



# **Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects**

Draft Statement of Common Ground with Historic  
England: Onshore & Offshore

Title:	
<b>Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects Draft Statement of Common Ground with Historic England: Onshore and Offshore</b>	
PINS Document no.: 20.19	
Document no.: C282-RH-Z-GA-00245	
Revision: A	
Date:	Classification
<b>July 2023</b>	<b>Draft</b>
Prepared by:	
<b>Royal HaskoningDHV</b>	
Approved by:	Date:
<b>Sheery Atkins, Equinor</b>	July 2023

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Background .....	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Statement of Common Ground .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Consultation with Historic England.....	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Signatures .....</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>References .....</b>	<b>20</b>

## Table of Tables

Table 1: Summary of consultation with Historic England .....	5
Table 2: Topics agreed, under discussion or not agreed in relation to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage .....	8
Table 3: Topics agreed, in discussion or not agreed in relation to Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage .....	14

## Glossary of Acronyms

AEZ	Archaeological Exclusion Zone
CIA	Cumulative Impact Assessment
DCO	Development Consent Order
DEL	Dudgeon Extension Limited
DEP	Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPP	Evidence Plan Process
ES	Environmental Statement
ETG	Expert Topic Group
GIS	Geographic Information System
HBMCE	Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England
HSC	Historic Seascape Character
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
SEL	Scira Extension Limited
SEP	Sheringham Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

1. This draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared by Equinor New Energy Limited (the Applicant) and Historic England. It identifies areas of the Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (SEP) and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (DEP) Development Consent Order (DCO) application (the Application) where matters are agreed, not agreed or that remain under discussion between the parties. This SoCG covers both onshore and offshore matters.

## 2 Statement of Common Ground

2. A summary of the consultation undertaken to date with Historic England and the matters agreed or not agreed (based on discussions and information exchanged between the Applicant and Historic England during the pre-application and examination phases of the Application) are set out below.

### 2.1 Consultation with Historic England

3. A summary of the consultation undertaken to date with Historic England regarding onshore and offshore archaeology meetings is provided in **Table 1**.

*Table 1: Summary of consultation with Historic England*

Date	Contact Type	Topic
Pre-Application		
14/01/2020	Expert Topic Group (ETG) Meeting	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of the project</li> <li>• Onshore and Offshore baseline environment</li> <li>• Approach to archaeology and cultural heritage impact assessment</li> <li>• Way forward and how to run ETG to application</li> </ul>
21/10/2020	ETG Meeting	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update</li> <li>• Update on the onshore studies and surveys undertaken:</li> <li>• Archaeological Desk Bases Assessment (ADBA) – Historic Environment Records (HER) data</li> <li>• HE walkover survey</li> <li>• Aerial Photography (AP), LiDAR and map regression work</li> <li>• Priority geophysics survey</li> <li>• Update on offshore and intertidal baseline data and initial findings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Palaeogeographic features and preliminary deposit model</li> <li>○ Seabed features</li> <li>○ Intertidal walkover survey</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Date	Contact Type	Topic
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Historic Seascape Character</li> <li>○ Cumulative Impact Assessment</li> </ul>
10/06/2021	Section 42 Consultation	Historic England's response to Section 42 consultation on the PEIR. Appendix 4 of the Consultation Report [APP-033].
14/07/2021	ETG Meeting	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update</li> <li>• Update on onshore archaeology and cultural heritage:</li> <li>• The approach to worst-case scenarios</li> <li>• The approach to ongoing surveys</li> <li>• Agreement to Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for Ground Investigations (GI)</li> <li>• Update on offshore and intertidal archaeology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Geophysical survey results</li> <li>○ Definitions of the worst-case scenario</li> <li>○ Embedded/additional mitigation and the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (Offshore) [APP-298]</li> <li>○ Avoiding impacts through Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) at the landfall</li> <li>○ Residual impacts</li> <li>○ Cumulative Impact Assessment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Heritage Setting and Viewpoints were presented and discussed</li> </ul>
16/08/2021	ETG Meeting	<p>The following onshore topics were discussed during the ETG meeting 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update</li> <li>• Update on onshore archaeology and cultural heritage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overview of PEIR comments</li> <li>○ Route Refinement</li> <li>○ Identifying Potential</li> <li>○ Priority Geophysics</li> <li>○ Geoarchaeology</li> <li>○ Trial Trenching</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Heritage Setting and Viewpoints were presented and discussed.</li> </ul>
06/04/2022	ETG Meeting	<p>The following onshore topics were discussed during the ETG meeting 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update</li> <li>• Review of Agreement Log</li> <li>• Phase 2 Geophysical Survey Results</li> <li>• Monitoring of Engineering-led Ground Investigation Works</li> <li>• Outline Written Scheme of Investigation for Onshore Archaeology [APP-308]</li> </ul>

