 20, 21 and 26 provided in the draft DCO for the mitigation of impacts associated with noise and vibration are considered appropriate and adequate.</p>

2.4 Above Ground Cultural Heritage

23. The project has the potential to impact upon onshore archaeology and above ground cultural heritage. Chapter 28 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the ES (document reference 6.1.28) provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
24. Table 6 provides an overview of meetings and correspondence undertaken with Broadland District Council regarding above ground cultural heritage. In terms of Broadland District Council the focus is on above ground cultural heritage as onshore archaeology is a matter that has been deferred to Norfolk County Council.
25. Table 7 provides areas of agreement and disagreement regarding above ground cultural heritage.
26. Further details on the Evidence Plan for onshore archaeology and cultural heritage can be found in Appendix 9.22 and Appendix 25.4 of the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application).

Table 6 Summary of Consultation with Broadland District Council regarding above ground cultural heritage

Date	Contact Type	Topic
Pre-Application		
14 th January 2017	Email	Provision of the Method Statement.
11 th December 2017	Letter	PEIR feedback.
19 th July 2017	Email to Broadland District Council	Project update and overview of results for onshore archaeology and cultural heritage ETG meeting.

Table 7 Statement of Common Ground - above ground cultural heritage

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
Existing Environment	The scope of the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (ADBA) is appropriate to inform the assessment.	Not a matter for BDC to agree	
	Sufficient survey data (extent/duration) has been collected to inform the assessment.	Agreed in respect of above ground cultural heritage	It is agreed by both parties that sufficient data was collected to inform the assessment in respect of above ground cultural heritage.
	It is accepted that outstanding geophysical surveys (scheme-wide) may be undertaken post-consent.	Not a matter for BDC to agree	
	The approach to the selection of priority geophysical survey areas was appropriate and sufficient to inform the assessment of impacts.	Not a matter for BDC to agree	
	Archaeological trial trenching is not required to inform the assessment of impacts pre-application. Further evaluation will be completed post-consent.	Not a matter for BDC to agree	I
Assessment methodology	The impact assessment methodologies used for the assessment (DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 2: Cultural Heritage) provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts of the project.	Agreed in respect of above ground cultural heritage	It is agreed by both parties that that the assessment methodology in respect of above ground cultural heritage is appropriate.
	The worst-case scenario presented in the assessment is appropriate.	Agreed in respect of above ground cultural heritage	It is agreed by both parties that the worst case scenario in respect of above ground cultural heritage presented is appropriate.

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
	The assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment in terms of onshore archaeology and cultural heritage, including the setting of designated heritage assets.	Agreed in respect of above ground cultural heritage	It is agreed by both parties that the worst case scenario in respect of above ground cultural heritage presented is appropriate
Assessment findings	The assessment of impacts for construction, operation and decommissioning presented is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described and commitment to further evaluation post-consent, impacts on onshore archaeology and cultural heritage are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.	Agreed in respect of above ground cultural heritage	It is agreed by both parties that impacts on above ground cultural heritage are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms
	The assessment of cumulative effects is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, cumulative impacts on onshore archaeology and cultural heritage are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.	Agreed in respect of above ground cultural heritage	It is agreed by both parties that cumulative impacts on above ground cultural heritage are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms
Approach to mitigation	The provision of a pre-construction and construction Archaeological WSI (Onshore) (to be based on the outline WSI, document reference 8.5) is considered suitable, with respect to Set-Piece Excavation (SPE); Strip, Map and Sample and archaeological monitoring/watching brief scenarios.	Not a matter for BDC to agree	
	The mitigation proposed for potential impacts on buried and above-ground archaeological remains is appropriate.	Not a matter for BDC to agree	
Wording of Requirement(s)	The wording of Requirement 23 provided within the draft DCO (and supporting certified documents) for the mitigation of impacts to above ground cultural heritage are considered appropriate and adequate.	Agreed in respect of above ground cultural heritage	It is agreed by both parties that the wording of Requirement 23 is appropriate as it relates to above ground cultural heritage

2.5 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

27. The project has the potential to impact upon landscape and visual receptors. Chapter 29 Landscape and Visual Impacts of the ES (document reference 6.1.29) provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
28. Table 8 provides an overview of meetings and correspondence undertaken with Broadland District Council regarding the landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA).
29. Table 9 provides areas of agreement and disagreement regarding the LVIA.
30. Further details on the Evidence Plan for LVIA can be found in Appendix 9.18 and Appendix 25.3 of the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application).

