



N O R T H F A L L S

Offshore Wind Farm

Applicant's Response to the ExA's Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES)

Document Reference:	9.105
Volume:	9
Date:	July 2025
Revision:	0

Project Reference: EN010119



Project	North Falls Offshore Wind Farm
Document Title	Applicant's Response to the ExA's Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES)
Document Reference	9.105
Supplier	Pinsent Masons LLP

This document and any information therein are confidential property of North Falls Offshore Wind Farm Limited and without infringement neither the whole nor any extract may be disclosed, loaned, copied or used for manufacturing, provision of services or other purposes whatsoever without prior written consent of North Falls Offshore Wind Farm Limited, and no liability is accepted for loss or damage from any cause whatsoever from the use of the document. North Falls Offshore Wind Farm Limited retains the right to alter the document at any time unless a written statement to the contrary has been appended.

Revision	Date	Status/Reason for Issue	Originator	Checked	Approved
0	July 2025	Deadline 8	Pinsent Masons LLP	NFOW	NFOW

Contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Applicant's Response to Questions in the ExA's Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES)	5
3.	Condition Status of European Sites	15

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This document has been prepared by North Falls Offshore Wind Farm Limited ('the Applicant') to respond to the Examining Authority's ('ExA') Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES) **[PD-020]**, in relation to the North Falls Offshore Wind Farm (herein referred to as 'North Falls' or the 'Project').
- 1.2 Responses to questions 7 and 26 were provided at Deadline 7 as requested by the ExA, and are set out in 9.103 Applicant's Response to the ExA's Report on the Implications of European Sites (RIES) (Rev 0) [REP7-054]. All other applicant responses to the RIES are set out in this document.

2. APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS IN THE EXA'S REPORT ON THE IMPLICATIONS FOR EUROPEAN SITES (RIES)

REIS Q	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
RIES Q1	NE	The ExA seeks clarification of your advice on the applicant's screening of LSE pathways for the MLS SAC. Confirm if you consider that there are additional LSE pathways, or LSE pathways excluded by the applicant, which should be assessed for adverse effects on integrity. If yes, provide reasons and confirm what additional assessment you consider is required.	N/A
RIES Q2	Applicant	In your proposed updates to the RIAA Part [APP-175] planned for submission no later than Deadline 8, update the assessment of AEoI to the MLS SAC to include consideration of NE's updated condition assessment.	An update to the RIAA Part 2 [REP7-013/014] was provided at Deadline 7 which includes consideration of NE's updated condition assessment. As discussed in the Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 7 submission [document reference 9.115, Section 2.1], the Applicant understands Natural England's concerns have been addressed and therefore that an AEoI of the MLS SAC can be ruled out.
RIES Q3	Applicant	The applicant is requested to confirm which, if any, European sites affected by the project are in unfavourable condition (including unfavourable recovering).	A summary of the condition status of all sites/ features screened into the RIAA is provided in Section 0 of this document.
RIES Q4	NE	<p>With reference to Tables A3 and A4, can NE confirm if it agrees with the applicant's conclusions of no AEoI to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alde-Ore Estuary SPA: Sandwich tern (breeding), avocet (breeding and non-breeding), marsh harrier (breeding), redshank (non-breeding), ruff (non-breeding) and notable assemblage of breeding and wintering wetland birds. Outer Thames Estuary SPA: common tern FFC SPA: seabird assemblage. Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar: avocet (breeding), black-tailed godwit (wintering), dark-bellied brent goose (wintering), dunlin (wintering), grey plover (wintering), knot (wintering), pintail (wintering), redshank (wintering), redshank (autumn passage), waterbird assemblage. 	<p>The Applicant's understanding is that Natural England has not raised any concerns regarding effects on the species listed for the Alde Ore Estuary SPA with regards to the works to be authorised by the DCO. However, comments have been raised with regards to the effect of LBBG compensation on these species. As a result, the Applicant has committed to undertake pre-construction surveys and scheduling of works where practicable based on the species found to be present at the final selected compensation site (secured in the Outline LBBG CIMP). The compensation, including the approach to surveys and mitigation will be discussed with the LBCSG post consent and the works will be further assessed to inform a planning application.</p> <p>With regards to Stour and Orwell, Natural England's relevant representation stated that this site had not been assessed, however this appeared to be a misunderstanding and the Applicant provided cross references to where this had been assessed in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) Part 4 [APP-178], Section 4.5 and the RIAA Part 5 [APP-181], Section 5.4.3. As this site has not been included in Natural England's risk and issues log, the Applicant understood this matter to be resolved. The Applicant has engaged with Natural England and understands that Natural England considers that, while there will be a residual impact to the site, given the nature of the farmland habitats being used by the lapwing from the SPA and the availability of similar habitats in the wider area, they are able to rule out AEoI for North Falls, alone and in-combination. Therefore, no HRA derogation is provided for Stour and Orwell SPA.</p>