Date	Contact Type	Topic
08/04/2022	ETG Meeting	<p>The following topics were discussed during the ETG meeting 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update</li> <li>• Review of the agreement log (Statement of Common Ground Precursor)</li> <li>• Update on Historic Seascape Characterisation</li> <li>• Update on geoarchaeological assessment</li> <li>• Overview of the Outline WSI (Offshore) [APP-298] for Offshore Archaeology</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Topics agreed, under discussion or not agreed in relation to Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage**

ID	Matters to be agreed	The Applicant Position	Historic England Position	Position Summary
<b>EIA – Baseline Environment</b>				
1	Baseline characterisation	The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in terms of onshore archaeology and cultural heritage as detailed in Section 21.5 of ES Chapter 21 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-107).	<p>ETG meeting 1 (14/01/2020) in which both NCC Heritage team and HE were present agreed on list of categories of known and potential ‘heritage assets’, list of sources for desk-based assessment, agreement on approach to baseline surveys.</p> <p>Historic England (as stated in REP1-112) are:</p> <p>.... broadly satisfied with the scope, methodology and conclusions of the Aerial Photographic, LiDAR and Map Regression Analysis and Addendum.</p> <p>....and had raised concerns in our Section 42 response that the assessment of historic map sources was too limited but acknowledged that this was due to relevant archives being closed during Coronavirus lockdowns. The Addendum (6.3.21.3) has addressed these concerns and includes additional map and aerial photographic sources and assessment.</p>	Agreed
2	Survey data	<p>Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within ES Chapter 21 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (APP-107).</p> <p>Supplementary Note:</p>	The approach to baseline and survey data has been discussed in a number of the ETG meetings. In ETG 5 (in which Historic England were present) it was confirmed that the ETG still accept as adequate for the purpose of examination:	Agreed



ID	Matters to be agreed	The Applicant Position	Historic England Position	Position Summary
		<p>The Applicant is aware of and acknowledges Historic England's previous advice on the risk of undertaking all trial trenching post-consent.</p> <p>A commitment to undertaking trial trenching [in a timely manner] is set out in the outline WSI (Onshore) [APP-308 / REP2-031]. The Applicant has also noted NCC HES advice on this front that it is important that the programme of trial trenching post-consent must allow for sufficient time within the delivery schedule to achieve any requirements of mitigation.</p> <p>The initial informative stages of mitigation (to include trial trenching) and further (subsequent/additional) mitigation stage(s) is presented in the outline WSI (Onshore) [APP-308 / REP2-031].</p> <p>It was stated by NCC HES in ETG meeting 3 (17/072021) that the range of survey techniques proposed for the Projects (i.e. aerial photos, LIDAR, geophysical surveys (currently magnetometry), metal detecting and later intrusive surveys) is consistent with other projects in the area. Trial trenching for these projects was ultimately considered an 'initial informative stage of mitigation' to be undertaken in the post-consent stages of the Projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approach to baseline surveys, and potential additional surveys, being suitable for the characterisation of the study area and onshore project boundary for EIA purposes.</li> <li>• It was agreed that if any Engineering-led Ground Investigation (GI) works are planned for the project, Norfolk County Council (NCC) Historic Environment Service (HES) and Historic England (HE) should review the methodology and provision for associated archaeological watching brief and/or geoarchaeological monitoring.</li> <li>• Analysis of Lidar and aerial photographic data will primarily be undertaken within the 200m onshore cable corridor and will also include a suitable small buffer out with the onshore project boundary.</li> </ul>	

