

From: Faulkner, Stephen <stephen.faulkner@norfolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 September 2020 10:01
To: Norfolk Boreas <NorfolkBoreas@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: jake.laws@vattenfall.com; claire.davies@rhdhv.com; Shaw, John R <John.R.Shaw@norfolk.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Norfolk Boreas Norfolk County Council Statement of Common Ground (Version 4)

FAO:
Norfolk Boreas Case Team
National Infrastructure Planning
The Planning Inspectorate

Reference EN010087

Please see email below – I can confirm that the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) attached has been agreed by Norfolk County Council.

Please can you acknowledge receipt of this email.

Regards

Stephen

Stephen Faulkner MRTPI
Principal Planner
Community and Environmental Services
Telephone: 01603 222752

The Strategic Planning Team is working remotely in response to COVID-19 health advice. The team will be available by phone, email and Teams.

Please leave a voicemail if we are unable to answer your call and a member of the team will get back to you.

From: Faulkner, Stephen
Sent: 22 September 2020 08:24
To: jake.laws@vattenfall.com; claire.davies@rhdhv.com

Cc: Shaw, John R <John.R.Shaw@norfolk.gov.uk>

Subject: Norfolk Boreas Norfolk County Council Statement of Common Ground (Version 4)

Jake et al,

Further to our email exchange yesterday, please find attached a “signed – off” version of the Statement of Common Ground – Reference ExA SoCG – 19.D16.V4.

Kind regards

Stephen

Stephen Faulkner MRTPI

Principal Planner

Community and Environmental Services

Telephone: 01603 222752

The Strategic Planning Team is working remotely in response to COVID-19 health advice. The team will be available by phone, email and Teams.

Please leave a voicemail if we are unable to answer your call and a member of the team will get back to you.

--

To see our email disclaimer click here <http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer>

Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm

Statement of Common Ground

Norfolk County Council

Applicant: Norfolk Boreas Limited
Document reference: ExA.SoCG-19.D16.V4
Deadline 9

Date: September 2020
Revision: Version 4
Author: Royal HaskoningDHV

Photo: Ormonde Offshore Wind Farm

Date	Issue No.	Remarks / Reason for Issue	Author	Checked	Approved
12/09/2019	01D	First draft for Norfolk County Council Review	CD	AR/JL	JL
11/11/2019	02D	Second draft for Norfolk County Council Review	CD	JL	JL
29/11/2019	03D	Third draft for Norfolk County Council Review	CD	JL	JL
02/12/2019	04D	Fourth draft with Norfolk County Council updates for submission at Deadline 2	CD	JL	JL
05/03/2020	05D	Fifth draft with Norfolk County Council updates for submission at Deadline 6	CD	JT	JL
09/04/2020	06F	Sixth draft for Norfolk County Council Review	CD	AR/JL	JL
28/04/2020	01F	Final to be submitted at Deadline 9	CD	JL	JL
21/09/2020	02F	Final to be submitted at Deadline 16	CD	JL	JL

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	The Development.....	1
1.2	Consultation with Norfolk County Council.....	1
2	Statement of Common Ground.....	5
2.1	Project-wide considerations	5
2.2	Water Resources and Flood Risk	8
2.3	Onshore Ecology and Ornithology	13
2.4	Traffic and Transport	17
2.5	Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.....	39
2.6	Tourism and recreation.....	44
2.7	Socio-economics	47

Table of Tables

Table 1 Summary of pre-application consultation with Norfolk County Council	2
Table 2 Summary of post-application consultation with Norfolk County Council	4
Table 3 Project-wide considerations	5
Table 4 Agreement Log - Water resources and flood risk	9
Table 5 Agreement Log- Onshore ecology and onshore ornithology	14
Table 6 Agreement Log - Traffic and transport	18
Table 7 Agreement Log - Onshore archaeology and cultural heritage	40
Table 8 Agreement Log - Tourism and recreation	45
Table 9 Agreement Log - Socio-economics	48

Appendices

Appendix 1	Highways England Norfolk Vanguard Briefing Notes BN07 and BN08
Appendix 2	Norfolk Vanguard Technical Note Responding to Norfolk County Council's Request for Trenchless Crossings of the A1067 and B1149

Glossary of Acronyms

ADBA	Archaeological Desk Based Assessment
AMP	Access Management Plan
CIA	Cumulative Impact Assessment
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice
CWS	County Wildlife Sites
DCO	Development Consent Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
EMP	Ecological Management Plan
EPP	Evidence Plan Process
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
HIA	Health Impact Assessment
HVAC	High Voltage Alternating Current
HVDC	High Voltage Direct Current
MMP	Materials Management Plan
MSA	Mineral Safeguard Area
OAMP	Outline Access Management Plan
OCoCP	Outline Code of Construction Practice
OLEMS	Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Strategy
OTMP	Outline Traffic Management Plan
OTP	Outline Travel Plan
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
TMP	Traffic Management Plan
TP	Travel Plan
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation
VMPL	Vattenfall Wind Power Limited

Glossary of Terminology

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 grid connection location for Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard.
Norfolk Boreas	The Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm project.
Norfolk Boreas Limited	The Applicant undertaking the development of the Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm project (an affiliate company of VWPL).
Norfolk Vanguard	Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm, sister project of Norfolk Boreas.

Onshore cable route	The up to 35m working width within a 45m wide corridor 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 HVDC to HVAC, to 400kV (grid voltage). This also contains equipment to help maintain stable grid voltage.
Trenchless crossing zone (e.g. HDD)	Areas within the onshore cable route which will house trenchless crossing entry and exit points.
The Applicant	Norfolk Boreas Limited

1 INTRODUCTION

1. This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared between Norfolk County Council and Norfolk Boreas Limited (hereafter the Applicant) to set out the areas of agreement, ongoing discussions or disagreement in relation to the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm (hereafter ‘the project’).
2. This SoCG comprises an agreement log which has been structured to reflect the topics of interest to Norfolk County Council with regard to the Norfolk Boreas DCO application (hereafter ‘the Application’). The agreement logs (Table 3 to Table 9) outline all topic specific matters agreed, not agreed and actions to resolve between Norfolk County Council and the Applicant.
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. Matters 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 Boreas Offshore Wind Farm and associated infrastructure. A full description of the project can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference 6.1.5 of the Application, APP-218).
5. The Application is seeking consent for the following two alternative development scenarios:
 - **Scenario 1** – Norfolk Vanguard proceeds to construction and installs ducts and other shared enabling works for Norfolk Boreas.
 - **Scenario 2** – Norfolk Vanguard does not proceed to construction and Norfolk Boreas proceeds alone. Norfolk Boreas undertakes all works required as an independent project.
6. Where a topic of agreement is specific to a scenario this is identified in the Agreement Log (section 2), otherwise the agreement applies to both scenarios.

1.2 Consultation with Norfolk County Council

7. This section briefly summarises the consultation that the Applicant has had with Norfolk County Council. For further information on the consultation process please see the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application, APP-027).

1.2.1 Pre-Application

8. The Applicant has engaged with Norfolk County 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, Norfolk County Council provided comments on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) by way of email 28th November 2018.
10. Further to the statutory Section 42 consultation, meetings were held with Norfolk County Council through the Evidence Plan Process (EPP). For further details on these meetings see sections 9.5, 12.5, 13.5, 18.5, 21.5 and 21.6 of the Consultation Report (document 5.1 of the Application, APP-027). These included meetings for onshore archaeology, traffic and transport, onshore ecology and water resources and flood risk and the minutes of the meetings are provided as appendices to the Consultation Report (see Table 1 for details).
11. Table 1 provides a summary of pre-application correspondence with Norfolk County Council.

Table 1 Summary of pre-application consultation with Norfolk County Council

Date	Contact Type	Topic
Pre-Application		
January / February 2018	Email from the Applicant	Issue of Method Statements and Agreement Logs for relevant Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) topics.
March 2018	EPP Meeting	Onshore and Offshore Archaeology agreement on method statements (minutes in document 5.1.9.44 of the Application, APP-081).
May 2018	EPP Meeting	Traffic and Transport agreement on method statement and traffic parameters for the scenarios (minutes in document 5.1.9.42 of the Application, APP-079)
November 2018	Section 42 consultation	Norfolk County Council response to section 42 consultation on PEIR. Appendix 24.01 of the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1.24.1 of the Application, APP-180).
January 2019	Emails from the Applicant	Offering any topic specific EPP meetings for relevant onshore EIA topics (for those topics not identified below it was concluded a meeting was not required).
February 2019	EPP Meeting	Onshore archaeology agreement on finding of geophysical survey and approach to ES Chapter (minutes in document 5.1.28.1 of the Application, APP-192).