REIS Q	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farne Islands SPA: Sandwich tern (breeding), common tern (breeding) Arctic tern (breeding) 	The Applicant is not aware of any other comments from Natural England relating to these sites and species and therefore it is the Applicant's position that an AEOL can be ruled out for each of these.
RIES Q5	NE	Confirm if the ExA's understanding is correct or, if not, clarify which other activities or pathways are of concern.	<p>With regards to indirect effects as a result of sandwave levelling and cable protection, the Applicant has provided additional hydrodynamic and dispersion modelling [REP7-041/042] at Deadline 7, along with an update to the RIAA Part 2 [REP7-013/014] which confirms that there will be no AEOL on the Margate and Long Sands SAC.</p> <p>With regards to changes in supporting processes resulting in impacts to SPA supporting habitats and availability of prey, as discussed in ID 3.1.9 of the RIES, NE [REP5-110, Q10.0.12] stated that having reflected on its position for this project any further assessment of impacts to supporting benthic habitat for qualifying features of the OTE SPA was unlikely to materially change the conclusions and confirmed that it did not require any further action on this matter by the applicant. As discussed in the Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 7 submission [document reference 9.115, Section 2.1], the Applicant understands Natural England's concerns have been addressed and therefore that an AEOL of the MLS SAC can be ruled out.</p>
RIES Q6	NE	Based on the applicant's monitoring commitments in the OIPMP [REP6-031] confirm if you are content that this matter is resolved and that AEOL from this LSE pathway can be excluded. If you have outstanding concerns, explain these and the steps you consider are required to resolve them.	<p>The In Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) [7.10, Rev 3] includes targeted geophysical and bathymetric surveys of areas within the order limits where cable protection is deployed in proximity to the Margate and Long Sands SAC or Kentish Knock East MCZ.</p> <p>In the event that this monitoring shows significant changes to the physical processes, monitoring of the benthic community will be undertaken. Where monitoring within the order limits validates the conclusions of the ES Chapter 10 Benthic and Intertidal Ecology [APP-024], the RIAA Part 2 [REP7-013/014] and the MCZA report [REP7-019/020], there would also be no significant impact beyond the order limits and therefore wider monitoring would be disproportionate. In accordance with the IPMP [7.10, Rev 3], in the event that the monitoring results show a greater impact than that assessed, the Applicant will review an adaptive management approach in consultation with the MMO and SNCB. This could include further monitoring.</p>
RIES Q7	Applicant	By Deadline 7, submit contours showing the predicted pressures from elevated sediment deposition relevant to the MarESA pressure benchmark thresholds as requested by NE.	The Applicant responded to this question at Deadline 7 in the Applicant's Response to The ExA's Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES) (REIS Q7, Q26) [REP7-054].
RIES Q8	NE	Confirm if the ExA's understanding is correct or, if not explain your outstanding concerns about the WCS parameters for scour prevention and cable protection.	The Applicant notes Natural England's Deadline 7 [REP7-086] comments regarding confirming the WCS for cable protection in relation to MLS SAC. The Applicant provided additional modelling (the Hydrodynamic and Dispersion Modelling Report [REP7-041/042]) at Deadline 7 based on a highly conservative worst case scenario of cable protection in the offshore cable corridor in proximity to the MLS SAC, taking into account the 150m buffer between cable protection and the SAC. This additional modelling confirms there will be no discernible effect in the SAC from cable protection placed anywhere in the offshore cable corridor.
RIES Q9	Applicant	Noting that the DML provides a maximum total length, area and volume of cable protection, and that NE's request for WCS	Up to 10% of the export cable length could require cable protection and this could be placed anywhere in the offshore cable corridor, except in areas where the Applicant has committed to no

REIS Q	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		parameters for cable protection adjacent to the SAC remains unresolved (C32), confirm the WCS parameters for cable protection and scour prevention that could result in potential LSE to the MLS SAC used in the assessment, how these would be secured, and how the regulator can have confidence that these would not be exceeded.	<p>cable protection (the -5mCD depth contour) and no reduction in water depth (Sunk and Trinity Deep Water Routes and Pilot Boarding Diamond buffer). The Applicant has provided additional hydrodynamic and dispersion modelling [REP7-041/042] at Deadline 7, which includes modelling of cable protection along the full length of the export cable corridor adjacent to the Margate and Long Sands SAC (taking into account the 150m buffer between cables/any cable protection and the SAC). This is an unlikely and highly conservative scenario, and the modelling shows this would still have no AEOL of the Margate and Long Sands SAC.</p> <p>The maximum parameters for cable protection including the maximum total scour protection volume are secured in the DCO (Requirement 2(2)) and the DMLs (conditions 10 and 11 – schedules 8 and 10, and conditions 11 and 12 – schedule 9). The works authorised by the DCO/DMLs must not exceed these parameters. The definition of 'maintain' in the DCO and DMLs limits maintenance and repair activities to the extent of what has been assessed in the environmental statement.</p>
RIES Q10	NE	Confirm if the applicant's modelling updates and clarifications address your outstanding concerns. If not, set out the remaining concerns, the reason for them and what steps you consider are required to resolve these such that you could advise that AEOL of the SAC can be excluded. In doing so, provide any evidence you hold the demonstrates the proposed 150m buffer would not be sufficient mitigation to avoid AEOL.	As discussed in the Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 7 submission [document reference 9.115, Section 2.1], the Applicant understands Natural England's concerns have been addressed and therefore that an AEOL of the MLS SAC can be ruled out.
RIES Q11	Applicant	If monitoring of cable protection in accordance with the CSIP shows adverse effects to the SAC qualifying features, explain how this would be addressed, including at decommissioning if cable protection that is not readily removeable has been used	<p>It should be noted that due to the commitments made by the Applicant, in consultation with Natural England, there will be no cable protection placed within MPAs designated for benthic habitats, therefore there will be no direct effects. Furthermore, the Hydrodynamic and Dispersion Modelling Report [REP7-041/042] shows there will be no discernible indirect effects in the SAC as a result of cable protection. It is noted that where other offshore wind farms have had a requirement to decommission cable protection, this has been in relation to protection placed within SACs or MCZs. Therefore, the Applicant considers decommissioning cable protection is not proportionate to the level of impact.</p> <p>In accordance with the updated In Principle Monitoring Plan [REP6-031/032], in the unlikely event that a review of the monitoring results shows a greater impact than that assessed in the RIAA, the Applicant will review an adaptive management approach, in consultation with the MMO and SNCB. This could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication of the results to inform future assessments; • Further monitoring; and/ or • Remedial action/ mitigation. <p>The approach would be subject to the circumstances identified by the monitoring.</p> <p>As discussed in response to RIES Q9 above, further modelling has been secured to provide further confidence that there will be no AEOL of the Margate and Long Sands SAC.</p>