ID	Matters to be agreed	The Applicant Position	Historic England Position	Position Summary
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locations for priority archaeological geophysical surveys would be agreed with NCC HES. It was agreed that possible targeted archaeological trial trenching should also be considered in the areas identified as 'critical', or at particular pinch-points, for the projects. However, it was acknowledged that this is heavily dependent on land access.</li> <li>• The approach was supported by NCC HES but HE highlighted the risks of relying on post-consent trenching and stated that these needed to be acknowledged. We have consistently maintained that pre-consent trenching would be preferable (HE Written Rep 6.7, 6.17, 15.6).</li> </ul>	
3	Selection of priority survey locations (geophysics)	<p>The approach to the selection of priority archaeological geophysical survey areas was adequate and sufficient to inform the assessment of impacts.</p> <p>It was agreed that consultation and the flow of information would continue alongside examination. Agreed to focus on cropped land for surveys but would not stop efforts to engage with any landowners currently refusing access.</p> <p>Locations for priority archaeological geophysical surveys undertaken to date have been agreed through submission of a survey-specific WSI. Further phases of geophysical survey will</p>	<p>Agreed that in the event the current priority geophysical (magnetometry) survey works/results were not completed in time for the submission, works will still continue, wherever possible, although all are aware they will not form part of the examination.</p>	Agreed

ID	Matters to be agreed	The Applicant Position	Historic England Position	Position Summary
		continue in agreement with NCC HES as part of ongoing detailed investigations.		
4	Heritage setting viewpoints	Heritage setting viewpoint locations are representative and adequate.	Discussed and agreed with Norfolk County Council in ETG meeting 1 (14/01/2020) in which both NCC Heritage team and HE were present. This was discussed and further and agreed in ETG meeting 4, 16/08/2021 (in which Historic England were present) where ETG agreed on the locations of the heritage viewpoints within the 5km study area of the substation.	Agreed
5	Approach to intrusive evaluation (trial trenching)	<p>The Applicant confirms that archaeological trial trenching has not been undertaken to inform the assessment of impacts pre-application. Further evaluation (intrusive and non-intrusive) will be completed in the early post consent stages, wherever possible.</p> <p>As above in ID3, the Applicant acknowledges Historic England's previous advice on the risk of undertaking all trial trenching post-consent.</p> <p>A commitment to undertaking trial trenching [in a timely manner] is set out in the outline WSI (Onshore) [APP-308 / REP2-031]. The Applicant has also noted NCC HES advice on this front that it is important that the programme of trial trenching post-consent must allow for sufficient time within the delivery schedule to achieve any requirements of mitigation.</p> <p>The initial informative stages of mitigation (to include trial trenching) and further (subsequent/additional) mitigation stage(s) is presented in the outline WSI (Onshore) [APP-308 / REP2-031].</p> <p>At ETG meeting 4 (dated 16/08/2021) it was agreed with the Archaeological Advisor to NCC that trial trench evaluation would be undertaken post-consent, and that the Applicant would follow a</p>	<p>Discussed and agreed with Norfolk County Council in ETG meeting 4 (16/08/2021) in which both NCC Heritage team and HE were present.</p> <p>The approach was supported by NCC HES but HE highlighted the risks of relying on post-consent trenching and stated that these needed to be acknowledged. We have consistently maintained that pre-consent trenching would be preferable (HE Written Rep 6.7, 6.17, 15.6). Although Historic England disagree with this position - we do recognise the Applicant's position, however, we consider best practise would include trial trenching pre-determination.</p>	Agreed