Date	Contact Type	Topic
	EPP Meeting (conference call)	Water Resources and Flood Risk agreement on approach to the Environmental Statement and section 42 responses. (minutes in document 5.1.28.1 of the Application, APP-192). Norfolk County Council invited but not able to attend but minutes and updated agreement log provided post meeting
	EPP Meeting (conference call)	Onshore Ecology and Ornithology process meeting to discuss section 42 responses and approach to Environmental Statement (document 5.1.28.1 of the Application, APP-192). Norfolk County Council invited but not able to attend but minutes and updated agreement log provided post meeting
July 2019	Email from the Applicant	Providing early sight of relevant chapters of the Environmental Statement.

12. Consultation was also undertaken with Norfolk County Council concerning matters relevant to both projects by Norfolk Vanguard and has been taken into account by Norfolk Boreas. For details see Norfolk Vanguard Statement of Common Ground – Norfolk County Council (Norfolk Vanguard examination document REP9-047).

1.2.2 Post-Application

13. The Applicant met with Norfolk County Council on 24th July 2019 to agree the approach for drafting the SoCG. Norfolk County Council agreed that the SoCG should cover the same subject areas as identified in the Norfolk Vanguard SoCG, i.e. focusing on traffic and transport, onshore ecology, historic environment, flood risk, tourism and recreation and socio economics only.
14. This SoCG is a live document and will be updated throughout the examination process. This version is the original draft and takes consideration of the relevant representations submitted as part of the Section 56 Consultation (RR-037).

15. Table 2 provides a summary of post-application correspondence with Norfolk County Council.

Table 2 Summary of post-application consultation with Norfolk County Council

Date	Contact Type	Topic
Post-Application		
24 th July 2019	Meeting	Project update and agreement on approach to SoCG's.
4 th November 2019	Meeting	Project update and discuss comments on SoCG relating to socio-economics and traffic and transport
15 th January 2020	Meeting	Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas project update meeting
12 th February 2020	Meeting	Meeting on Cawston Traffic attended by with Highways Authority, Cawston Parish Council and Broadland District Council.
16 th March 2020	Meeting	Meeting to discuss Road Safety Audit of Revised Highway Intervention Scheme for Cawston

2 STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

16. Within the sections and tables below the different topics for agreement, ongoing discussion and disagreement for the different subject areas between Norfolk County Council and the Applicant are set out.

2.1 Project-wide considerations

17. Table 3 provides areas of agreement and disagreement for project-wide considerations.

Table 3 Project-wide considerations

Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
Electricity supply		
<p>The principle of offshore wind is supported, as Norfolk Boreas accords with national renewable energy targets and objectives.</p> <p>This was noted in Norfolk County Councils PEIR response in November 2018.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed that both parties support offshore wind in principle and the project accords with national targets and objectives for renewable energy.
<p>The onshore connection point was determined through a statutorily mandated process involving both the Applicant and National Grid, to identify a direct connection to the 400kV national transmission system.</p> <p>There are no planning or regulatory mechanisms through which the Applicant could identify direct 'infeeds' into the regional distribution network in Norfolk.</p>	Agreed	The County Council accepts that Vattenfall are unable to influence National Grid and UK Power Networks regarding options to potentially feed electricity into the local transmission networks.
Site selection		
<p>The methodology adopted for selecting and assessing the onshore project substation location options, including the final option, is considered robust and appropriate (ES Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives, document reference 6.1.4 of the Application, APP-127).</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the approach to selecting and assessing the onshore project substation location was appropriately undertaken.
<p>The methodology adopted for selecting and assessing the landfall location options, including the final option, is considered robust and appropriate. (ES Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives, document reference 6.1.4 of the Application, APP-127).</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the approach to selecting and assessing landfall location was appropriately undertaken.
<p>The proposed transition pit has been suitably set back from the cliff edge to ensure natural coastal erosion will not affect the drilled cable or</p>	Agreed	The County Council ask that sufficient safeguards and mitigation measures are

Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
<p>transition pits within the conceivable lifetime of the project (approx. 30 years).</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant has committed to a long HDD to avoid any interaction with intertidal areas.</p> <p>Requirement 17 of the draft DCO (Landfall Method Statement) commits the Applicant to producing a method statement for the landfall works including the long HDD and any associated mitigation measures. This will be approved by the relevant planning authority. With this in place, measures to mitigate any impacts associated with the landfall are adequately secured.</p>		<p>put in place where the offshore cable route makes landfall to the south of Happisburgh (as a planning requirement), in order to ensure the onshore infrastructure does not exacerbate existing coastal erosion in the area.</p>
<p>Committing to a High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) solution removes the need for additional onshore infrastructure (cable relay station) in North Norfolk and reduces the potential environmental impact associated with the cable route by narrowing the cable corridor from 50m to 35m.</p> <p>This was noted in Norfolk County Councils PEIR response in November 2018.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The County Council welcomes the decision by Vattenfall to pursue a HVDC solution, particularly in terms of minimising the impacts of this development on the landscape in North Norfolk.</p>
<p>Health Impact Assessment (HIA)</p>		
<p>Detailed matters relating to construction noise and local environmental health, will be addressed by the relevant District Councils and/or other statutory body such the Environment Agency.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The County Council would expect detailed matters relating to construction noise and local environmental health, to be addressed by the relevant District Councils.</p> <p>Providing the District Councils are satisfied with the proposal in relation to the above matters, the County Council would not wish to raise any public health concerns at this time.</p>
<p>Minerals and waste</p>		
<p>The provision of a Materials Management Plan (MMP) is considered suitable to mitigate any potential impacts to the Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSA).</p> <p>This was noted in Norfolk County Councils PEIR response in November 2018.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Norfolk County Council in its capacity as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority does not object to the Proposed Boreas Wind Power Project. Requirement 20(2)(f) of the</p>

Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
<p>The MMP will form part of the final Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and is secured through Requirement 20(2)(f) of the draft DCO.</p>		<p>draft DCO adequately secures the request that the applicant continues to work with Norfolk County Council regarding the mitigation of impacts on the Mineral Safeguarding Areas.</p>

2.2 Water Resources and Flood Risk

18. The project has the potential to impact upon water resources and flood risk. Chapter 20 Water Resources and Flood Risk of the ES, (document reference 6.1.20 of the Application, APP-233), provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
19. Details on the Evidence Plan for water resources and flood risk can be found in Consultation Report Appendix 9.22 (document reference 5.1.9.22 of the Application, APP-059) and Appendix 28.1 (document 5.1.28.1 of the Application, APP-192).
20. Table 4 outlines the topics for agreement with respect to water resources and flood risk between Norfolk County Council and the Applicant.

Table 4 Agreement Log - Water resources and flood risk

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
Environmental Impact Assessment			
Existing Environment	<p>Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment.</p> <p>Detailed in section 20.5.2 of ES Chapter 20 Water Resources and Flood Risk (document reference 6.1.20, APP-233). The survey data collected as part of the Norfolk Vanguard project is suitable for use in the Norfolk Boreas EIA.</p> <p>Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that sufficient survey data have been collected to undertake the assessment.
Assessment methodology	<p>The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA, section 20.4 of ES Chapter 20 (APP-233) provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts of the project.</p> <p>Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the impact assessment methodologies used in the EIA are appropriate.
	<p>The worst case assumptions presented in the assessment for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2, as outlined in ES Chapter 20 (APP-233) Table 20.15 and 20.16 respectively, are appropriate.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the worst case assumptions presented in the ES are appropriate for this project.
Assessment findings	<p>The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in terms of water resources and flood risk as outlined in section 20.6 of ES Chapter 20 (APP-233).</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the ES adequately characterises the baseline environment.
	<p>The assessment of impacts of both scenarios for construction, operation and decommissioning presented in section 20.7 of ES Chapter 20 (APP-233) are consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment is consistent with the agreed methodologies.

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	The assessment of cumulative impacts of both scenarios presented in section 20.8 of ES Chapter 20 (APP-233) is consistent with the agreed methodologies.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment of cumulative impact is consistent with the agreed methodologies
Approach to mitigation	<p>Under Scenario 2 the proposed locations for trenchless crossing techniques as detailed in Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 16 (13) of the draft DCO are appropriate and will be explored further and details agreed at each location at detailed design stage.</p> <p>Under Scenario 1 trenchless crossings will not be required as these will have been pre-installed by Norfolk Vanguard.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the proposed trenchless crossing techniques under Scenario 2 are appropriate, subject to detailed design.
	<p>The onshore project substation surface water drainage plan will have sufficient storage / attenuation volume to ensure that during the 1 in 100 year rainfall event, plus an allowance for climate change, there will be no increase in surface water runoff from the site.</p> <p>Whilst the outline drainage design assumptions included an allowance of 40% for climate change, this was included as contingency to demonstrate proof of concept. As the operational life of the project is approximately 30 years, the relevant flood risk epoch is 2040 to 2069 using the Environment Agency's Climate Change Allowance Guidance. This identifies an allowance of 20% for climate change.</p> <p>Based on the operational life of the substation (30 years) the detailed design of the surface water drainage plan will therefore allow for the 1 in 100 year critical rainfall plus 20% for climate change as a minimum (as identified within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment). This is appropriate and in accordance with the Environment Agency's Climate Change Allowance guidance.</p> <p>40% climate change allowance is the worst-case allowance identified for developments that have a design life extending beyond 2070. The onshore</p>	Agreed	While the Council's requested figure for climate change allowance (40%) is consistent with advice set out by County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority it is felt that given the operational life of the development (approximately 35 years) a reduced figure of 20% is acceptable