REIS Q	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
RIES Q12	NE	If further modelling interpretation from the applicant shows no LSE effect pathway from placement of cable protection near to the SAC, confirm if your advice is that cable protection still needs to exclude rock protection and be readily removable to avoid AEol? If so, why?	<p>As noted above, the hydrodynamic and sediment dispersion modelling report [REP7-041/042] shows there will be no discernible indirect effects of cable protection in the SAC and therefore there will be no AEol of the SAC. As discussed in the Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 7 submission [document reference 9.115, Section 2.1], the Applicant understands Natural England's concerns have been addressed and therefore that an AEol of the MLS SAC can be ruled out.</p> <p>Where other offshore wind farms have had a requirement to decommission cable protection, this has been in relation to cable protection placed within SACs or MCZs, whereas the Applicant has ensured there will be no cable protection placed within MPAs designated for benthic habitats by avoiding all such MPAs. Therefore, the Applicant considers decommissioning cable protection is not proportionate to the level of impact.</p>
RIES Q13	NE	Confirm if you are content with the applicant's updated sediment dispersion modelling. If not, set out what further measures you consider are needed to manage sediment disposal in a way that avoids AEol to SAC. Provide reasons for your position	The Applicant agrees with the ExA's summary regarding sediment disposal and confirms its position that a worst case scenario had been assessed. In addition, the Applicant has provided a commitment to a 1km buffer between the KKE MCZ and disposal of any dredged sediment, secured in the Outline Sediment Disposal Management Plan [REP6-049]. Furthermore, the Applicant has modelled disposal at a location 1km from the KKE MCZ.
RIES Q14	Applicant	By Deadline 8, provide an updated RIAA Part 2 that includes an updated in-combination assessment to address NE's comments, and incorporating the additional cumulative modelling outcomes	An updated RIAA Part 2 [REP7-013/014] was provided at Deadline 7. Modelling of the cumulative effects requested by Natural England was included in the hydrodynamic and sediment dispersion modelling report submitted at Deadline 6 (and subsequent Deadline 7 version [REP7-041/042]). The cumulative modelling is relevant to the Marine Conservation Zone Assessment [REP7-019/020], provided at Deadline 7.
RIES Q15	NE	Confirm that these matters are agreed. If not, set out the remaining concerns and your advice on the steps required to resolve them.	The Applicant understands Natural England's comments regarding smothering for the Project alone would also apply to the in-combination assessment. As discussed above, the Applicant has made further mitigation commitments (150m minimum buffer) and undertaken extensive additional modelling to address Natural England's comments. The modelling validates the Applicant's conclusions for the Project alone and in-combination assessments that there would be no AEol of the Margate and Long Sands SAC.
RIES Q16	NE	Confirm if you are satisfied that mitigation proposed for the MLS SAC is adequately secured based on the applicant's response in [REP5-054], and subject to supporting evidence for the 150m buffer as described above. If not, set out what further measures you consider are needed.	As discussed in the Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 7 submission [document reference 9.115, Section 2.1], the Applicant understands Natural England's concerns have been addressed and therefore that an AEol of the MLS SAC can be ruled out.
RIES Q17	NE, EWT and MMO	Please review the applicant's amendments to the Outline SIP and Draft MMMP submitted at Deadline 5 and provide comment. Are you content with the applicant's wording in respect of NAS? If you have concerns, please expand. Does this document address your concerns regarding AEol?	The Applicant notes the wording added on NAS aligns with advice provided by the MMO and the MMO welcomed the updates in their Deadline 6 response [REP6-082].

REIS Q	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
RIES Q18	Applicant, EWT, local authorities	Please confirm whether it has been agreed the Outline PEMP contains the necessary guidance and procedures in respect of marine mammal collision and that a separate Working in Proximity to Wildlife Plan is not deemed necessary.	The Applicant notes that at a Working in Proximity to Marine Wildlife Plan is not a "typical" document, it is a document that was used by Five Estuaries to secure mitigation and which, in the case of North Falls, is secured for North Falls in the PEMP. Therefore, a Working in Proximity to Marine Wildlife Plan is not necessary for North Falls. This matter is now agreed between the Applicant and EWT, as shown in the SOCG [REP6-070].
RIES Q19	Applicant	Please confirm whether this information will be included in an updated ES Chapter 12 and RIAA.	<p>As noted in the RIES, Natural England [REP5-106] stated "<i>Natural England welcomes the additional assessment conducted in relation to vessel disturbance. We consider this issue resolved.</i>"</p> <p>The Further Information Regarding Marine Mammal Disturbance due to Vessel Presence [REP3-046] is included in the DCO Schedule 12, Part 2 Examination Documents forming the Environmental Statement to be Certified.</p> <p>As the assessment provided by the Applicant has resolved Natural England's concerns and is certified in the DCO as a document forming the Environmental Statement, an update to ES Chapter 12 and the RIAA Part 3 is not proposed.</p>
RIES Q20	NE	Do NE have any outstanding concerns on this matter? If so, please provide detailed comments	The Applicant notes that UXO clearance is not included in the DCO and will be subject to a marine licence post consent, informed by UXO surveys, however an assessment of UXO clearance and outline mitigation is provided for completeness.
RIES Q21	NE	Can NE clarify if its concerns regarding the use of PAM in respect of UXO clearance are resolved?	The Draft MMMP [7.7, Rev 4] contains details for how PAM will be utilised, as set out in Section 1.4.3.2.2. As per Natural England's request the text has been amended to ensure, if required, PAM will be used in conjunction with the MMObs for the UXO clearance mitigation procedures.
RIES Q22	RSPB	The applicant has responded to concerns relating to the consideration of impacts resulting from HPAI in its assessment [REP1-045]. Please provide comments on any outstanding concerns further to the justification provided in [REP1-045].	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that there remains uncertainty about the long-term effects of HPAI on seabird populations. However, it is considered that this has been appropriately addressed in the Applicant's submissions to the Examination, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 13.5.5 and species-specific assessments within ES Chapter 13 [APP-027] • Feature-specific assessments within the RIAA [APP-178] and Farne Islands SPA guillemot HRA update [REP1-056] • Specific responses to RSPB's comments (Section 2.17 of [REP1-045]). <p>Taking into account these responses, and the significant precaution incorporated into the assessment, it is considered that there is sufficient information to enable the Secretary of State to reach a conclusion for all marine ornithology receptors at both the EIA and HRA scales.</p> <p>The Applicant is aware that there is limited published information on the most recent effects on HPAI on key colonies relevant to North Falls:</p>