ID	Matters to be agreed	The Applicant Position	Historic England Position	Position Summary
		similar approach undertaken for other [recent] offshore wind farm projects in Norfolk.		
6	Approach to obtaining desk-based data	The approach to obtaining desk-based data such as aerial photos and historic maps, as detailed in ES Chapter 21 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-107] and associated appendices is adequate.	Historic England are satisfied with the scope and methodology of the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, as stated in REP1-112.	Agreed
<b>EIA – Assessment Methodology</b>				
7	EIA methodology	Agreement on the list of categories of key known and potential heritage assets for consideration with regard to onshore archaeology and cultural heritage.	Agreed at ETG Meeting 1 (14/01/2020) in which both NCC Heritage team and HE were present, as well as subsequent ETG meetings with respect to heritage viewpoints and consideration of settings effects (e.g. ETG Meeting 4) .	Agreed
8	Data sources	Agreement on the list of sources for desk-based assessment with regard to onshore archaeology and cultural heritage.	Agreed at ETG Meeting 1 (14/01/2020) in which both NCC Heritage team and HE were present.	Agreed
9	Study Area	The study areas identified in Section 21.3 of ES Chapter 21 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-107] are adequate for the assessment.	Agreed at ETG Meeting 1 (14/01/2020) in which both NCC Heritage team and HE were present.	Agreed
10	Impacts	Section 21.6 of ES Chapter 21 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-107] represents a comprehensive list of the potential impacts.	Historic England were pleased with the inclusion of a wide range of potential impacts on the historic environment in Section 21.6, including those often lesser considered and acknowledged (e.g. heat emission of cables and HDD drilling / bentonite) as stated in REP1-112.	Agreed
<b>EIA – Project-Alone Assessment Conclusions</b>				

ID	Matters to be agreed	The Applicant Position	Historic England Position	Position Summary
11	Mitigation	Inclusion of proposed mitigation – both initial informative and subsequent/additional methodologies (as outlined in brief in Table 21-19 of ES Chapter 21 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-107] and mapped out in more detail in the outline WSI (Onshore) [APP-308 / REP2-031]) are considered adequate and in line with similar approaches undertaken for other [recent] offshore wind farm projects in Norfolk.	Whilst Historic England considers that pre-consent trial trenching would be preferred (see ID 3 above), we acknowledge that the range of mitigation measures proposed are suitable and in line with similar approaches undertaken for other [recent] offshore wind farm projects in Norfolk	Agreed
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
12	WSI Onshore	The measures and methodologies identified in the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Revision C) [REP2-031] are adequate for the purpose of the examination. Where possible and appropriate (at this stage) comments received from Historic England were incorporated in this latest version on the Outline WSI, as per Deadline 2 Submission – 14.2 The Applicant’s Comments on Written Representations [REP2-017].	Historic England acknowledges that the measures and methodologies set out in the OWSI (Revision C) onshore are suitable and that our advice has been incorporated as far as possible within the constraints of the examination timetable.	Agreed
13	DCO Requirement	Schedule 2, Part 1, Requirement 18 of the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1] is sufficient to secure the measures identified in the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Revision C) [REP2-031].	Historic England confirmed through their written representation [REP1-112] agreement with the wording of Schedule 2 Part 1, Requirement 18 in relation to post-consent archaeological works.	Agreed

**Table 3: Topics agreed, in discussion or not agreed in relation to Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage**

ID	Matters to be agreed	The Applicant Position	Historic England Position	Position Summary
<b>EIA – Baseline Environment</b>				
1	Baseline characterisation	The ES adequately characterises the baseline environment in terms of offshore archaeology and cultural heritage as detailed in Section 14.5 of ES <b>Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [APP-100].	The approach to archaeological assessment, analysis and reporting was discussed at the Historic Environment ETG 1 meeting (14/01/2020) and we responded to the archaeological analysis presented in the PEIR (our response dated 10/06/2021). We also commented on the assessment presented in the submitted Environmental Statement through our Written Representation [REP1-112]	Agreed
2	Survey data	Survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within ES <b>Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [APP-100]. It is acknowledged that there are gaps in the survey coverage (i.e. with respect to the offshore temporary works area) but that these data gaps will be filled post-consent as set out in the <b>Outline WSI (Offshore)</b> [APP-298] and as agreed through the EPP. The data acquired, and the analysis of this data, is therefore suitable to characterise the baseline environment for the purposes of the impact assessment.	The availability and use of survey data commissioned for this proposed development was discussed at the Historic Environment ETG 3 meeting (14/07/2021) and we commented on the spatial adequacy of available survey data in our Written Representation and in response to The Examining Authority’s Second Written Questions [REP3-130] and Third Written Questions [REP5-079]	Agreed
3	Consideration of data from the existing Sheringham and Dudgeon wind farms	The archaeological assessment of geophysical data has been adequately integrated with previous assessments undertaken for Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farms in order to address gaps in the current survey coverage and to characterise the baseline environment for the purposes of the impact assessment.	We accept that sufficient analysis of survey data has occurred in order to characterise the proposed development areas as necessary for EIA requirements, as we acknowledge in our response to the Examination Authorities Second Written Questions [REP3-130]	Agreed