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>project substation has a 30-year design life running from approximately 2025-2055. Whilst the Applicant is committed to adopting best practice design standards for all infrastructure, adopting elevated standards that aren't appropriate for the proposal may lead to unnecessary over-engineering within the design and potentially affect the functionality of the drainage system that is installed. These systems are designed to receive a certain volume of water to self-clean. If they are over designed and receive less water than expected there is a risk they will silt up which could lead to impacts to the sensitive chalk river catchment.</p>		
	<p>The outline Operational Drainage Plan (document reference 8.21, APP-712) sets out the principles for the development of the operational drainage at the onshore project substation in accordance with the principles of Sustainable Drainage Systems discharge hierarchy. The final Operational Drainage Plan will be developed in accordance with the outline plan, in consultation with Norfolk County Council. This is secured through Requirement 32 of the draft DCO, as such mitigation to manage potential flood risk impacts associated with the operation of the onshore project substation will be appropriate and adequately secured.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>It is agreed by both parties that mitigation to manage operational flood risk at the onshore project substation will be appropriate and adequately secured.</p>
	<p>The mitigation proposed for managing flood risk is appropriate and adequate.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>It is agreed by both parties that that mitigation to manage flood risk will be appropriate and adequate.</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	Part 4 of the DCO (Supplemental Powers) Article 15 (Discharge of water and works to watercourses) sets out that the Applicant must not undertake any works to any ordinary watercourse without the consent of the relevant drainage authorities or Norfolk County Council.	Agreed	The County Council confirms that for ordinary watercourses that are to be crossed by open cut trenching or where any other temporary works proposed as part of this project are likely to affect flows in an ordinary watercourse, then the Applicant would need the approval of Norfolk County Council
Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)			
Wording of Requirement(s)	The wording of Requirements 20, 25 and 32 presented provided within the draft DCO (and supporting certified documents) for the mitigation of impacts to water resources and flood risk are considered appropriate and adequate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the wording of Requirement 20, 25 and 32 that mitigation to manage flood risk will be appropriate and adequately secured.

2.3 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology

21. The project has the potential to impact upon onshore ecology and ornithology. Chapter 22 Onshore Ecology and Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology of the ES, (document reference 6.1.22 and 6.1.23 of the Application, APP-235 and APP-236 respectively), provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
22. Details on the Evidence Plan for onshore ecology and ornithology can be found in Consultation Report Appendix 9.17 (document reference 5.1.9.17 of the Application, APP-054) and Appendix 28.1 of the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1.28.1 of the Application, APP-192).
23. Table 5 outlines the topics for agreement with respect to onshore ecology and ornithology between Norfolk County Council and the Applicant.

Table 5 Agreement Log- Onshore ecology and onshore ornithology

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
Environmental Impact Assessment			
Survey methodology	Survey methodologies for Phase 1 Habitat Surveys are appropriate and sufficient. Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that sufficient survey data have been collected to undertake the assessment.
	Survey methodologies for Phase 2 Surveys are appropriate and sufficient. Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.	Agreed	Both parties agree that Phase 2 survey scopes are appropriate.
Existing Environment	Survey data collected for Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas for the characterisation of onshore ecology and ornithology are suitable for the assessment (as summarised in section 22.5.2 of ES Chapter 22 (APP-235) and section 23.5.2 of ES Chapter 23 (APP-236)). Due to access constraints only 65% of the onshore project area and only 45% of the ponds within the onshore study area were subject to ecological field surveys. The use of the Norfolk Living Map to 'fill-in' data gaps at this stage, is appropriate to inform the assessment. The Applicant has committed to undertake field surveys of all un-surveyed areas post consent, which will inform site specific mitigation.	Agreed	The County Council recognises field surveys of the currently un-surveyed locations will be necessary post-consent, and these surveys may lead to further mitigation at specific locations.
	County Wildlife Sites (CWS) in proximity to the cable route have been sufficiently surveyed to inform the assessment of potential impacts. At an early stage, the County Council advised that surveying of CWS close to the cable corridor was necessary (Norfolk Vanguard Evidence Plan Process meeting Jan 2017, Minutes included in Appendix 9.32 of the Consultation report (APP-069)). This was accepted by the Applicant and the surveys were completed.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the survey effort at CWS in proximity to the works is sufficient to inform the assessment.

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in terms of onshore ecology and ornithology.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the ES adequately characterises the baseline environment.
Assessment methodology	Appropriate legislation, planning policy and guidance relevant to ecology and ornithology has been considered for the project (listed in section 22.2 ES Chapter 22 Ecology (APP-235) and section 23.2 in ES Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology (APP-236). Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the appropriate legislation, planning policy and guidance has been taken into account with regard to onshore ecology and ornithology.
	The list of potential impacts on onshore ecology (section 22.7 ES Chapter 22) and ornithology (section 23.4 in ES Chapter 23) assessed is appropriate. Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the list of potential impacts considered is appropriate.
	The impact assessment methodologies used for the EIA provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts of the project. Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the impact assessment methodologies used in the EIA are appropriate.
	The worst case assumptions for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 presented in the ES Chapter 22 (Table 22.22 and Table 22.33) for onshore ecology and ES Chapter 23 (Table 23.23 and 23.24) for onshore ornithology, are appropriate for the project.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the worst case assumptions presented are appropriate.
Assessment findings	The assessment of impacts of both scenarios for construction, operation and decommissioning presented in the ES (Chapter 22 section 22.7 Chapter 22 and section 23.7 Chapter 23) are consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.
	The assessment findings for potential cumulative impacts for both scenarios presented in the ES (section 22.8 Chapter 22 and section 23.8 Chapter 23) are consistent with the agreed methodologies.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment is consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies.

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
Mitigation and Management			
Approach to mitigation	<p>The provision of an Ecological Management Plan (EMP) (based on the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS) submitted with the DCO application, document reference 8.7 (APP-698) is considered suitable to ensure potential impacts identified in the Ecological Impact Assessment are reduced to a non-significant level.</p> <p>The OLEMS sets out that all hedgerows will be reinstated along the cable route and sets out additional hedgerow planting that is proposed in proximity to the onshore project substation.</p>	Agreed	The County Council welcome the approach and agrees the content of the outline CoCP and the OLEMS.
	<p>Under Scenario 2 the use of trenchless crossing techniques at CWS is acceptable subject to detailed design.</p> <p>Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.</p> <p>Under Scenario 1 trenchless crossings will not be required as these will have been pre-installed by Norfolk Vanguard.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the use of trenchless crossings at CWS are acceptable, subject to detailed design.
	<p>The mitigation proposed for bats (ES Chapter 22 section 22.7.5.10) is appropriate and proportionate.</p>	Agreed	The County Council is content that appropriate mitigation for bats has been identified and notes that during the design process the landfall has moved away from the key area of concerns for Barbastelle bats at the Paston Great Barn SAC colony.
Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)			
Wording of Requirement(s)	<p>The Requirements provided in the draft DCO (and supporting certified documents) for the mitigation of impacts to onshore ecology and ornithology are considered appropriate and adequate.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the Requirements provided in the draft DCO are considered appropriate and adequate.

2.4 Traffic and Transport

24. The project has the potential to impact upon traffic and transport. Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport of the ES, (document reference 6.1.24 of the Application, APP-237), provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
25. Further details on the Evidence Plan for traffic and transport can be found in Consultation Report Appendix 9.18 (document reference 5.1.9.18 of the Application, APP-055) and Appendix 9.42 (document reference 5.1.9.42 of the Application, APP-079).
26. Table 6 outlines the topics for agreement with respect to traffic and transport between Norfolk County Council and the Applicant.