REIS Q	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At FFC SPA, the most recent published counts are from 2023 (Butcher <i>et al.</i>, 2023¹). At that time, the survey report indicated that while HPAI was recorded at the colony, population effects were limited. In kittiwakes, impacts were considered 'localised' with overall productivity considered 'good'. For gannet, an increase in breeding population (compared to 2022) was noted. For auks, 'limited mortality' was observed. At the Farne Islands SPA, the Seabird Monitoring Programme (SMP) database (BTO and JNCC, 2025²) indicates a reduced guillemot population in 2023 and 2024, in the order of 43,000 individuals, compared to a peak of 64,000 birds in 2019. However, it is noted that the population increased from approximately 48,000 individuals in 2017 to the peak of 64,000 in just two years, suggesting that the species has substantial capacity to recover within a relatively short timeframe. It is also noted that the National Trust reopened the islands to public visitors in 2025, indicating that HPAI was no longer prevalent within seabird populations. For lesser black-backed gull at Alde-Ore Estuary SPA and red-throated diver at Outer Thames Estuary SPA the Applicant is unaware of any measurable presence of HPAI in these populations. <p>It is recognised by the Applicant that there is uncertainty as to how HPAI will impact long-term populations for affected species and colonies. This will be linked to the rate of natural immunity within each species, and other demographic factors that will determine the rate of colony recovery following any loss. Realistically, it may be several years before the full effects of HPAI on seabird populations are known. However, it is also the case that any population reduction at a colony is likely to result in a proportionate reduction in effects (i.e. collision or displacement mortality), as fewer birds from that colony would be present at the North Falls array. Therefore, it is unlikely that impacts from Project (which in isolation are relatively small) would significantly interact with the effects of HPAI, and, based on the best available evidence relating to HPAI mortality, it is considered that the conclusions of the EIA and HRA are sufficiently robust to account for this uncertainty.</p>
RIES Q23	RSPB	Given the information provided by the applicant in [REP1-045] can the RSPB explain if it has outstanding concerns regarding the DAS methodology?	The Applicant notes its position that sufficient and appropriate detail has been provided in relation to the Digital Aerial Survey methodology, and that the methodology is fully compliant with the best practice guidance from the appropriate SNCB, the Natural England Best Practice Advice for Evidence and Data Standards (Parker et al. 2025). Indeed, in their Relevant Representation, Natural England has stated that appropriate baseline data has been gathered for the purposes of ornithological impact assessment ([RR-243], NE ref F8), and that following pre-application engagement through the Evidence Plan Process (EPP), Natural England are content that the baseline has been appropriately characterised. ([RR-243], NE ref F9).
RIES Q24	NE	With reference to the justification provided in [APP-181] in which the applicant concluded no AEoI on the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar site, is NE in agreement that the	Natural England's relevant representation stated that this site had not been assessed, however this appeared to be a misunderstanding and the Applicant provided cross references to where this had been assessed in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) Part 4 [APP-178], Section 4.5 and the RIAA Part 5 [APP-181], Section 5.4.3. As this site has not been included in Natural England's risk and issues log, the Applicant understood this matter to be resolved. The Applicant

¹ Butcher, J., Aitken, D., O'Hara, D. (2023). Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA Seabird Monitoring Programme Report 2023. RSPB report to Natural England.

² BTO and JNCC (2025) Seabird Monitoring Programme Online Database. Available at <https://app.bto.org/seabirds/public/data.jsp> [accessed 22/07/2025]

REIS Q	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		proposed development would not result in AEol on these sites. If NE disagree, please set out the reasoning.	has engaged with Natural England and understands that Natural England considers that, while there will be a residual impact to the site, given the nature of the farmland habitats being used by the lapwing from the SPA and the availability of similar habitats in the wider area, they are able to rule out AEol for North Falls, alone and in-combination. Therefore, no further HRA derogation is provided.
RIES Q25	NE	Does NE agree with the conclusions of the applicant with respect to impacts on invertebrate assemblage and plant assemblage of AOE Ramsar site?	The Applicant notes that this relates to Lantern Marshes which has been removed as an option due to the submission from National Trust at Deadline 7 [REP7-084].
RIES Q26	NE and the Applicant	Based on submissions to date, whilst NE advises it should be possible to exclude AEol, at Deadline 6 it is still not in a position to do so. Noting the limited time remaining in the examination, the ExA is concerned that it may not be possible for the competent authority to exclude AEol beyond reasonable scientific doubt on MLS SAC. As such, and in line with the relevant NPS EN-1, the ExA requests confirmation from NE and the applicant at Deadline 7 that they have reached agreement that AEol on MLS SAC can be excluded. If the applicant is unable to reach agreement with NE by Deadline 7, the ExA considers that a derogations case is required and should be provided by the applicant for Deadline 7. This can be provided on a without prejudice basis. This is to enable the ExA to examine information during the examination and make a recommendation to the SoS, and so that the SoS has all information available to them at the point of decision.	The Applicant responded to this question at Deadline 7 in the Applicant's Response to the ExA's Report on the Implications for European Sites [REP7-054]. The Applicant also provided a without prejudice derogation case for MLS SAC at Deadline 7 (Habitats Regulations Derogation Provision of Evidence [REP7-015/016] and Outline Benthic Compensation Implementation and Monitoring Plan [REP7-058]). However, as discussed in the Applicant's Response to Natural England's Deadline 7 submission [document reference 9.115, Section 2.1], the Applicant understands Natural England's concerns have been addressed and therefore that an AEol of the MLS SAC can be ruled out.
RIES Q27	Applicant	Can the applicant provide an updated version of the Compensatory Measures Overview document to reflect updates in compensation measures being required?	An updated Compensatory Measures Overview was submitted at Deadline 7 to reflect updates to the Applicant's position regarding ornithological compensatory measures and to include Margate and Long Sands SAC and further updated at Deadline 8 [7.2.1, Rev 4] to include Kentish Knock East MCZ, without prejudice of the Applicant's position.
RIES Q28	Applicant	Can the applicant provide an update of the Compensation Funding Statement which reflects changes in compensation?	The Applicant has submitted an updated Compensation Funding Statement [7.2.1.2, Rev 1] at Deadline 8 to include on a without prejudice basis, funding for compensation measures / MEEB for benthic features of the MLS SAC and KKE MCZ.
RIES Q29	NE	Can NE confirm if they consider the content of the without prejudice compensation schedules [REP5-065] to be sufficient? If NE have outstanding concerns, please set this out	N/A
RIES Q30	NE	Does NE have outstanding concerns regarding the scale/extent of compensation required for LBBG of AOE SPA? If NE have outstanding concerns, please set this out	N/A