Table 8 Summary of Consultation with Broadland District Council regarding LVIA

Date	Contact Type	Topic
Pre-Application		
14 th January 2017	Email	Provision of the Landscape Method Statement.
25 th April 2017	Email	Circulation of viewpoint locations for the LVIA and Cultural Heritage Assessment.
19 th July 2017	Meeting	PEI ETG meeting – project update and results overview.
11 th December 2017	Letter	PEIR feedback
4 th April 2018	Email	Request for confirmation of projects to be included in the CIA.
Post-Application		
16 th January 2019	Submissions to PINS	Broadland District Council’s position as set out in their Local Impact Report and response to Examiner’s first questions submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 9 Statement of Common Ground - LVIA

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
Existing Environment	Sufficient desk-based and survey based data (extent/duration) has been collected to inform the assessment. This was discussed and agreed during the Expert Topic Group meeting in July 2017.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that sufficient survey data has been collected to undertake the assessment.
	The methodology and viewpoints selected are representative and appropriate. This was discussed and agreed during the Expert Topic Group meeting in July 2017.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that representative and appropriate viewpoints have been collected to undertake the assessment.
Assessment methodology	The list of potential LVIA effects assessed as proposed in the Evidence Plan method statement provided in October 2016 are appropriate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the potential LVIA effects assessed are appropriate.
	All hedgerows have been assessed for their ecological value and historic landscape value, in accordance with the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Potential impacts to hedgerows are discussed in detail within Chapter 22 Onshore Ecology and Chapter 29 Landscape and Visual Impact.	Not agreed	
	The impact assessment methodologies, including for cumulative effects, used are those agreed and remain appropriate for assessing potential impacts. This was discussed and agreed during the Expert Topic Group meeting in July 2017.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the impact assessment methodologies used in the EIA are appropriate.

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
	Visual impacts associated with the cable installation are limited to the construction phase and an assessment of operational impacts was not required. This was discussed and agreed via the method statement provided and agreed via the Method Statement and during the Expert Topic Group in July 2017.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the landfall and cable installation are subject to construction impacts only.
	The worst-case scenario presented in the assessment is appropriate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the worst case scenario presented in the assessment is appropriate.
Assessment findings	The assessment adequately characterises the visual baseline.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the baseline is suitably established.
	The assessment of effects for construction, operation and decommissioning presented is appropriate and adheres to the agreed methodology.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment of effects is appropriate and adheres to the agreed methodology.
	The assessment of cumulative effects (including the point where Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea Project Three onshore cable routes overlap) is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, cumulative effects would be mitigated over time.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment of cumulative effects is appropriate, and that these would be mitigated over time.
Approach to mitigation	The mitigation proposed for LVIA are considered appropriate and adequate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the mitigation proposed for LVIA are considered appropriate and adequate.

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
	All mitigation measures required (including the temporary removal of any hedgerows within Broadland District) are outlined in sufficient detail within the Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Strategy (OLEMS).	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the mitigation measures required are outlined in sufficient detail within the OLEMS
Wording of Requirement(s)	The wording of Requirements 18 and 19 provided within the draft DCO (and supporting certified documents) for the mitigation of impacts in the LVIA are considered appropriate and adequate.	Agreed in respect of 18; aware that NNDC will require a 10 yr landscape maintenance period instead of 5 yrs in respect of 19	
	Important hedgerows are listed in Schedule 13 of the draft DCO and the Important Hedgerows Plan (document reference 2.11).	Not agreed BDC require further consideration of this matter	

2.6 Tourism and Recreation

31. The project has the potential to impact upon tourism and recreation. Chapter 30 Tourism and Recreation of the ES, (document reference 6.1.30), provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
32. Table 10 provides an overview of meetings and correspondence undertaken with Broadland District Council regarding tourism and recreation.
33. Table 11 provides areas of agreement and disagreement regarding tourism and recreation.
34. Further details on the Evidence Plan for tourism and recreation can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application).