Table 6 Agreement Log - Traffic and transport

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
Environmental Impact Assessment			
Existing Environment	Sufficient survey data (extent/duration) has been collected to inform the characterisation of the baseline environment.	Agreed	Agreed
Assessment methodology	The impact assessment methodologies used for the assessment represent an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts.	NCC has no specific points to raise	n/a
	The methodology adopted for the Great Yarmouth port assessment (onshore construction traffic derived from the port) is acceptable. Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process. All construction traffic associated with the onshore works, including that derived from relevant ports, will be included within the relevant Travel Plan for that stage of the works.	Agreed	Agreed
	The assessment adequately defines the realistic worst case scenario for traffic demand for Scenario 1 (S1-WCS) and Scenario 2 (S2-WCS) (ES Chapter 24 section 24.7.2 and 24.7.3, respectively). Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process. NCC requested clarification regarding the change in HGV increase for Link 33 B1149: The 132.1% increase in HGV flows relates to traffic flows presented within the Norfolk Vanguard ES and is derived by an additional 234 HGV construction movements to the future baseline (2022) of 178 HGV movements.	Other than issues specifically identified elsewhere within this Statement of Common Ground - this is now agreed.	Agreed

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>In comparison, Norfolk Boreas Scenario 2 presents a lower increase of 117.8% in HGV flows (derived by an additional 213 HGV construction movements to the future baseline (2023) of 180 HGV movements.</p> <p>By using professional judgement, based on the outlined HGV construction flows, character and classification of the B1149 (Main Distributer others) and baseline flows. It was deemed that the reduced % increase in HGV flows constituted a low magnitude of change from the Medium presented in Norfolk Vanguard. Thus, resulting in an impact significance of Minor Adverse. Notwithstanding, in the event that the magnitude of effect were to stay as Medium, the impact significance would still result in a Minor adverse impact and no further assessment would be required.</p>		
	<p>The assessment adequately defines the realistic worst case scenario for employee distribution for Scenario 1 (S1-WCS) and Scenario 2 (S2-WCS) (ES Chapter 24 section 24.7.2 and 24.7.3, respectively).</p> <p>Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.</p>	NCC have no specific points to raise	n/a
	<p>The assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment in terms of traffic and transport.</p>	NCC have no specific points to raise	n/a
Abnormal Indivisible Loads	<p>Consideration of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) is presented within section 3.6 of the Outline Traffic Management plan (OTMP) (document reference 8.8 of the Application, APP-699). An AIL Route Access Study is included as Appendix 3 of the OTMP, which sets out the type of management measures which could be employed to minimise disruption to traffic during AIL delivery.</p>	NCC is satisfied that any impact from abnormal loads will be insignificant and falls outside the current assessment. However, it will still need to be assessed at a later and appropriate time.	Agreed

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>The movement of AILs will be subject to separate agreement with the relevant highway authorities and police through the Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads system.</p>		
<p>Approach to mitigation</p>	<p>With the exception of points identified separately in this SoCG, the measures described in the OTMP, Outline Travel Plan (OTP) and Outline Access Management Plan (OAMP) (document reference 8.8, 8.9 and 8.10 of the application (APP-699, APP-700, APP-701)) are considered appropriate. Further detail and site-specific measures will be developed in the final documents post-consent and will require approval from the relevant planning authority in consultation with the highways authority. This is secured through DCO Requirement 21 of the draft DCO.</p> <p>The OTMP (section 3.9), secured through DCO Requirement 21, states that “A highway condition survey would be undertaken by the contractor before the commencement of construction and after the substantial completion of construction works. Any damage to the existing road network or public highway as a consequence of the construction activities, will be made good to the reasonable satisfaction of NCC.”</p> <p>It is proposed to update the OTMP to clarify the Applicant’s approach to highway conditions surveys with the following amendment.</p> <p>“A highway condition survey would be undertaken by the contractor before the commencement of construction and after the substantial completion of construction works.</p> <p>The specification and scale of the survey would be agreed with NCC prior to implementation and would be proportional to</p>	<p>The TMP; TP and AMP are all in outline form only. Accordingly, they are working documents that need to be progressed as the project develops.</p> <p>In particular temporary signage will be required in accordance with TSRGD as well as Temporary speed limits via Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders The exact details to be confirmed via the CTMP. Also require a commitment to remove temporary construction accesses unless otherwise approved by the HA.</p> <p>The Applicants commitment to updating the OTMP to incorporate S278 agreements and part 1 claims is noted and accepted.</p>	<p>Agreed, the OTMP has been updated to include reference to S278 and S59 agreements.</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>the Project's impacts using recognised UK Pavement Management Systems.</p> <p>Any damage to the existing road network or public highway as a consequence of the construction activities, will be made good to the reasonable satisfaction of NCC."</p> <p>It is anticipated NCC would utilise the powers afforded under S59 of the Highways Act to ensure that evidenced damage is adequately repaired or a financial contribution is made for the cost of repair.</p> <p>The Applicant will ensure effective and open communication with local stakeholders affected by the construction works (as detailed in Section 2.4 of the OCoCP) and further details will be provided in a communication plan will developed as part of the final CoCP.</p> <p>Under the dDCO, offsite highway works can only be undertaken with the consent of the street authority, and when providing consent, the street authority can attach reasonable conditions to the consent. In addition, the draft DCO does not preclude the use of agreements with street authorities (i.e. s278 agreements). Therefore, for offsite highway works required under the OTMP, the Applicant envisages that NCC's consent will be required and will be subject to a condition that the undertaker is responsible for Part 1 claims arising from the offsite highway works in the usual way. This update is captured in paragraph 103 of OTMP Version 6 [REP 14-022]</p>		
	<p>Within section 4.3.2 of the submitted Outline Traffic Management Plan TMP (Document reference 8.8, APP-699) Link 68 (The Street at Oulton) during Norfolk Boreas Scenario</p>	<p>The County Council is satisfied the proposed off-site highway works for Oulton will mitigate against the impact arising from the applicant's</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>2, serves mobilisation area MA7 during the duct installation period and access points AC84, AC85, AC88 during the Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 cable pulling works.</p> <p>A scheme of mitigation (Table 4.2 of the OTMP) has been developed by Hornsea Project Three (and agreed with Norfolk County Council) on The Street at Oulton which incorporates all of the required traffic management measures for a single development alone, or for projects cumulatively.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to adopting the mitigation under both scenarios. In effect this scheme of mitigation, on the shared part of Link 68, would be sufficient to mitigate impacts for Norfolk Boreas alone, Hornsea Project Three alone or for both projects together. The first project to proceed to construction would deliver the full scheme of mitigation and the final project remaining on site would be responsible for removing the measures once both projects' construction phases are complete.</p> <p>In addition, Norfolk Boreas Limited has committed not to route HGV construction traffic along Oulton Street north of the junction between the Street and Heydon Road.</p> <p>This commitment has been captured in the OTMP (document reference 8.8, APP-699) submitted with the Application.</p> <p>Norfolk Boreas will use the same cable Logistics Area, to the south east of Oulton for the same purpose as Norfolk Vanguard. It is the Applicant's preferred strategy to deliver cable drums and associated materials directly to the jointing bay locations from the supplier, and that the cable logistics area will seek to provide 'buffer' storage only should delivery or installation issues arise. The Cable Logistics Area will also</p>	<p>development – including the cumulative scenario with Hornsea 3.</p> <p>The information in relation to the cable logistics area is now agreed.</p>	

