

Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm

Statement of Common Ground

Broadland District Council

Applicant: Norfolk Vanguard Limited
Document Reference: Rep3 - SOCG - 3.1
Version: 3

Date: June 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
06/06/2019	01F	Final for submission at Deadline 9	JA	RS	RS

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	17
2.5	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	21
2.6	Tourism and Recreation.....	25
2.7	Socio-economics	28

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. A first draft SoCG was produced based on the Relevant Representations and Local Impact Report. This updated draft takes into account subsequent discussions with Broadland District Council during the examination and is submitted for Deadline 9 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.
<p>The principle of offshore renewable energy is supported, and will be permitted unless environmental impacts outweigh social, economic and environmental benefits.</p> <p>This was noted in Broadland District Council's PEIR response in December 2017.</p>	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.

Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
Health Impact Assessment (HIA)		
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, Vibration and Air Quality

19. The project has the potential to generate noise, vibration and air quality effects. Chapter 25 Noise and Vibration of the ES (document reference 6.1.25) and Chapter 26 Air Quality (document reference 6.1.25) provide 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, vibration and air quality.
22. Further details on the Evidence Plan for noise, vibration and air quality can be found in Appendices 9.9, 9.10, 9.25 and 25.10 of the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application).

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

Date	Contact Type	Topic
Pre-Application		
14 th January 2017	Email	Provision of the Noise and Vibration and Air Quality Method Statements.
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.
20 th March 2019	Submission to PINS	Applicant's cumulative impact assessment of construction traffic taking into account Hornsea Project Three. Including noise and air quality assessments.

Date	Contact Type	Topic
2 nd May 2019	Submission to PINS	Applicant's assessment of cumulative air quality impacts at the Old Railway Gatehouse, Oulton. Taking into account idling and accelerating heavy good vehicles (HGVs), other known polluting activities and potential ammonia increases from HGVs.
2 nd May 2019	Submission to PINS	Applicant's assessment of cumulative noise impacts at the Old Railway Gatehouse, Oulton. Taking into account idling and accelerating HGVs.
25 th April – 14 th May 2019	Emails	Email correspondence from BDC requesting clarification on the noise and air quality assessments submitted on 20 th March 2019 and 2 nd May 2019.

Table 5 Statement of Common Ground – noise, vibration and air quality

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 and air quality 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 impact assessment methodologies used for the assessment are appropriate
	British Standard BS8233:2014 (Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings) states that the recognised national method for calculating road traffic noise levels is the Calculation for Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) augmented by additional guidance published by the Highways Agency (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), Volume 11, Section 3, Part 7). The Applicant's assessment of road traffic noise was undertaken using the approach set out in the CRTN using impact thresholds defined within DMRB (Volume 11, Section 3, Chapter 3, Table 3.1). This approach was agreed with BDC through the Evidence Plan Process.	Agree that the CRTN, augmented by the additional guidance in the Highway Agency's DMRB is the only readily available method of assessment of road traffic noise available for use.	It is agreed by both parties that the CRTN, augmented by DMRB is the only readily available method of assessment of road traffic noise available for use
	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.

