

Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm

Statement of Common Ground

Historic England

Applicant: Norfolk Vanguard Limited
Document Reference: REP3 – SOCG – 8.1

Date: May 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
01/05/2019	09D	Ninth draft	GK	GK	RS
09/05/2019	10D	Tenth draft	GK	GK	RS
23/05/2019	11D	Final Version	GK	GK	RS

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.
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 and not agreed between HBMCE and the Applicant are included.
3. The Applicant has also committed to continue to engage with HBMCE through the development of the offshore and onshore Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)s post consent.

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.
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.

Date	Contact Type	Topic
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 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
5 th March 2019	Meeting (conference call)	Discussions regarding SOCG
12 th March	Examination submission	Response to the Examining Authority’s further (second) written questions and requests for information
5 th April 2019	Email to Historic England	Provision of the Norfolk Vanguard Stage 4 Offshore Palaeoenvironmental Assessment

Date	Contact Type	Topic
5 th April 2019	Examination submission	Action from Issue Specific Hearing on 28th March 2019 – consistency between Norfolk Vanguard, Hornsea Project Three and Thanet Extension DCOs
26 th April 2019	Email to Historic England	Interim comments on Historic England's Deadline 6 submission, in accordance with request from the panel that the Deadline 6 submission be discussed
30 th April 2019	Email from Historic England	Response to interim comments on Historic England's Deadline 6 submission
1 st May 2019	Email from Historic England	<p>Feedback on the Norfolk Vanguard Stage 4 Offshore Palaeoenvironmental Assessment</p> <p><i>"We offer the following comments and a request that this (draft) report is amended and re-issued due to a typographic error identified within Section 5.3 (Radiocarbon dating and chronological modelling), paragraph 5.5.3 in which we noted that the dates used for VC074 and VC076 appear to have been mixed up within the discussion.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, we found the Stage 4 report supplied to us to be of a high standard and which addressed the majority of the comments we made at the Preliminary Environmental Information Report stage (our letter, dated 11th December 2017)."</i></p>

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. Stage 4 of 5 is complete and all stages to date have been provided to Historic England. Achieving Stage 4 by the pre-consent phase is uncommon and therefore presents good practice by Norfolk Vanguard Limited.	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	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.	Agreed
	The assessment considers the extent to which setting contributes to the significance of individual heritage assets and identifies the potential for change; although no change has been identified which could cause harm to the significance of those heritage assets.	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
	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 provides sufficient detail so as to inform a post-consent strategy for further geoarchaeological assessment, as detailed in the Outline WSI (offshore).	Agreed
	The assessment of cumulative effects is presented in Chapter 17 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Norfolk Vanguard ES	Agreed

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Historic England position
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
	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 (produced in accordance with the Outline WSI) to be prepared post-consent and formally submitted to the MMO.	Agreed

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Historic England position
	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
	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

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Historic England position
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)).	It is accepted that the Outline WSI (offshore), IPMP and draft DCO (subject to agreed clauses) together are sufficient to ensure that any subsequent survey programmes required to deliver this proposed project (should consent be obtained) should be adequately informed by archaeological objectives.
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.	It is accepted that all mitigation measures, as included in the outline WSI (offshore), are secured through the draft Development Consent Order (DCO). However, the Historic England position is that the WSI (offshore) should be submitted six months prior to commencement (see below).
	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.	Not agreed The Historic England position is detailed within our response to Examination Authorities Second Written Questions (our letter dated 12 th March 2019) and in our response to Action arising from Issue Specific Hearing on 28/03/2019, our letter to the Planning Inspectorate, dated 5 th April 2019
	The wording of the DCO and DMLs provides sufficient clarity that pre-commencement surveys and archaeological investigations and pre-commencement material operations which involve intrusive seabed works must only take place in accordance with a specific written scheme of investigation which is itself in accordance with the details set out in the outline offshore written scheme of investigation (offshore), and which has been submitted to and approved by the MMO.	The Historic England position is that the WSI (offshore) should be submitted six months prior to commencement (see above).

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.
30 th June 2017	Email to Historic England	Provision of updated WSI for Geoarchaeological Monitoring of Site Investigation works.


Date	Contact Type	Topic
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.
12 th March	Examination submission	Response to the Examining Authority’s further (second) written questions and requests for information

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. 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
	Archaeological/geoarchaeological approaches were adopted and implemented alongside the engineering-led geotechnical site investigation surveys undertaken at the landfall and key crossing locations.	Agreed

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Historic England position
	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 approach to assessing potential impacts of the project. This was accepted at 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
	There are some 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 will result in a residual impact. 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 in accordance with 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	<i>Christopher Pater</i>
Position	<i>Head of Marine Planning</i>
On behalf of	<i>Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (Historic England)</i>
Date	<i>23rd May 2019</i>

Signed	R. Sherwood
Printed Name	Rebecca Sherwood
Position	Norfolk Vanguard Consents Manager
On behalf of	Norfolk Vanguard Ltd (the Applicant)
Date	22 May 2019