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>include a temporary site office, welfare and space for the storage of other materials associated with cable jointing such as cable joint kits and cement bound sand. The cable logistics area would only be used during the cable pulling phase of the project and would not be used during the duct installation phase or operational phases.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further information on the use of the Cable Logistics Area [RE2-027] and Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 of the OTMP have been updated to note the 10 HGV movements to and from the Cable Logistics Area.</p>		
	<p>Substation Access - The Applicant is continuing to engage with Highways England on the approach to junction design off the A47(T). An SoCG between the Applicant and Highways England is also being progressed.</p> <p>The approach to the junction design is set out in the Substation Access Clarification Technical Note (SACTN) and OAMP (document reference 8.10, APP-701) and have been agreed with Highways England for Norfolk Vanguard (Highways England Norfolk Vanguard Briefing Note BN07, see Appendix 1). The same design has been brought forward and included in the Norfolk Boreas Application (see section 24.7.6.3 of ES Chapter 24 (APP-237) and SACTN in ES Appendix 24.33 (APP-648).</p> <p>Requirement 22 of the draft DCO ensures that the siting, design, layout and any access management measures for any new, permanent or temporary means of access to a highway</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>NCC remain of the opinion that a full right turn lane is needed but acknowledge the applicant and Highways England are in discussion. Accordingly, we will leave Highways England to advise upon the suitability of the final junction design.</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>must be approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the highway authority.</p> <p>Following agreement of the SACTN (and on the understanding that the work outlined within the document is delivered to the satisfaction of Highways England post-consent), and with the inclusion of Requirement 22, this will ensure that that any final junction design will be fit for purpose with regard to safety, driver delay and will not obstruct any future plans for dualling the A47(T).</p>		
	<p>Construction access off the A47(T) at Scarning - The Applicant is continuing engage with Highways England on the approach to junction design off the A47(T) at Scarning. A SoCG between the Applicant and Highways England is also being progressed.</p> <p>The approach to the access strategy for the A47 cable crossing north west of Scarning, is set out in the Cable Crossing Access Technical Note (CCATN) and has been agreed in principle for Norfolk Vanguard (Highways England Norfolk Vanguard Briefing Note BN08, see Appendix 1). The same approach has been brought forward and included in the Norfolk Boreas Application (see OAMP, document reference 8.10, APP-701).</p> <p>Requirement 22 of the draft DCO ensures that the siting, design, layout and any access management measures for any new, permanent or temporary means of access to a highway must be approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant highway authority.</p> <p>Following agreement of the CCATN (and on the understanding that the work outlined within the document is delivered to the satisfaction of Highways England post-consent), and with the inclusion of Requirement 22, this will ensure that that any</p>	<p>NCC have received clarification from the Applicant that the maximum number of daily HGV movements generated from the National Grid Substation extension would be 68 (ref. SACTN, Table 4.1).</p> <p>With respect to the hourly traffic movements that are likely to be diverted to the Tavern Lane / Yaxham Road junction, this equates to a peak demand of 20 movements (3 HGVs and 17 employees) (ref. SACTN, Table 6.2). On the basis of these flows no further assessment is required.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>final junction design will be fit for purpose with regard to safety, driver delay and will not obstruct any future plans for dualling the A47(T).</p>		
<p>Cumulative impacts</p>	<p>The Street, Oulton (Link 68)</p> <p>A transport cumulative transport impact assessment was undertaken and presented in section 24.8 of ES Chapter 24, to consider the potential cumulative traffic and transport impacts of Norfolk Boreas in combination with other relevant projects.</p> <p>For Norfolk Boreas in the absence of mitigation, potentially significant cumulative pedestrian amenity impacts were identified along The Street at Oulton (Link 68) and a suite of mitigation measures have been identified, including temporary speed restriction, priority vehicle signage and passing bays to reduce impacts down to no greater than minor adverse significance.</p> <p>A scheme of mitigation has been developed by Hornsea Project Three (and agreed with Norfolk County Council) on The Street at Oulton which incorporates all of these requirements. This mitigation scheme has been reviewed by the Applicant and will deliver the measures identified within the Applicant's own cumulative impact assessment. The Applicant has therefore committed to also adopt this scheme of mitigation in full under both scenarios. The first project to proceed to construction would deliver the full scheme of mitigation and the final project would be responsible for</p>	<p>NCC supports a mitigation scheme proposed for Hornsea 3 which we believe overcomes the issue of either Norfolk Boreas or Ørsted using link 68 independently of each other. NCC would want to ensure that the two projects work together to ensure that the mitigation delivered for link 68 is introduced in full and retained for the duration of both projects and then removed, in order to minimise disruption.</p> <p>The information in relation to the cable logistics area is now agreed.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>removing the measures once both projects' construction phases are complete.</p> <p>This commitment has been captured in the OTMP (document reference 8.8, APP-699) submitted with the Application.</p> <p>Norfolk Boreas will use the same cable Logistics Area, to the south east of Oulton for the same purpose as Norfolk Vanguard. It is the Applicant's preferred strategy to deliver cable drums and associated materials directly to the jointing bay locations from the supplier, and that the cable logistics area will seek to provide 'buffer' storage only should delivery or installation issues arise. The Cable Logistics Area will also include a temporary site office, welfare and space for the storage of other materials associated with cable jointing such as cable joint kits and cement bound sand. The cable logistics area would only be used during the cable pulling phase of the project and would not be used during the duct installation phase or operational phases.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further information on the use of the Cable Logistics Area [RE2-027] and Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 of the OTMP have been updated to note the 10 HGV movements to and from the Cable Logistics Area.</p>		
	<p>B1145 at Cawston (Link 34)</p> <p>A transport cumulative transport impact assessment was undertaken and presented in section 24.8 of ES Chapter 24. The assessment identified the requirement for mitigation along the B1145 through Cawston (Link 34) to mitigate potentially significant pedestrian amenity impacts associated with the combined peak construction traffic flows for both Norfolk Boreas and Hornsea Project Three. The measures</p>	<p>Whilst the County Council Highway Authority would still prefer to see a haul route aimed at removing HGV construction traffic from Cawston Village, nevertheless we are satisfied the proposed HIS for Link 34 is sufficient to mitigate against the impact arising from the applicant's development, including the cumulative scenario with Hornsea3.</p>	<p>Joint Final Position Statement with NCC on HIS issued at Deadline 11 [REP11-016], which states that: Agreed that the HIS for Link 34 is</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>identified included enhanced pedestrian facilities, managed parking and road safety measures. The Applicant committed to peak traffic not exceeding 133 daily HGV movements for Norfolk Boreas alone during the cumulative scenario. This would ensure that cumulative HGV movements (combined with Hornsea Project Three) would not exceed 260, which would reduce the identified pedestrian amenity impacts to minor adverse.</p> <p>Following discussions with Cawston Parish Council as part of Norfolk Vanguard, the Applicant has sought to further reduce this peak traffic to as low as practicable within the existing construction programme. The Applicant is able to commit to a Norfolk Boreas peak of 112 daily HGV movements (in both the single project and cumulative scenario). This further commitment has been captured within an updated OTMP submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>This reduction does not change the findings of the CIA (the residual impacts remains minor adverse), however, they recognise the concerns of Cawston Parish Council and represent a further effort by the Applicant to reduce these short-term peaks to as low as practicable.</p> <p>A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been undertaken by Hornsea Project Three for the proposed scheme of mitigation and NCC's own auditors have also reviewed the proposed scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant understands that NCC's position is that the proposed scheme of mitigation along Link 34 would be suitable to mitigate traffic impacts with the incorporation of a small number of amendments to address issues raised through the Road Safety Audit, which will be addressed during detailed design post-consent.</p>	<p>We have previously identified a potential driver compliance issue, however we are now satisfied that the Applicants proposed amendments to the OTMP, as set out within this joint position statement, are sufficient to address the issue should it arise.</p>	<p>sufficient to mitigate against the impact arising from the Norfolk Boreas, including cumulative scenario with HP3.</p> <p>Measures to address driver compliance detailed in the OTMP section 5.6 are agreed.</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>The adopted scheme would be sufficient to mitigate impacts for Norfolk Boreas alone, Hornsea Project Three alone or for both projects together. The first project to proceed to construction would deliver the full scheme of mitigation and the second project would be responsible for removing the measures once both project’s construction phases are complete.</p> <p>Norfolk Boreas Limited is committed to continuing to engage with Norfolk Vanguard, Hornsea Project Three, NCC, Broadland District Council and Cawston Parish Council to finalise the scheme post-consent.</p> <p>It has been agreed with Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea Project Three that the Applicant would take forward the scheme design to address the concerns raised in the Road Safety Audit (RSA) and by Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>A revised Cawston Highway Intervention Scheme (HIS) was submitted to the Examination at Deadline 4 [REP4-016]. The scheme revisions were designed to address the remaining road safety concerns.</p> <p>A Stage 1 RSA was undertaken on the revised HIS and submitted at Deadline 5, together with a RSA decision log [REP5-055]. The decision log confirms the Applicant’s acceptance of all RSA recommendations and accordingly details minor revisions to the D4 HIS [RE4-016].</p> <p>The Applicant considers that all residual road safety matters have now been addressed and the HIS concept design is finalised.</p>		