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
	The assessments adequately characterise the baseline environment in terms of noise, vibration and air quality.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment.
Assessment findings	<p>The Street, Oulton</p> <p>The assessment of cumulative noise, vibration and air quality effects associated with Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea Project Three along The Street at Oulton has been assessed and submitted to the examination at Deadline 5 (ExA; ISH1; 10.D5.3). Further assessments specifically considering the noise, vibration and air quality effects of vehicles idling and accelerating in proximity to the Old Railway Gatehouse at Oulton have also submitted to the examination at Deadline 7 (ExA; ISH6; 10.D7.7 and ExA; ISH6; 10.D7.9).</p> <p>Mitigation is proposed in the form of a cap on the maximum number of daily HGV movements, a temporary speed restriction, regrading the road surface in proximity to the Old Railway Gatehouse, incorporation of passing places along The Street and priority warning signs in proximity to The Old Railway Gatehouse. With these mitigation measures in place residual impacts related to noise, vibration and air quality are not significant based on the agreed EIA criteria. These measures are captured within the Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) (document reference 8.8) and secured through DCO Requirement 21.</p> <p>This combined suite of measures is consistent with those proposed by Hornsea Project Three and will serve to mitigate the effects of either Norfolk Vanguard or Hornsea Three alone, or both projects together. Whichever project</p>	<p>Notes the combination of noise and vibration reduction measures that the applicant is proposing in respect of The Old Railway Gatehouse, the physical alterations to the property need to be agreed with the resident. The principle of the mitigation measures specified are acceptable and need to be secured by revised wording in the Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>Remain concerned that the submitted air quality assessment does not take full account of the existing baseline air quality given the nearby intensive poultry farm and other agricultural uses in the locality. Although it is anticipated that the additional traffic associated with the Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea Three proposals will be likely to have a negligible effect on air quality.</p>	It is agreed by both parties that the principle of the noise mitigation measures specified are acceptable; and that traffic will be likely to have a negligible effect on air quality.

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
	<p>progresses to construction first will introduce the measures and the second project will remove the mitigation at the end of construction.</p> <p>Although the assessment has not identified the need for further mitigation, the Applicant acknowledges the potential for disturbance experienced by the residents of The Old Railway Gatehouse. As such, the Applicant has identified measures to further minimise perceived disturbance impacts comprising upgraded glazing on facades that face the traffic and a garden wall acting as a noise absorption barrier. These are offered as optional mitigation, to be taken forward should the residents wish, however, they are not essential to mitigate the effects. This approach is consistent with commitments also made by Hornsea Project Three.</p> <p>With the inclusion of the subsequent assessments of potential cumulative noise, vibration and air quality impacts along The Street at Oulton, the assessments findings are considered robust and with the inclusion of the identified mitigation measures, impacts have been reduced to non-significant.</p>		
	<p>B1145, Cawston</p> <p>The assessment of cumulative noise, vibration and air quality impacts associated with Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea Project Three along the B1145 through Cawston has been assessed and submitted to the examination at Deadline 5 (ExA; ISH1; 10.D5.3).</p> <p>Mitigation is proposed in the form of a cap on the maximum number of daily HGV movements, temporary speed restrictions, resurfacing the road, incorporation of</p>	<p>The District Council recognise that the applicant has committed to further reduce the peak traffic levels in Cawston to the following: 1 week peak of 112 (reduced from 144) daily HGV movements (in both the single and cumulative scenario) which will reduce to 95 daily HGV movements for 22 weeks, further reduced to 40 daily HGV movements for 13 weeks and finally 8</p>	<p>It is agreed by both parties that the mitigation proposals for Cawston, including the implementation of a 20 mph speed restriction, that significant effects in respect of noise and vibration will be likely to be avoided.</p>

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
	<p>formalised parking and parking restriction, localised pavement widening and priority warning signs. With these mitigation measures in place residual impacts related to noise, vibration and air quality are not significant based on the agreed EIA criteria. These measures are captured within the Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) (document reference 8.8) and secured through DCO Requirement 21.</p> <p>This combined suite of measures will serve to mitigate the effects of either Norfolk Vanguard or Hornsea Three alone or both projects together. Whichever project progresses to construction first will introduce the measures and the second project will remove the mitigation at the end of construction.</p> <p>The traffic cap identified within the CIA set out that cumulative HGV traffic must not exceed 271 daily HGV movements through Cawston, by reducing the Norfolk Vanguard daily HGV movements from 168 down to 144 (combined with the Hornsea Project Three peak of 127 daily HGV movements). This peak of 144 daily movements would occur for 4 weeks in total, followed by 93 daily HGV movements for 24 weeks, then 10 daily HGV movements for 23 weeks.</p> <p>After discussions with Cawston Parish Council and BDC the Applicant has sought to further optimise the construction programme to reduce the Norfolk Vanguard peak traffic as low as practicable. As such, the Applicant is now able to commit to a 1 week peak of 112 (reduced from 144) daily HGV movements (in both the single project and cumulative scenario), which will reduce down to 95 daily HGV movements for a further 22 weeks, and then 44 daily HGV movements for a further 13 weeks, and finally reducing to 8</p>	<p>daily HGV movements for the remaining 23 weeks. On this basis and in combination with the proposed traffic management mitigation proposals for Cawston centre, including the implementation of a 20 mph speed restriction, the District Council are satisfied that significant effects in respect of noise and vibration will be likely to be avoided and request that the Traffic Management Plan will need to be agreed with BDC.</p>	