ID	Matters to be agreed	The Applicant Position	Historic England Position	Position Summary
4	Historic Seascape Characterisation Geographical Information System (GIS) datasets	The national GIS datasets for HSC produced by Historic England are a point in time source of data and have been updated in line with the published methodology for HSC.	The methodological approach to conducting Historic Seascape Characterisation was discussed at Historic ETG meeting 1 and at ETG 2 (21/10/2020). We commented on the approach taken in the Environmental Statement [APP-100] in our Written Representation as being suitable and we have no further advice to offer.	Agreed,
5	Offshore temporary works area characterisation	The use of desk-based information only to assess potential impacts within the offshore temporary works area was discussed through the EPP and is suitable to characterise the baseline environment for the purposes of the impact assessment within the offshore temporary works area. Data will only be acquired from these areas should the worst-case anchor spreads be required and if impacts may occur in those areas. If no works, or construction activities, are required within these areas, further survey data may not be required. This commitment and the method by which this data would be acquired and subject to archaeological assessment has been adequately incorporated into the <b>Outline WSI (Offshore)</b> [APP-298].	The use of desk-based sources of information within the offshore temporary works area was discussed at Historic Environment ETG meeting 6 (08/04/2022). We also acknowledged in our response to the Examination Authorities Second Written Questions the adequacy of the Outline WSI (Offshore) included with the DCO submission	Agreed,
<b>EIA – Assessment Methodology</b>				
6	Heritage asset categories	The list of categories of key known and potential heritage assets for consideration with regard to Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage was agreed in ETG meeting 1 and is suitable to characterise the baseline environment for the purposes of the impact assessment.	The categories of known and potential heritage assets were discussed at Historic Environment ETG meeting 1 and the detail provided in the PEIR consultation and in the submitted Environmental Statement is considered suitable to characterise the baseline environment	Agreed

ID	Matters to be agreed	The Applicant Position	Historic England Position	Position Summary
7	Desk-based assessment sources	The list of sources for desk-based assessment for consideration with regard to Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage was agreed in ETG 1 and are suitable to characterise the baseline environment for the purposes of the impact assessment.	the approach to be taken to the desk-based assessment was discussed at ETG meeting 1. The approach then demonstrated and presented in the PEIR and Environmental Statement are considered suitable to characterise the baseline environment	Agreed
8	Study areas	The study areas identified in Section 14.3 of ES <b>Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [APP-100] are adequate for the assessment.	The Applicant explained site selection at Historic Environment ETG meeting 1 and the detail provided in the PEIR consultation and the selected study area as described in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement would seem to be appropriate for the purposes of EIA	Agreed
9	Worst-case scenarios	The worst-case scenarios presented in the assessment for the development scenarios, as outlined in Table 14-2 of ES <b>Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [APP-100] are adequate.	The worst-case scenario presented in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement is considered to be adequate	Agreed
10	Assessment methodologies	The impact assessment methodologies as presented in Section 14.4 of ES <b>Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [APP-100] are adequate to assess the potential impacts of the project.	The impact assessment methodologies presented in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement are considered adequate	Agreed
11	Assessment methodologies	The assessment of impacts presented are consistent with the agreed assessment methodologies, as detailed in Section 14.6 and 14.4 respectively of ES <b>Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [APP-100].	We accept that the assessment of impacts presented are consistent with the assessment methodologies set out in Environmental Statement Chapter 14, as we acknowledge in our Written Representation [Rep1-112]	Agreed
12	List of potential impacts	Section 14.6 of ES <b>Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> (APP-100) represents a comprehensive list of the potential impacts.	The list of potential impacts presented in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement are considered adequate	Agreed