REIS Q	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
RIES Q31	NE	Does NE have outstanding concerns regarding the quantum of compensation required for LBBG of AOE SPA?	N/A
RIES Q32	Applicant	Can the applicant respond to concerns raised by NE in its Deadline 5 submission [REP5-108].	This relates to Lantern Marshes which has been removed as an option due to the submission from National Trust at Deadline 7 [REP7-084].
RIES Q33	Applicant	Please respond to points raised by NE [REP6-088] particularly in relation to potential impacts of fence installation and maintenance.	<p>The Outline Lesser Black-backed Gull Compensation Implementation and Monitoring Plan [REP6-014/015] has been updated at Deadline 6 to include a commitment that construction of the fence will take place outside the nesting seasons of relevant bird species present on Gedgrave Marshes to avoid causing significant disturbance, where possible. This will be informed by pre-construction surveys and further impact assessment prior to construction. The CIMP, including scope and timing of surveys, and mitigation measures, will be discussed with the LBCSG.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered the Boyton and Hollesley Marshes RSPB reserve, which includes breeding wader, during site selection and in consultation with the RSPB. The indicative location on Gedgrave Marshes (Figure 1 in the LBBG Compensation Document [REP6-013/014]) maintains a greater distance between the North Falls compensation and RSPB reserve than is present between the existing LBBG colony and RSPB reserve, therefore the North Falls compensation would not increase risk to the waders at Boyton and Hollesley Marshes RSPB reserve. However, as discussed above, pre-construction monitoring will be undertaken at the selected site.</p>
RIES Q34	NE	With regard to the Deadline 6 submission from the applicant [REP6-013], does NE have any outstanding concerns regarding monitoring for LBBG?	The Outline LBBG CIMP [REP6-013] includes monitoring throughout the operational life of North Falls and the frequency of this monitoring will be agreed with the LBCSG.
RIES Q35	NE	The applicant has proposed a without prejudice schedule 15 for guillemot and razorbill which includes compensation measures for guillemot of the Farne Islands SPA. Is NE content that the measures included in the without prejudice schedule 15 satisfy its requirements for guillemot of the Farne Islands SPA? if not, please explain outstanding concerns.	At Deadline 6, the Applicant included compensation for guillemot from the Farnes Islands SPA and Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA in Part 2 of Schedule 15 of the DCO [REP6-005]. Compensation for razorbill continues to be provided on a without prejudice basis (see Without Prejudice HRA /MCZA DCO Schedules [9.73, Rev 3]).
RIES Q36	NE	Can NE confirm if it agrees with the scale of compensation set out in the applicant's submission [REP6-023].	N/A
RIES Q37	Applicant	Can the applicant provide an update of its ongoing discussions with landowners regarding site selection and access arrangements.	The Applicant continues to engage with landowners regarding access for surveys supporting site selection for guillemot and razorbill compensatory measures. To date, access has been agreed and surveys undertaken across 10 distinct locations. Further information on the status of these discussions and access arrangements is detailed within the Applicant's Habitats Regulations Assessment Land Rights Tracker [Document Reference: 9.75 (Rev 2)].
RIES Q38	NE	Is NE content with the approach of the applicant as set out in [REP6-025] that the detail of post implementation monitoring	N/A

REIS Q	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		will be agreed with the Guillemot and Razorbill Compensation Steering Group (or Guillemot Compensation Steering Group)?	
RIES Q39	NE	Can NE respond to the applicant's position in [REP6-019] that it will provide for ten nesting spaces on the ANS?	<p>In the RIES, the Examining Authority states that at Deadline 6 the Applicant provided updated compensation calculations for kittiwake to include the Hornsea 3 Part 2 method alongside the Hornsea 4 method and concluded that the proposed development should provide ten nesting pairs on the ANS.</p> <p>To clarify, the Applicant's recommendation is based on the mean predicted collisions of kittiwakes from the FFC SPA at North Falls, the Hornsea 3 method, and a ratio of 2:1 (Document Reference 7.2.4, Rev 2 [REP6-019/020] Section 5.3, Table 5.5). The Applicant's recommendation for North Falls takes account of the Secretary of State's decision on Rampion 2 that 10 nesting pairs was appropriate, also based on the mean or central impact value (CIV) of predicted collisions and a 2:1 ratio.</p>
RIES Q40	Applicant	Can the applicant explain whether it will amend the contents of the kittiwake compensation document as a result of findings from the BTO report?	<p>The Natural England commissioned review of methods used to calculate the scale of ANS proposed as compensation measures for kittiwake at OWFs (Rhoades et al. 2025 [REP6-087]) is welcomed, and the recommendations are noted. In particular it is noted that [REP6-087] recommends an approach to calculating compensation quantum which is similar to the Hornsea 3 method, but with some additional population constraints considered. The Applicant notes that Natural England is considering this method but advises that The Hornsea 3 method should be used by North Falls to calculate the compensation quantum for kittiwake.</p> <p>For kittiwake, the Applicant has provided a revised compensation document (Document Reference 7.1.4, Revision 2 [REP6-019/020]) which presents compensation scale calculations based on the Hornsea 3 method, as requested by Natural England (in their cover letter to Deadline 6 submission [REP6-084] and also in their Deadline 4 submission [REP4-062]). In relation to the Hornsea 3 method, the revised kittiwake compensation document draws on information in the <i>in press</i> version of the Rhoades et al. (BTO) report previously supplied by Natural England. A revised outline compensation implementation plan was also submitted at Deadline 6 (Document Reference 7.2.4.1 [REP6-021/022]) which provides some additional information on monitoring and adaptive management, noting that full details of proposed monitoring and adaptive management would be developed post-consent in consultation with the Kittiwake Compensation Steering Group.</p> <p>Updated compensation documents and Outline CIMPs have also been provided at D6 for all other species where compensation proposals (including without prejudice) have been provided. For species where compensation proposals apply to breeding populations: lesser black-backed gull, guillemot and razorbill [REP6-011/012 and REP6-023/024] (without prejudice for the latter species), as recommended by Natural England in their Deadline 4 submissions [REP4-060 and REP4-061], compensation scale calculations are presented using the Hornsea 4 methodology, with consideration given to natal philopatry where recommended by Natural England. Updated Outline CIMPs have also been provided for these species [REP6-013/014 and REP6-025/026], which expand on proposals for monitoring and adaptive management, while noting that full details of</p>

REIS Q	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			proposed monitoring and adaptive management would be developed post-consent in consultation with the appropriate Compensation Steering Group.
RIES Q41	NE	Do NE agree that peatland management as set out by the applicant [REP1-021] could result in an additional 3.4 adult birds per annum? Please set out any outstanding concerns regarding compensation measures for red-throated diver.	N/A
RIES Q42	NatureScot	Is NatureScot in agreement with the proposed without prejudice compensation measures in Scotland for red-throated divers? If not, please set out any concerns and how they may be managed.	N/A
RIES Q43	NE	Given the information provided by the applicant [REP5-054] regarding monitoring and adaptive management for red-throated diver. Do NE have outstanding concerns on this matter?	The Outline RTD CIMP [REP6-017/018] includes monitoring throughout the operational life of North Falls and the frequency of this monitoring will be agreed with the RTDCSG.