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>The Applicant understands following a meeting with NCC Highways Authority on 16th March, that NCC do not require any further amendments to the HIS and there are no remaining technical objections. Accordingly, NCC also indicated they will be completing the RSA log to finalise the scheme.</p> <p>NCC have raised a concern with regard to driver compliance, that drivers may potentially fail to yield at pinch points causing traffic to back up, inducing unacceptable delays.</p> <p>In response to this concern, the Applicant has agreed to intensify the monitoring regime to facilitate early warning of issues and to work with NCC to develop correction measures to be introduced should driver compliance concerns manifest.</p> <p>A commitment to an intensification of monitoring and intervention measures has been included within the OTMP Version 4 submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>The Applicant has updated to the OTMP (Version 5) with the agreed measures to address possible driver compliance and as such the HIS is considered to be agreed with NCC.</p>		
	<p>Cawston Access Alternatives</p> <p>A review of a number of proposed options for traffic movements through Cawston was undertaken, full details are provided the Position Statement Cawston Traffic submitted at Deadline 5 [ExA.AS-2.D5.V1].</p> <p>Four alternative options were reviewed (Option 1 being the existing proposal to use the B1145 and the Highways Intervention Scheme);</p>	<p>In highway terms NCC favour Option 2 as it has the potential to remove all of the traffic from Cawston.</p> <p>Failing that we would also support Options 4; 3; and 1 (listed in order of preference due to traffic impact) subject to safety audit.</p> <p>We do not support Option 5 as the highway network is not suitable to cater for the traffic proposed.</p>	<p>Both sides differ in relation to which access proposal should be pursued but agree the HIS design has received technical approval. Whilst other options may be desirable (noting</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2 (Norfolk Boreas Scenario 2 only) a full bypass from the B1149 requiring a new separate haulage route parallel to the cable corridor; • Option 3 (Norfolk Boreas Scenario 2 only) a light bypass where traffic uses the running track when not in use for duct installation; • Option 4 (Norfolk Boreas Scenario 2 only) moving mobilisation MA6 adjacent to the B1149; and • Option 5 (Norfolk Boreas Scenario 1 and 2) Implementing a one-way system using Heydon Road. <p>Option 2 - Due to the additional significant constraints relating to construction methodology, traffic demand, environment and land, (see Appendix 2) the full bypass option does not represent a viable alternative.</p> <p>Options 3 and 4 go against the principles of construction and associated embedded mitigation to minimise the amount of land required and duration of works and is constrained by the need for additional land outside the existing Order Limits. Therefore, are not considered an appropriate alternative.</p> <p>Option 5 with appropriate highway measures represents a viable route for reducing the HGV demand through Cawston High Street. An initial scheme concept was submitted at Deadline 5. The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by NCC on the initial scheme concept and provided updated drawings to NCC during meeting on 16th March. However,</p>	<p>Options 2 to 4: Involve a temporary access from the B1149 adjacent to the Applicant's cable crossing, which in turn links to a haul road. These options were previously dismissed by the County Council due to traffic management concerns.</p> <p>Our previous concerns have now been addressed by the Applicant as part of their assessment for traffic management at this same location relating to open cut trenching (albeit unrelated issues for open cut trenching remain).</p> <p>Out of the four possibilities presented, Norfolk County Council would favour options that can be used by Hornsea 3; Vanguard and Boreas rather than one wind farm in isolation.</p> <p>We fully recognise there are other environmental considerations which may render these options unacceptable.</p> <p>Option 5 – This option utilises a one-way system through Cawston, with the return journeys directed along existing narrow rural roads. NCC does not support this option on highway safety grounds. In addition, the fabric/construction of the road is not suitable to cater for the volume of traffic proposed.</p> <p>Firstly - the Applicant's concept drawings indicate the level of emerging visibility for vehicles exiting Heydon Road onto Cawston Road. However, the Applicant's vehicles will be travelling in the</p>	<p>environmental impact and cumulative traffic constraints)</p> <p>Option 1 accommodates cumulative traffic and subject to addressing the driver compliance issue, mitigates highway constraints.</p> <p>Option 5 is discounted on safety grounds.</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>NCC indicated that they do not consider Option 5 to be a suitable alternative.</p> <p>The Applicant's final position on Options 2,3 4 it is they are not appropriate to take them forward, based on considerations such as construction methodology, environmental impacts, and land requirements (including associated changes to Order limits), a is set out in the Position Statement on Cawston Traffic [ExA.AS-2.D5.V1].</p> <p>The Applicant's position on Option 5 is; had Option 5 been acceptable to NCC than the Applicant would have been willing to consider it further, but this is not the case. Whilst it may now not be possible to progress Option 5, there is still a suitable mitigation strategy which can be delivered in the form of the HIS.</p>	<p>opposite direction. Accordingly, the assessment needs to be made against forward visibility and not emerging visibility. NCC's concern is that HGVs will be stationary on the carriageway whilst making the turn into the junction at a point where forward visibility is restricted due to a bend in the road. This presents a risk of tail end collision. There has been one personal injury accident at this junction in the last 5 years, involving three vehicles and 2 casualties.</p> <p>Secondly – The Applicant's drawings indicate a visibility splay at the B1149 junction measuring 2.4 x 215m. However, the plans submitted are not based on a topographical survey and the presence of roadside trees significantly reduces on-site visibility below that indicated.</p> <p>Thirdly - These rural lanes are used by walkers; horse riders and cyclists. The volume of HGV traffic would turn a 1. mile length of public highway into a private haul road for a considerable period, rendering it inaccessible to non-motorised users.</p> <p>Lastly, the fabric/construction of the road is not suitable to cater for the volume of traffic proposed.</p> <p>The Applicant provided updated drawings for Option 5 during a meeting on the <u>16th</u> March 2020, however apart from providing 4 additional passing places the updated drawings do not</p>	

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>B1149 crossing</p> <p>An investigation was undertaken in response to the concerns raised by NCC on the potential impacts of open cut trenching on the B1149 and was submitted as part of the Norfolk Vanguard examination at Deadline 7.5 (see Appendix 2). The findings are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forecast cumulative traffic flows were examined and would fall well below the total vehicles per hour level at which single lane traffic management would lead to network disruption. A drawing has been provided showing the swept path of vehicles (including abnormal loads) which demonstrates that the proposed traffic management is viable. Norfolk Partnership Laboratory (NPL), investigated ground conditions at the B1149 to ascertain if an appropriate road reinstatement specification (to address additional concerns raised by NCC) would be feasible. The testing indicates that the road subsurface has good load bearing properties and a specification was identified for the reinstatement that liability. 	<p>address the concerns we have raised. In addition, it is now evident the Applicants proposal would involve filling in a drainage ditch which (apart from the obvious drainage implications) does not form part of the public highway and lies outside the Applicants order limits.</p> <p><u>NCC</u> note the applicant accepts it would be possible to provide a <u>trenchless</u> crossing design capable of being accommodated within the existing order limits</p> <p><u>NCC</u> accept the point that accommodating an <u>HDD</u> at this location would constrain the project design prior to detailed design, however we argue that when balanced against the concerns raised by both <u>NCC</u> and <u>Broadland</u> District Council, the Applicants reason is not sound or justifiable.</p> <p><u>NCC</u> maintains its view that an open cut method of duct installation at this specific point on the <u>B1149</u> is not appropriate.</p> <p><u>NCC</u> note the Applicant now accepts traffic signals would be required 24 hours a day, reducing the carriageway to one-way flows. With this in mind, we note paragraph <u>D5.1.6</u> of Chapter 8: -</p> <p>“...On roads where flows are very high, overload of the controlled area is possible and exceptional delays may result. This can occur with two-way flows as low as 1300 vehicles per hour (for sites</p>	<p>The Applicants and NCC are not able to agree which crossing method is appropriate. Given both methods are physically achievable, we both leave it for the SoS to determine.</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>An open cut trench crossing was deemed appropriate for Norfolk Vanguard and therefore is also considered appropriate Norfolk Boreas Scenario 2, as there is no evidence from the investigations to suggest that this form of open cut crossing and associated reinstatement will cause significant adverse impacts or present a maintenance liability for Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>NCC’s concerns regarding the 1.2m wide safety zone are noted and will be taken account in a revised traffic management drawing (incorporating the requisite 1.2m safety zone) which will be captured within an update to the OTMP submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>Under Scenario 1 the duct installation for Norfolk Boreas will have been undertaken by Norfolk Vanguard.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced an updated traffic management design which has been developed to address the safety concerns raised by NCC . The updated design incorporates a distance of separation of 1.5m (amply allowing for the required 1.2m safe working distance) and includes details for both sides of the carriageway. The drawings (which include Swept Path Analysis), demonstrate traffic management detail fully compliant with Chapter 8 of the Traffic Designs Manual, which can also accommodate Hornsea Project Three cumulative traffic (including Abnormal Loads) and is entirely within the current Norfolk Boreas DCO Order limits. The updated design has been included in the updated OTMP at Deadline 5.</p>	<p>about <u>50m</u> long)” and with a one-way flow of 900 vehicles per hour (for longer sites with balanced flows) with signal control.</p> <p>The <u>B1149</u> peak hourly traffic flows (Norfolk Boreas; combined with <u>Hornsea3</u>; plus baseline traffic) are forecast to be in the order of 900 movements and signal control is required for in excess of <u>50m</u>, thereby reducing the road to single flows. Accordingly, exceptional delays may result.</p> <p>Whilst <u>NCC</u> have not raised an objection relating to driver delay, nevertheless we wish to point out that such an impact lies on the cusp of acceptability.</p> <p><u>NCC</u> recognises that Norse laboratory has provided a construction specification, however the issue of long-term maintenance liability remains a significant concern, particularly given the potential for other future large-scale projects and their associated <u>HGV</u> load movements. Rural road structure can vary greatly, and with an increasing volume of base level traffic (notwithstanding the additional loading from these <u>HGV</u> movements) any weakening of the surface construction derived from breaking open the bound and <u>subgrade</u> layers will greatly increase the risk of carriageway failure for years to come.</p> <p><u>NCC</u> notes no detailed project timeframe has</p>	