ID	Matters to be agreed	The Applicant Position	Historic England Position	Position Summary
13	Cumulative impact assessment (CIA) methodologies	The assessment of cumulative impacts, as detailed in Section 14.7 of ES <b>Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</b> [APP-100] is consistent with the agreed methodologies. The CIA includes sufficient information on other developments in the area, including archaeological information from other projects in the region.	We accept that the Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) presented in Environmental Statement Chapter 14 is adequate. However, in our Written Representation we did question Table 14-29 in regard to the setting of heritage assets whereby identifying significance should be considered equally for setting, historical and research value	Agreed
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
14	<b>Outline WSI (Offshore)</b> [APP-298] broad approach	Agreed that the <b>Outline WSI (Offshore)</b> [APP-298] will follow the structure and approaches set out in the updated Crown Estate guidance (2021) but will include specific detail for SEP and DEP as necessary to inform the requirements for post-consent survey and mitigation, rather than just representing a generic document.	We acknowledge that at Historic Environment ETG meeting 6 that the detail of the Outline WSI (Offshore) was discussed in reference to our response to the PEIR consultation exercise. We confirm that we accept the methodological approach set out in the Outline WSI (Offshore) as we explain in our response to The Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP3-130] and Third Written Questions [REP5-079]	Agreed
15	<b>Outline WSI (Offshore)</b> [APP-298]	The measures identified in the <b>Outline WSI (Offshore)</b> [APP-298] are adequate.	Historic England have confirmed our agreement with the methodological approach presented in the Outline WSI, see our Written Representation [REP1-112] and our response to Second Written Questions [REP3-130].	Agreed
16	<b>Outline WSI (Offshore)</b> [APP-298] DCO wording	Schedule 10, Part 2, Condition 13(1)(e), Schedule 11, Part 2, Condition 13(1)(e), Schedule 12, Part 2, Condition 12(1)(f) and Schedule 13, Part 2, Condition 12(1)(f) of the (Revision H)	In our Written Representation [REP1-112] we offered amendment to the draft Development Consent Order (deemed Marine Licences) [APP-024] and we accept the action taken by the Applicant as	Agreed

ID	Matters to be agreed	The Applicant Position	Historic England Position	Position Summary
		[document reference 3.1]) are sufficient to secure the measures identified in the <b>Outline WSI (Offshore)</b> [APP-298].	set out in The Applicant's Comments on Written Representations [REP2-017]	
17	Approach to defining Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZs)	The nature and extent of AEZs will be finalised and agreed in consultation with the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (HBMCE) prior to construction based upon the archaeological assessment of preconstruction data with regard to a refined design footprint and to any other information which may come to light.	We accept the statement made by the Applicant regarding AEZs and that it accords with the response we provided to The Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP1-113] regarding AEZs	Agreed
18	Approach to geoarchaeological assessment	Agreed that the approach to geoarchaeological assessment, in conjunction with ongoing geotechnical ground investigations offshore, as set out in the <b>Geoarchaeological Method Statement</b> [REP3-119] is appropriate and fit for purpose.	Historic England have confirmed our agreement with the methodological approach presented in the geoarchaeological method statement see our response to Second Written Questions [REP3-130].	Agreed

### 3 Signatures

4. The above draft Statement of Common Ground is agreed between Equinor New Energy Limited and Historic England on the day specified below.

Signed:

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of James Albone.

Print Name: James Albone

Job Title: Inspector of Ancient Monuments

Date: 06/07/2023

Duly authorised for and on behalf of the **Historic England**

Signed:

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Sheery Atkins.

Print Name: Sheery Atkins

Job Title: Onshore Consents Manager

Date: 06/07/2023

Duly authorised for and on behalf of **Equinor New Energy Limited**

## References

Department for Communities and Local Government (2015) Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent.

The Crown Estate (2021). Archaeological Written Schemes of Investigation for Offshore Wind Farm Projects. Guidance prepared by Wessex Archaeology and issued by The Crown Estate