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
	<p>daily HGV movements for the remaining 23 weeks. These reductions do not change the findings of the CIA (the residual impacts remains minor adverse for noise impacts) but recognise the concerns of Cawston Parish Council and BDC and represent an effort to reduce these short-term peaks in construction traffic to as low as practicable.</p> <p>With the inclusion of the updated assessments of potential cumulative noise, vibration and air quality impacts along the B1145 through Cawston (submitted at Deadline 5), and the further commitment to reduce Norfolk Vanguard peak daily HGV movements to 112, the assessments findings are considered robust, and with the inclusion of the identified mitigation measures, impacts have been reduced to non-significant.</p>		
	The assessment of impacts for construction, operation and decommissioning presented is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, impacts from noise, vibration and air quality are non-significant in EIA terms.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment of impacts for construction, operation and decommissioning presented is appropriate
	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, vibration and air quality are non-significant in EIA terms.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that assessment of cumulative effects, other than cumulative traffic associated with Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea Project Three, is appropriate.

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
Approach to mitigation	The production of a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), including a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan and Air Quality Management Plan (based on the OCoCP, document reference 8.1) will provide sufficient controls for potential noise, vibration and air quality impacts.	Agreed in principle and the wording of the CoCP will need to be agreed with BDC.	Agreed
	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, vibration and air quality 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.	Agreed in principle and the wording of the TMP will need to be agreed with BDC.	Agreed
	<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>	Construction work outside of the normal construction hour may be undertaken only for essential and specified non-intrusive activities which must be agreed with the LPA in advance of the activities taking place (Requirement 26)	It is agreed by both parties that construction work outside of the normal construction hour may be undertaken only for essential and specified non-intrusive activities which must be agreed with the LPA in advance.

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
Wording of Requirement(s)	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.	Agreed	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.

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.
Post-Application		
21st May 2019	Email	Provision of Cawston Conservation Heritage Assessment

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	
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 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
	The Applicant has undertaken a Heritage Assessment of the proposed scheme of mitigation proposed along the B1145 at Cawston which is partially located within the Cawston Conservation Area. The assessment has identified that the majority of the measures are temporary in nature and whilst they will represent a temporary change to the character of the Conservation Area they will not lead to a permanent change to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.	Agreed although there is a minor issue with the widening of part of the footpath that narrows the carriageway at the listed Whitehouse Farm that needs to be addressed	It is agreed by both parties that the widening of part of the footpath in proximity to Whitehouse Farm has safety implications that need to be addressed post-consent as part of the detailed design of the highway intervention scheme.
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	

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
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.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that all hedgerows have been assessed in accordance with the Hedgerow Regulations 1997
	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	It is agreed by both parties that the wording of Requirement 18 is considered appropriate and adequate.
	Important hedgerows are listed in Schedule 13 of the draft DCO and the Important Hedgerows Plan (document reference 2.11).	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that important hedgerows are listed in Schedule 13 of the draft DCO

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.
	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.

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
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.
	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.

Topic	Norfolk Vanguard Limited position	Broadland District Council position	Final position
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	06/06/2019

Signed	R. Sherwood
Printed Name	Rebecca Sherwood
Position	Norfolk Vanguard Consents Manager
On behalf of	Norfolk Vanguard Ltd (the Applicant)
Date	06 June 2019