3. CONDITION STATUS OF EUROPEAN SITES

1. This section provides a summary of the condition assessments undertaken by the relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Body for each site screened into the North Falls shadow appropriate assessment (RIAA Parts 1 to 6, APP-173 to APP-182] in order to address the Examining Authority's Question 3 (shown in Section 2):
2. The following information sources were used:
 - Natural England Designated Sites View (<https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/SiteSearch.aspx>)
 - Joint Nature Conservation Committee (<https://jncc.gov.uk>)
 - NatureScot SiteLink (<https://sitelink.nature.scot/home>)
3. With regards to Transboundary sites designated under the Habitats Directive, the last Reporting under Article 17 was in 2018, with reporting for 2019-2024 due on 31 July 2025. Therefore, there is no up-to-date information available for Transboundary sites.

3.1 Benthic Ecology

Table 3.1 Condition Status of sites screened into the shadow appropriate assessment for the effects on benthic ecology

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
UK0030371	Margate and Long Sands Special Area of Conservation (SAC)	H1110 Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time	Unfavourable declining
UK9020309	Outer Thames Estuary SPA supporting	Subtidal coarse sediment	No condition assessment available
		Subtidal sand	
		Subtidal mud	
		Subtidal mixed sediment	
		Circalittoral rock	

3.2 Marine Mammals

Table 3.2 Condition Status of sites screened into the shadow appropriate assessment for the effects on marine mammals

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
UK			
UK0030170	Humber Estuary SAC and Ramsar	Grey seal	Not Assessed
UK0030395	Southern North Sea SAC	Harbour porpoise	Favourable
UK0017075	The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC	Harbour seal	Not Assessed
Belgium			
BEMNZ0001	Vlaamse Banken SAC	Harbour porpoise	No recent condition assessment available
		Harbour seal	
		Grey seal	
BEMNZ0002	SBZ 1 / ZPS 1 SPA	Harbour seal	
BEMNZ0005	Vlakte van de Raan Site of Community Importance (SCI)	Harbour porpoise	
		Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
France			
FR3102005	Baie de Canche et couloir des trois estuaires SAC	Harbour porpoise	No recent condition assessment available
		Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
FR3102002	Bancs des Flandres SAC	Harbour porpoise	
		Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
FR3100474	Dunes De La Plaine Maritime Flamande SAC	Harbour seal	
FR3100480	Estuaire De La Canche, Dunes Picardes Plaquees Sur L'ancienne Falaise, Foret D'hardelot Et Falaise D'equihen SAC	Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
FR2200346	Estuaires et littoral picards (baies de Somme et d'Authie) SAC	Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
FR3100478	Falaises du Cran aux Oeufs et du Cap Gris-Nez, Dunes du Chatelet, Marais de Tardinghen et Dunes de Wissant SAC	Harbour porpoise	
		Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
FR3102003	Recifs Gris-Nez Blanc-Nez SAC	Harbour porpoise	
		Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
FR3102004	Ridens et dunes hydrauliques du detroit du Pas-de-Calais SAC	Harbour porpoise	
		Harbour seal	
		Grey seal	
Netherlands			
NL2008001	Doggersbank SAC	Harbour porpoise	No recent condition assessment available
		Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
NL3009005	Duinen Ameland SAC	Grey seal	
NL2003060	Duinen en Lage Land Texel SAC	Grey seal	
NL9801079	Duinen Goeree & Kwade Hoek SAC	Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
NL2003059	Duinen Terschelling SAC	Grey seal	
NL2003061	Duinen Vlieland SAC	Grey seal	
NL4000021	Grevelingen SAC	Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
NL2008002	Klaverbank SAC	Harbour porpoise	
		Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
NL9802001	Noordzeekustzone SAC	Harbour porpoise	
		Grey seal	

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
		Harbour seal	
NL3009016	Oosterschelde SPA and SAC	Harbour porpoise	
		Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
NL2008003	Vlakte van de Raan SAC	Harbour porpoise	
		Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
NL4000017	Voordelta SAC and SPA	Harbour porpoise	
		Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
NL1000001	Waddenzee SAC	Harbour porpoise	
		Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	
NL9803061	Westerschelde & Saeftinghe SAC	Harbour porpoise	
		Grey seal	
		Harbour seal	

3.3 Offshore Ornithology

Table 3.3 Condition Status of sites screened into the shadow appropriate assessment for the effects on offshore ornithology

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
UK			
UK9009112 and UK11002	Alde-Ore Estuary SPA and Ramsar site	Sandwich tern, breeding	Not Assessed
		Lesser black-backed gull, breeding	
		Avocet, breeding	
		Avocet, non-breeding	
		Marsh harrier, breeding	
		Redshank, non-breeding	

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
		Ruff, non-breeding	
		Notable assemblage of breeding and wintering wetland birds	
UK9020309	Outer Thames Estuary SPA	Red-throated diver (non-breeding)	Unfavourable – No change
		Common tern (Breeding)	Favourable
UK11026	Foulness SPA and Ramsar	Sandwich tern, breeding	Unfavourable Declining
		Common tern, breeding	Unfavourable Declining
		Avocet, breeding	Unfavourable Recovering
		Ringed plover, breeding	Unfavourable Recovering
		Bar-tailed godwit, wintering	Unfavourable Recovering
		Dark-bellied brent goose, wintering	Unfavourable Recovering
		Grey plover, wintering	Unfavourable Declining
		Hen harrier, wintering	Not Assessed
		Knot, wintering	Unfavourable Declining
		Oystercatcher, wintering	Unfavourable Declining
		Redshank, wintering, passage	Unfavourable No Change
		Waterbird assemblage (shelduck, dunlin, curlew)	Unfavourable Declining
UK9006101	Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA	Gannet, breeding	Not Assessed
		Kittiwake, breeding	Not Assessed
		Guillemot, breeding	Not Assessed
		Razorbill, breeding	Not Assessed
		Seabird assemblage, breeding	Not Assessed
UK9020286	Sandlings SPA	Nightjar, breeding	Not Assessed
		Woodlark, breeding	Not Assessed