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>It is the Applicant's position that an open cut crossing method is appropriate and feasible at this location. However, it is possible to develop a bespoke design to enable trenchless crossing in this location (in the event the SoS decides that a trenching crossing of the B1149 is necessary).</p>	<p>been provided and whilst the Applicant states a full and detailed construction method statement could be included within the final <u>CoCP</u>, as secured by Requirement 20(2)(g) of the <u>dDCO</u>, that would be too late to make the appropriate assessment.</p> <p>Whilst the Applicants indicate active construction works would not be required outside of construction hours, that does not address the point we make. <u>NCC's</u> point is that disruption would take place 24 hours per day as a direct result of the traffic signals, including noise associated with traffic stopping and starting at the signals during night-time hours.</p>	
	<p>A1067 crossing</p> <p>An investigation has been undertaken in response to the concerns raised by NCC on the potential impacts of open cut trenching on the A1067 and was submitted as part of the Norfolk Vanguard examination at Deadline 7.5 (see Appendix 2).</p> <p>Updated traffic counts were undertaken on the A1067 in April 2019. These show increased usage of the A1067 as a result of the operation of the Norwich Northern Distributor Road and forecast traffic flows for Norfolk Vanguard would now exceed the total vehicles per hour level at which single lane traffic management may be undertaken without network disruption. As a result, under Norfolk Boreas Scenario 2 the Applicant has now committed to undertake the crossing of the A1067 using trenchless techniques. This trenchless crossing will be included on the list of trenchless crossings in DCO Requirement 16 the</p>	<p>The commitment to trenchless crossing of the A1067 is welcomed.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>updated draft DCO submitted on 4th November 2019 (AS-019).</p> <p>The mobilisation areas either side of the A1067 (MA5a and MA5b) can be repurposed to be used as drilling and receiving compounds to enable this trenchless crossing to be undertaken within the existing Order limits.</p> <p>Under Scenario 1 the duct installation for Norfolk Boreas will have been undertaken by Norfolk Vanguard.</p>		
	<p>Link 41 – B1436, Felbrigg</p> <p>The Applicant has proposed to cap construction traffic to 93 daily HGV movements for Norfolk Boreas during the six week school summer holiday period.</p> <p>This cap represents typical average HGV demand and will be achieved by re-scheduling non-critical construction activities.</p> <p>After the six week school summer holiday period, the cap will revert to a maximum 287 daily HGV movements for Scenario 2 and 138 daily HGV movements for Scenario 1.</p> <p>This commitment has been captured within the OTMP submitted with the Application (document reference 8.8, APP-699).</p>	<p>This is acceptable to NCC</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
	<p>Link 36 – B1149, Holt Road</p> <p>During the Norfolk Vanguard Examination Norfolk County Council requested the use of an alternative route (Shortthorn Road) to avoid the village of Horsford along Link 36 (B1149). As this proposed diversion would take traffic off the B1149 and onto a lower classification road the Norfolk Vanguard</p>	<p>We have no objection to the alternative route proposed via links 39 and 37 but it needs be for all HGV traffic and not just in the cumulative scenario.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>proposed an alternative diversion for the cumulative scenario with Hornsea Project Three. This alternative diversion would use Link 39 (A140) and Link 37 (B1145) and ensure that traffic remains on a road of similar or greater standard, in terms of the road hierarchy, compared to the B1149.</p> <p>The Applicant is of the opinion that Link 36 is suitable for the proposed Norfolk Boreas daily peak HGV traffic, with the inclusion of a traffic cap (peak daily HGV movements no greater than 136) and enhanced mitigation, and represents the most efficient route for construction traffic, in comparison to the diversion along Shortthorn Road, which would be 2km longer and require traffic to divert onto a lower classification road.</p> <p>However, the Applicant recognises NCC's concerns and as there is a suitable alternative that ensures traffic remains on roads of similar or greater standard, in terms of the road hierarchy, which would not result in any impacts greater than those previously assessed, the Applicant will commit to avoiding the use of Link 36 for all HGV traffic (both for Norfolk Boreas alone and cumulatively with Hornsea Project Three). HGV traffic will instead be diverted along Link 39 (A140) and Link 37 (B1145). This commitment has been captured in an updated OTMP submitted at Deadline 1.</p>		
	<p>Link 32 – B1149, Edgefield</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to a cap of 289 cumulative daily HGV movements along Link 32. This will be achieved by a commitment for Norfolk Boreas Scenario 2 peak daily HGV movements to not exceed 136 in the cumulative scenario.</p>	<p>This is acceptable to NCC</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>For Scenario 1 the Applicant is committed to Norfolk Boreas peak traffic not exceeding 92 daily HGV movements alone or during the cumulative scenario.</p> <p>In addition, a restriction will be in place for the morning peak traffic flows between 07.30 and 09.00, i.e. no construction HGV movements along Link 32 during between 07.30 and 09.00 (this applies to Norfolk Boreas alone and in the cumulative scenario).</p> <p>These commitments are captured in the OTMP submitted with the Application (document reference 8.8, APP-699).</p>		
Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)			
Wording of Requirement(s)	<p>The wording of Requirements 21 and 22 provided within the draft DCO (and supporting certified documents) for the mitigation of impacts to traffic and transport are considered appropriate and adequate.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
	<p>The wording of Requirement 16 includes a list of trenchless crossings that were identified early in the project design and represent embedded mitigation that formed the basis of the design that was assessed within the Environmental Impact Assessment. Hence, they are listed in the detailed design DCO Requirement as they are considered fixed elements of the design.</p> <p>Further assessment work has been undertaken and the Applicant has committed to a trenchless crossing at the A1067 and this has been added to the list of trenchless crossings list under Requirement 16 in an updated draft DCO submitted on the 4th November (AS-019).</p>	<p>Whilst NCC disagrees with the Applicants overall assessment in relation to trenchless crossings, nevertheless we do agree that should the SoS be minded to accept trenchless crossing of the B1149, then this location will need to be included as an addition at Requirement 16(13), with reciprocal changes in Schedule 6 and Schedule 8 of the dDCO.</p>	<p>If the SoS agrees that trenchless crossing is required, then the applicant and NCC agree on the method to incorporate this within the dDCO.</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>Further assessment work has also been undertaken and the B1149 crossing. An open cut trench crossing is still deemed appropriate as there is no evidence from the investigations to suggest that this form of open cut crossing and associated reinstatement will cause significant adverse impacts or present a maintenance liability for the Norfolk County Council.</p>		

2.5 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

27. The project has the potential to impact upon onshore archaeology and cultural heritage. Chapter 28 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the ES, (document reference 6.1.28 of the Application, APP-241), provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
28. Details on the Evidence Plan for onshore archaeology and cultural heritage can be found in Consultation Report Appendix 9.25 (document reference 5.1.9.25 of the Application, APP-062), Appendix 9.44 (document reference 5.1.9.44 of the Application, APP-081) and Appendix 28.1 (document reference 5.1.28.1 of the Application, APP-192).
29. Table 7 outlines the topics for agreement with respect to onshore archaeology and cultural heritage between Norfolk County Council and the Applicant.

Table 7 Agreement Log - Onshore archaeology and cultural heritage

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
Environmental Impact Assessment			
Existing Environment	Sufficient survey data (extent/duration) has been collected to inform the assessment (section 28.6 of ES Chapter 28 (APP-241)). Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that sufficient survey data have been collected to undertake the assessment.
	It is accepted that outstanding geophysical surveys (scheme-wide) may be undertaken post-consent. Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the approach to survey data collection is appropriate to undertake the assessment.
	The approach to the selection of priority geophysical survey areas was appropriate and sufficient to inform the assessment of impacts. Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the approach to survey data collection is appropriate to undertake the assessment.
	Heritage setting viewpoint locations are representative and appropriate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the heritage setting viewpoint locations are representative.
	Archaeological trial trenching is not required to inform the assessment of impacts pre-application. Further evaluation will be completed post-consent. Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the approach to survey data collection is appropriate to undertake the assessment.
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 as part of the Evidence Plan Process.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the impact assessment methodologies used in the EIA are appropriate.

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>The worst-case assumptions for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 as outlined in Table 28.17 and Table 28.18 of ES Chapter 28 (APP-241) assessment is appropriate.</p> <p>Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the worst-case assumptions presented in the ES is appropriate for this project.
	<p>The assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment (section 28.6 of ES Chapter 28 (APP-241) in terms of onshore archaeology and cultural heritage, including the setting of designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the ES adequately characterises the baseline environment.
	<p>The scope of the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (ADBA) (ES Appendix 28.1, document reference 6.3.28.1, APP-666) is appropriate to inform the assessment.</p> <p>Agreed as part of the Evidence Plan Process.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the ADBA is appropriate to inform the assessment.
Assessment findings	<p>Based on all of the currently available information and assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described and commitment to further evaluation post-consent, impacts on onshore archaeology and cultural heritage of both scenarios (section 28.7 of ES Chapter 28, APP-241) during construction, operation and decommissioning, are very likely to be non-significant in EIA terms.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that based on the currently available information impacts are very likely to be non-significant. Accepting that there is a small risk that highly-significant, previously-unrecorded and unexpected heritage assets with archaeological interest could be encountered.
	<p>The assessment of cumulative effects of both scenarios (section 28.8 of ES Chapter 28, APP-241) is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, cumulative impacts on onshore archaeology and cultural heritage are non-significant in EIA terms.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the assessment of cumulative impact is appropriate and that the proposed mitigation will result in non-significant impacts.

