THE PLANNING ACT 2008

THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATION PROCEDURE) RULES 2010

NORTH FALLS OFFSHORE WIND FARM

Appendix B7 to the Natural England Deadline 7 Submission

Natural England's Marine Processes Advice on the Applicant's Deadline 6 Documents

For:

The construction and operation of North Falls Offshore Wind Farm, located approximately 40 km from the East Anglia Coast in the Southern North Sea.

Planning Inspectorate Reference EN010119

15 July 2025

Appendix B7 Natural England's Marine Processes Advice on the Applicant's Deadline 6 Documents

1. Minor comments

In formulating these comments, the following documents have been considered:

- [REP6-050] 9.52 Outline Sediment Disposal Plan (Rev 2) (Tracked)
- [REP6-052] 9.53 Cable Specification and Installation Plan (Rev 2) (Tracked)

Table 1: Natural England's advice on: Marine Processes

Document reviewed	Update made	Issue Resolved?
[REP6-050]/3.4	Natural England notes that the Applicant's commitment to dispose of any dredged sediment at a distance of greater than 1km from KKE MCZ. This is welcomed. However, the WCS sediment deposition thickness and footprint at/within KKE MCZ remains unclear. In [REP6-059] the Applicant has stated that the potential for concurrent construction activities and overlapping sediment deposition can be clarified in updates to the hydrodynamic and sediment dispersion modelling at Deadline 7. Furthermore, the Applicant has stated that an updated MCZA report will also be provided at Deadline 7. Therefore, we consider this matter progressed but await further clarification on the WCS in the updated documents.	Progressed.
[REP6-052]/4.3	Natural England notes that the Applicant has now committed to not placing cable protection in areas where the seabed is shallower than 5m Chart Datum to ensure that there will be negligible impact on the wave regime and nearshore sediment transport. This is the calculated depth of closure and c. 1.5km offshore. This commitment is welcomed. However, we would advise that in shallow water offshore of the 5m depth contour, cable protection should be avoided and where that is not possible the height/profile of any cable protection should be minimised as much as possible to avoid impacts to sediment transport processes and pathways.	Yes (point B6 in the R&I log)

2. Detailed comments

In formulating these comments, the following documents have been considered:

- [REP6-032] 7.10 Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan (Rev 1) (Tracked)
- [REP6-054] 9.54 Hydrodynamic and Dispersion Modelling Report (Rev 1) (Tracked)
- [REP6-059] 9.86 Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 5 Submissions

2. Detailed comments

Table 2: Natural England's Advice On: [REP6-032] 7.10 Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan (Rev 1) (Tracked)

Document reviewed: [REP6-032] 7.10 Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan (Rev 1) (Tracked)			
NE Ref	**Section**	**Key Concern and/or Update**	**Natural England's Advice to Resolve Issue**
1	Pages 15-16/Table 2.1	Natural England notes that the monitoring proposal to identify any unburied or shallow buried cables in the post-construction phase, relates to scour monitoring around turbines.	We advise amending the 'Monitoring proposal' section to discuss post cable repair/replacement works surveys rather than scour monitoring around turbines.
2	Page 17/Table 2.1	Natural England welcomes the Applicant's commitment to carry out sandwave recovery monitoring proposed and bedform migration analysis.	This issue is now resolved.
3	Page 17/Table 2.1	Natural England notes that monitoring is now included in the IPMP to provide further evidence to support the predictions of cable protection having no AEOI of the Margate and Long Sands SAC or Kentish Knock East MCZ in the unlikely event that cable protection is deployed in proximity to these areas. The monitoring proposed includes targeted bathymetric and geophysical surveys of areas within the Order Limits where cable protection is deployed in proximity to MLS SAC or KKE MCZ. The scope of these surveys (including location, programmes, and methodologies) shall be developed in consultation with the SNCB.	Natural England welcomes this monitoring and would welcome the opportunity to engage with the Applicant further to discuss the approach and scope of the monitoring. However, we advise that the monitored proposed should be more specific to monitor changes to the seabed morphology, level and sediment composition if/where cable protection is placed adjacent to MLS SAC. Furthermore, with regard to the MCZ, we advise that the Applicant should commit to intensive monitoring of the area potentially affected in the MCZ by construction-related sediment deposition and operational-related sediment transport and seabed morphology/sediment composition impacts. This should include triggers for remedial intervention if any observed impacts are greater than predicted.

Table 3: Natural England's Advice On: [REP6-054] 9.54 Hydrodynamic and Dispersion Modelling Report (Rev 1) (Tracked)

NE Ref	**Section**	**Key Concern and/or Update**	**Natural England's Advice to Resolve Issue**
2	5.3.5	Natural England notes that the 'option' hydrodynamic modelling scenario included 8 locations for export cable protection where areas	Natural England seeks clarification on the WCS cable protection placement adjacent to MLS SAC, and whether the indicative layout used in the modelling was the WCS. This will help inform

		may prove difficult for burying and cable crossings may be required. With one 400m section of cable protection located adjacent to MLS SAC. However, we note that beyond –5m CD (closure depth), cable protection could be deployed anywhere along the offshore cable corridor, up to the maximum of 10% of the export cable length [REP6-059]. Therefore, it is unclear whether the modelled cable protection layout represents the WCS for MLS SAC, if there is the potential for cable protection to be placed along the full length of the export cable corridor adjacent to MLS SAC.	understanding of the potential for cable protection to modify sediment transport processes/pathways near the SAC. Therefore, we advise that the Applicant should update their modelling to consider the potential WCS cable protection layout and to demonstrate that there will be no discernible effects on sediment transport processes within the SAC. If it is not possible to provide updated modelling within the examination, we advise that this could also be potentially resolved through a commitment to only place cable protection within the modelled 400m section. Please see our cover letter response to question 26 for further details.
3	8	Natural England notes that the WCS for overlapping sediment deposition thickness and footprint within KKE MCZ due to concurrent construction-related activities remains unclear.	Natural England seeks clarification of the realistic WCS sediment deposition thickness and footprint within KKE MCZ due to construction-related activities to inform the EIA and MCZA. However, we note in [REP6-059] the Applicant has stated that the potential for concurrent construction activities and overlapping sediment deposition can be clarified in further updates to the hydrodynamic and dispersion modelling by Deadline 7. We will, therefore, update our advice following review of the updated modelling.
4	5.5.4 & 5.5.5	Natural England notes that there is a predicted change in current speed and bed shear stress of up to 5% at the eastern edge of the array. This overlaps with an area of Annex I sandbank. However, the long-term implications for changes to patterns of erosion and deposition and morphological change have not been considered.	Natural England advises that predicted changes to bed shear stress and current speed due to the project's array alone and cumulatively with other nearby OWFs need to be considered in the context of changes to patterns of erosion/deposition and seabed morphology over the lifetime of the Project. In turn, impacts to Annex I sandbanks within/adjacent to the array also need to be considered.
5	5.5	As above, the predicted changes in current speed and bed shear stress due to the presence of scheme infrastructure (array and cable protection) have not been considered in the context of changes to patterns of erosion and accretion and, in turn, seabed morphology at the SAC and MCZ.	Natural England advises that the predicted changes in current speed and bed shear stress need to be considered in the context of changes to patterns of erosion and accretion and seabed morphology within the SAC and MCZ over the lifetime of the Project.