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
UK9009101 and UK11044	Minsmere-Walberswick SPA and Ramsar	Avocet, breeding	Favourable
		Marsh harrier, breeding	Favourable
		Nightjar, breeding	Unfavourable
		Shoveler, breeding	Favourable
		Shoveler, wintering	Favourable
		Teal, breeding	Unfavourable
		Gadwall, breeding	Favourable
		Gadwall, wintering	Favourable
		White-fronted goose, wintering	Not Assessed
		Hen harrier, wintering	Unfavourable
		Assemblage of rare breeding birds associated with marshland and reedbeds	Not Assessed
UK9009261 and UK11017	Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar	Avocet, wintering	Favourable
		Dark-bellied brent goose, wintering	Favourable
UK9009131 and UK11028	Hamford Water SPA and Ramsar	Avocet, wintering	Favourable
		Black-tailed godwit islandica, wintering	Unfavourable
		Dark-bellied brent goose, wintering	Favourable
		Grey plover, wintering	Favourable
		Redshank, wintering, passage	Favourable
		Ringed plover, wintering, passage	Unfavourable
		Shelduck, wintering	Favourable
		Teal, wintering	Favourable

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
UK9009121 and UK11067	Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA and Ramsar	Avocet, breeding	Favourable
		Black-tailed godwit islandica, wintering	Favourable
		Dark-bellied brent goose, wintering	Favourable
		Dunlin alpina, wintering	Unfavourable
		Grey plover, wintering	Favourable
		Knot, wintering	Favourable
		Pintail, wintering	Unfavourable
		Redshank, wintering	Favourable
		Redshank, autumn passage	Not Assessed
		Waterbird assemblage (great crested grebe, cormorant, shelduck, wigeon, gadwall, goldeneye, ringed plover, lapwing, curlew, turnstone)	Favourable
UK9012071 and UK11070	Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar	Golden plover, wintering	Unfavourable Declining
		Turnstone, wintering	Unfavourable Declining
UK9009291	Benacre to Easton Barents SPA	Marsh harrier, breeding	Not Assessed
UK9009243 and UK11015	Colne Estuary SPA and Ramsar	Pochard, breeding	Favourable
		Ringed plover, breeding	Unfavourable Declining
		Dark-bellied brent goose, wintering	Favourable
		Black-tailed godwit islandica, wintering	Not Assessed
		Hen harrier, wintering	Favourable
		Redshank, wintering	Favourable
		Waterbird assemblage, wintering (cormorant, mute swan, shelduck, goldeneye,	Favourable

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
		ringed plover, grey plover, sanderling, dunlin, curlew)	
UK9009253 and UK11010	Broadland SPA and Ramsar	Marsh harrier, breeding	Favourable
		Bewick's swan, wintering	Unfavourable
		Hen harrier, wintering	Unfavourable
		Ruff, wintering	Favourable
		Gadwall, wintering	Unfavourable
		Shoveler, wintering	Unfavourable
		Whooper swan, wintering	Favourable
		Wigeon, wintering	Favourable
UK9012121 and UK11066	Stodmarsh SPA and Ramsar	Gadwall, breeding	Favourable
		Gadwall, wintering	Favourable
		Bittern, wintering	Favourable
		Hen harrier, wintering	Favourable
		Shoveler, wintering	Favourable
		Breeding bird assemblage (great crested grebe, lapwing, redshank, snipe, grasshopper warbler, Savi's warbler, sedge warbler, reed warbler)	Favourable
		Waterbird assemblage, wintering (white-fronted goose, wigeon, mallard, pochard, tufted duck, water rail, lapwing, snipe)	Favourable
UK9009242 and UK11018	Dengie SPA and Ramsar	Dark-bellied brent goose, wintering	Favourable
		Grey plover, wintering	Favourable
		Hen harrier, wintering	Unfavourable No Change
		Knot, wintering	Favourable
		Waterbird assemblage, wintering (dunlin, black-	Favourable

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
		tailed godwit, bar-tailed godwit)	
UK9009245 and UK11007	Blackwater Estuary SPA and Ramsar	Pochard, breeding	Favourable
		Ringed plover, breeding	Unfavourable No Change
		Black-tailed godwit islandica, wintering	Favourable
		Dark-bellied brent goose, wintering	Favourable
		Dunlin alpina, wintering	Favourable
		Grey plover, wintering	Favourable
		Hen harrier, wintering	Unfavourable No Change
		Waterbird assemblage, wintering (cormorant, shelduck, gadwall, teal, goldeneye, ringed plover, curlew, redshank)	Favourable
UK9009141 and UK11001	Abberton Reservoir SPA and Ramsar	Coot, wintering	Unfavourable
		Gadwall, wintering	Unfavourable
		Goldeneye, wintering	Unfavourable
		Great crested grebe, wintering	Favourable
		Mute swan, wintering	Unfavourable
		Pochard, wintering	Unfavourable
		Shoveler, wintering	Favourable
		Teal, wintering	Favourable
		Tufted duck, wintering	Unfavourable
		Wigeon, wintering	Unfavourable
		Waterbird assemblage, late summer passage/moult	Unfavourable
UK9009244 and UK11058		Dark-bellied brent goose, wintering	Favourable