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
Approach to mitigation	The provision of a pre-construction and construction Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (Onshore) (to be based on the outline WSI, document reference 8.5, APP-696) is considered suitable, with respect to Set-Piece Excavation; Strip, Map and Sample and archaeological monitoring/watching brief scenarios.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the provision of a WSI is considered suitable.
	The mitigation proposed for both scenarios for potential impacts on buried and above-ground archaeological remains is appropriate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the proposed mitigation will result in non-significant impacts.
Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)			
Wording of Requirement(s)	<p>The wording of the Requirements provided within the draft DCO (and supporting certified documents) for the mitigation of impacts to onshore archaeology and cultural heritage are considered appropriate and adequate.</p> <p>Specifically, Requirement 23 states: <i>“No stage of the onshore transmission works may commence until for that stage an archaeological written scheme of investigation (which accords with the outline written scheme of investigation (onshore)) has, after consultation with Norfolk County Council and Historic England, been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority”.</i></p> <p>And <i>“In the event that archaeological site investigation is required, the scheme must include details of the following—</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <i>an assessment of significance and research questions; and</i> (b) <i>the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;</i> (c) <i>the programme for post investigation assessment;</i> (d) <i>provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;</i> 	Agreed	Both parties are in agreement that potential impacts to archaeology and cultural heritage impacts will be adequately managed subject to the submission and approval of a final Written Scheme of Investigation.

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>(e) <i>provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;</i></p> <p>(f) <i>provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation. “</i></p> <p>(g) <i>nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the written scheme of investigation.</i></p>		

2.6 Tourism and recreation

30. The project has the potential to impact upon tourism and recreation. Chapter 30 Tourism and Recreation of the ES, (document reference 6.1.30 of the Application, APP-243), provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
31. Details on the Evidence Plan for tourism and recreation can be found in Consultation Report Appendix 9.20 (document reference 5.1.9.20 of the Application, APP-057).
32. Table 8 provides topics for agreement with respect to tourism and recreation between Norfolk County Council and the Applicant.

Table 8 Agreement Log - Tourism and recreation

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
Environmental Impact Assessment			
Existing Environment	Appropriate datasets have been presented to inform the assessments (Table 30.11 of ES Chapter 30, APP-243).	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that datasets are appropriate.
Assessment methodology	The impact assessment methodologies (section 30.4 of ES Chapter 30, APP-243) used provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts of the project.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the methodologies used are appropriate.
	The worst-case assumptions for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 as outlined in section 30.7.3.1 and section 30.7.3.2 of ES Chapter 30 (APP-243) presented in the assessments are appropriate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that worst case scenario presented is appropriate.
	The assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment in terms of tourism and recreation (section 30.6 of ES Chapter 30, APP-243).	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the baseline environment has been adequately characterised.
Assessment findings	The assessment of effects of both scenarios for construction, operation and decommissioning presented in section 30.7 of ES Chapter 30, APP-243) is appropriate and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, impacts on tourism and recreation are non-significant in EIA terms.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the residual impacts are non-significant.
	The assessment of cumulative effects of both scenarios is appropriate (section 30.8 of ES Chapter 30, APP-243) and, assuming the inclusion of the mitigation described, cumulative impacts on tourism and recreation are non-significant in EIA terms.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the residual cumulative impacts are non-significant.

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
Approach to mitigation	The mitigation measures identified within the Public Right of Way Strategy (document reference 8.4 of the Application, APP-695) and the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (document reference 8.1 of the Application, APP-692), are considered to be appropriate to mitigate impacts on the PRow and Trails network.	Agreed	Norfolk County Council believes these documents should result in appropriate measures to manage impacts in relation to cable-laying. The County Council welcomes the intention of the applicant to liaise with the PRow Officers and Trail Officers.
	Under Scenario 2 the Applicant has committed to trenchless crossing techniques at a number of sensitive footpaths, which will avoid direct impacts to those routes. These include the Norfolk Coast Path, and Marriott's Way, Paston Way and Wensum Way Long Distance Trails. This is detailed in Appendix 30.1 (document reference 6.3.30.1, APP-679). Under Scenario 1 trenchless crossings will have been pre-installed by Norfolk Vanguard.	Agreed	Norfolk County Council welcomes the use of HDD underneath some of the particularly heavily-used recreational routes (long-distance trails).
Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)			
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 Requirements within the DCO are appropriate and adequate.

2.7 Socio-economics

33. The project has the potential to impact upon socio-economics. Chapter 31 Socio-economics of the ES, (document reference 6.1.31 of the Application, APP-244), provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
34. Details on the Evidence Plan for socio-economics can be found in Consultation Report Appendix 9.20 (document reference 5.1.9.20 of the Application, APP-057).
35. Table 9 provides topics for agreement with respect to socio-economics between Norfolk County Council and the Applicant.

Table 9 Agreement Log - Socio-economics

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
Environmental Impact Assessment			
Existing Environment	Appropriate datasets have been presented to inform the assessments (Table 31.7 of ES Chapter 31, APP-244).	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that datasets are appropriate.
Assessment methodology	The impact assessment methodologies (section 31.4 of ES Chapter 31, APP-244) used provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts of the project.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the methodologies used are appropriate.
	The worst-case assumptions for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 as outlined in section 31.7.4.1 and section 31.7.4.2 of ES Chapter 31 (APP-244) scenario presented in the assessments is appropriate.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that worst case assumptions presented is appropriate.
	The assessment adequately characterises the baseline environment (section 31.6 of ES Chapter 31, APP-244) in terms of socio-economics.	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the baseline environment has been adequately characterised.
Approach to mitigation	<p>As set out in paragraph 163 of ES Chapter 21 Land Use and Agriculture (document reference 6.1.21 of the Application, APP-234), private agreements (or compensation in line with the compulsory purchase compensation code) will be sought between Norfolk Boreas Limited and relevant landowners/occupiers regarding any measures required in relation to crop loss incurred as a direct consequence of the construction phase of the project.</p> <p>Norfolk Boreas Limited is committed to exploring options for delivering a provision for communities, with the aim of recognising hosts and accounting for change, where benefits acknowledge and address tangible local change. The form of the benefit and its purpose will be explored with relevant stakeholders at the appropriate time, separate to the DCO process.</p>	Agreed	It is agreed by both parties that the commitment to delivering compensation to relevant landowners/occupiers incurred as a direct consequence of the construction phase of the project is appropriate.

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	Given the impacts of the project, the mitigation proposed for socio-economics are considered appropriate and adequate. Where significant impacts are identified suitable mitigation is proposed.		
	Where there is likely to be a demonstrable impact (i.e. during: construction; operation and/or decommissioning) on commercial fishing affecting communities in Norfolk, individual agreements will be reached as necessary, with any agreements based on evidence and track record and in accordance with FLOWW Best Practice Guidance for Offshore Renewables Developments.	Agreed	The County Council welcomes the revised/amended design of the above proposal and mitigation measures set out in the applicant's ES.
	Norfolk Boreas Limited recognises the economic benefits of using local Port facilities at Great Yarmouth and Vattenfall has signed an agreement with Peel Ports that reserves space for the potential future operations and maintenance use of the site. This is subject to DCO consent award and other regulatory considerations.	Agreed	The County Council will continue to work pro-actively with Vattenfall to demonstrate the economic benefits of using the Port facilities at Great Yarmouth
	Vattenfall is actively seeking to collaborate with stakeholders to support, complement and enhance where appropriate, local skills development programmes. The aim shared with these stakeholders is to work towards a sustainable and resilient employment pipeline, and to channel into / retain more local intellectual and social capital within the green energy sector. To date this has included collaborations with University of East Anglia, UTCN Norwich, local schools, EEEGR, NCC, NALEP and others.	Agreed	The County Council will also continue to work with the Applicant to develop the creation of apprenticeships and work experience.
Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)			
Wording of Requirement(s)	<p>A Skills and Employment Strategy Requirement has been included within the draft DCO (Requirement 33), which will demonstrate consistency with advice set out in paragraph 55 of the NPPF.</p> <p>An Outline Skills and Employment Strategy has been submitted with the application (document 8.22), which sets out the approach that will be adopted by the Applicant to maximise the economic benefit associated</p>	The County Council welcomes the inclusion within the draft DCO of a Planning Requirement, which will ensure	The County Council is satisfied with the wording of the proposed Planning Requirement (33) set out in the draft DCO.

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited position	Norfolk County Council position	Final position
	<p>with Norfolk Boreas in Norfolk and the East of England and the principles that must be adhered to, including the types of activities to be undertaken by the Applicant as part of the development. The strategy also includes a commitment by the Applicant to produce a Supply Chain Plan and the Applicant will continue to work closely with local communities, communities of interest and stakeholders to explore means of local optimisation of supply chain, jobs and skills opportunities associated with the project.</p>	<p>that a Skills and Employment Strategy is prepared.</p>	

The names inserted below are to confirm that these are the current positions of the two parties contributing to this SOCG

Printed Name	Stephen Faulkner
Position	Principal Planner
On behalf of	Norfolk County Council
Date	22 September 2020

Printed Name	Jake Laws
Position	Norfolk Boreas Consents Manager
On behalf of	Norfolk Boreas Limited (the Applicant)
Date	21 September 2020