Table 10 Summary of Consultation with Broadland District Council regarding tourism and recreation

Date	Contact Type	Topic
Pre-Application		
14 th January 2017	Email to Broadland District Council	Provision of the tourism and recreation Method Statement.
9 th February 2017	Email from Broadland District Council	Advice to consider magnetic fields from onshore cables and structures.
11 th December 2017	Letter	PEIR feedback

Table 11 Statement of Common Ground - tourism and recreation

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
Existing Environment	Appropriate datasets have been presented to inform the assessments	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the datasets presented are appropriate to inform the assessment.
Assessment methodology	The impact assessment methodologies used provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts of the project.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that that the assessment methodology is appropriate.
	The worst-case scenario presented in the assessments is appropriate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the worst case scenario presented is appropriate.
	The assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment in terms of tourism and recreation.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment.
Assessment findings	The assessment of effects for construction, operation and decommissioning presented is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, impacts on tourism and recreation are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment of effects is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, impacts on tourism and recreation are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
	The assessment of cumulative effects is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, cumulative impacts on tourism and recreation are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment of cumulative effects is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, impacts on tourism and recreation are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.
Approach to mitigation	Given the impacts of the project, the mitigation proposed for tourism and recreation are considered appropriate and adequate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the mitigation proposed for tourism and recreation are considered appropriate and adequate.
Wording of Requirement(s)	Given the impacts of the project, the wording of the Requirements provided within the draft DCO (and supporting certified documents) for the mitigation of impacts to tourism and recreation are considered appropriate and adequate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the wording of the Requirements provided within the draft DCO (and supporting certified documents) for the mitigation of impacts to tourism and recreation are considered appropriate and adequate.

2.7 Socio-economics

35. The project has the potential to impact upon socio-economics. Chapter 31 Socio-economics of the ES, (document reference 6.1.31), provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
36. Table 12 provides an overview of meetings and correspondence undertaken with Broadland District Council regarding socio-economics.
37. Table 13 provides areas of agreement and disagreement regarding socio-economics.
38. Further details on the Evidence Plan for socio-economics can be found in Appendix 9.21 of the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application).

Table 12 Summary of Consultation with Broadland District Council regarding socio-economics


Date	Contact Type	Topic
Pre-Application		
14 th January 2017	Email	Provision of the Socio-Economics Method Statement.
11 th December 2017	Letter	PEIR feedback
4 th April 2018	Email	Request for confirmation of projects to be included in the CIA.

Table 13 Statement of Common Ground - socio-economics

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
Existing Environment	Appropriate datasets have been presented to inform the assessments	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the datasets presented are appropriate to inform the assessment.
Assessment methodology	The impact assessment methodologies used provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts of the project.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that that the assessment methodology is appropriate.
	The worst-case scenario presented in the assessments is appropriate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the worst case scenario presented is appropriate.
	The assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment in terms of socio-economics.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment.
Assessment findings	The assessment of effects for construction, operation and decommissioning presented is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, impacts on socio-economics are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment of effects is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, impacts on socio-economics are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
	The assessment of cumulative effects is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, cumulative impacts on socio-economics are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment of cumulative effects is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, impacts on socio-economics are likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.
Approach to mitigation	Given the impacts of the project, the mitigation proposed for socio-economics are considered appropriate and adequate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the mitigation proposed for socio-economics are considered appropriate and adequate.
Wording of Requirement(s)	The wording of the Requirements provided within the draft DCO (and supporting certified documents) for the mitigation of impacts to socio-economics are considered appropriate and adequate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the wording of the Requirements provided within the draft DCO (and supporting certified documents) for the mitigation of impacts to socio-economics are considered appropriate and adequate.

The undersigned agree to the provisions within this SOCG

Signed	
Printed Name	Matthew Rooke
Position	Planning Manager (West)
On behalf of	Broadland District Council
Date	12/03/2019

Signed	R Sherwood
Printed Name	Rebecca Sherwood
Position	Norfolk Vanguard Consents Manager
On behalf of	Norfolk Vanguard Ltd (the Applicant)
Date	12 March 2019