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
	Crouch and Roach Estuaries SPA and Ramsar	Waterbird assemblage, wintering	Favourable
UK9009181 and UK11008	Breydon Water SPA and Ramsar	Common tern, breeding	Favourable
		Avocet, wintering	Favourable
		Bewick's swan, wintering	Unfavourable
		Golden plover, wintering	Favourable
		Lapwing, wintering	Unfavourable
		Ruff, passage	Unfavourable
		Waterbird assemblage	Favourable
UK9012011 and UK11071	The Swale SPA and Ramsar	Dark-bellied brent goose, wintering	Favourable
		Dunlin alpina, wintering	Favourable
		Redshank, passage	Not Recorded
		Grey plover, wintering	Favourable
		Breeding bird assemblage (shelduck, mallard, moorhen, coot, lapwing, redshank, reed warbler, reed bunting)	Favourable
		Waterbird assemblage, wintering (oystercatcher, ringed plover, redshank, shelduck, wigeon, teal, curlew)	Favourable
UK9009171 and UK11006	Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA and Ramsar	Dark-bellied brent goose, wintering	Favourable
		Dunlin alpina, wintering	Favourable
		Grey plover, wintering	Favourable
		Knot, wintering	Favourable
		Ringed plover, wintering	Unfavourable No Change
		Waterbird assemblage, wintering	Favourable

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
UK9012021 and UK11069	Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar	Avocet, wintering	Favourable
		Black-tailed godwit islandica, wintering, passage	Favourable
		Dunlin alpina, wintering	Favourable
		Grey plover, wintering	Favourable
		Hen harrier, wintering	Unfavourable No Change
		Knot, wintering	Favourable
		Redshank, wintering	Unfavourable No Change
		Ringed plover, passage	Favourable
		Waterbird assemblage	Favourable
UK9012031 and UK11040	Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar	Avocet, breeding	Favourable
		Avocet, wintering	Favourable
		Dark-bellied brent goose, wintering	Unfavourable
		Dunlin alpina, wintering	Unfavourable
		Grey plover, wintering	Unfavourable
		Knot, wintering	Unfavourable
		Pintail, wintering	Unfavourable
		Redshank, wintering	Unfavourable
		Ringed plover, wintering	Unfavourable
		Shelduck, wintering	Unfavourable
		Breeding bird assemblage (oystercatcher, lapwing, ringed plover, redshank, shelduck, mallard, teal, shoveler, pochard, common tern)	Favourable
		Waterbird assemblage, wintering (red-throated diver, great crested grebe, cormorant, mallard, teal, shoveler, pochard, oystercatcher, Bewick's	Favourable

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
		swan, hen harrier, merlin, golden plover, short-eared owl, kingfisher)	
UK9009201	Breckland SPA	Nightjar, breeding	Unfavourable
		Stone curlew, breeding	Favourable
		Woodlark, breeding	Unfavourable
UK9012091 and UK11023	Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SPA and Ramsar	Sandwich tern, breeding	Favourable
		Common tern, breeding	Favourable
		Avocet, breeding	Favourable
		Marsh harrier, breeding	Favourable
		Aquatic warbler, passage	Favourable
		Bewick's swan, wintering	Unfavourable
		Bittern, wintering	Unfavourable
		Golden plover, wintering	Unfavourable
		Hen harrier, wintering	Unfavourable
		Ruff, wintering	Favourable
		Shoveler, wintering	Favourable
		Mute swan, wintering	Not Assessed
		Waterbird assemblage, wintering (European white-fronted goose, wigeon, gadwall, pochard, little grebe, great crested grebe, cormorant, coot, sanderling, whimbrel, common sandpiper, lapwing)	Favourable
UK9009031	North Norfolk Coast SPA	Sandwich tern, breeding	Unfavourable
		Common tern, breeding	Unfavourable
UK9011011	Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA	Sandwich tern, breeding	Unfavourable No Change
		Common tern, breeding	Unfavourable No Change
UK9011061		Sandwich tern, breeding	Unfavourable

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
	Solent and Southampton Water SPA	Common tern, breeding	Unfavourable
UK9006061	Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA	Common tern, breeding	Favourable
UK9006031	Coquet Island SPA	Sandwich tern, breeding	Favourable
		Common tern, breeding	Favourable
		Arctic tern, breeding	Favourable
		Roseate tern, breeding	Favourable
UK9006021	Farne Islands SPA	Sandwich tern, breeding	Unfavourable
		Common tern, breeding	Unfavourable
		Arctic tern, breeding	Unfavourable
		Guillemot, breeding	Favourable
UK9004171	Forth Islands SPA	Sandwich tern, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
		Common tern, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
		Arctic tern, breeding	Favourable maintained
		Roseate tern, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
		Gannet, breeding	Favourable maintained
		Lesser black-backed gull, breeding	Favourable maintained
UK9002221	Ythan Estuary, Sands of Forvie and Meikle Loch SPA	Sandwich tern, breeding	Favourable maintained
		Common tern, breeding	Not Assessed
	Loch of Strathbeg SPA.	Sandwich tern, breeding	Not Assessed
UK9008021	The Wash SPA	Common tern, breeding	Favourable
UK9001624	Inner Moray Firth SPA	Common tern, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
UK9001623	Cromarty Firth SPA	Common tern, breeding	Unfavourable declining
	Northumbria Coast SPA	Arctic tern, breeding	Not Assessed
UK9001131	Pentland Firth Islands SPA	Arctic tern, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
	Auskerry SPA	Arctic tern, breeding	Unfavourable declining
UK9002371	Rousay SPA	Arctic tern, breeding	Unfavourable declining

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
UK9002091	Fair Isle SPA	Arctic tern, breeding	Unfavourable recovering
		Guillemot, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
UK9002101	West Westray SPA	Arctic tern, breeding	Unfavourable declining
		Guillemot, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
UK9002111	Papa Westray (North Hill and Holm) SPA	Arctic tern, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
		Arctic skua, breeding	Unfavourable declining
UK9002511	Sumburgh Head SPA	Arctic tern, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
UK9002361	Mousa SPA	Arctic tern, breeding	Unfavourable declining
UK9002061	Foula SPA	Arctic tern, breeding	Unfavourable declining
		Guillemot, breeding	Unfavourable declining
		Great skua, breeding	Unfavourable declining
		Red-throated diver, breeding	Favourable maintained
UK9002051	Papa Stour SPA	Arctic tern, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
UK9002031	Fetlar SPA	Arctic tern, breeding	Unfavourable recovering
		Great skua, breeding	Unfavourable declining
UK9002271	Fowlsheugh SPA	Guillemot, breeding	Favourable maintained
		Kittiwake, breeding	Unfavourable declining
UK9002471	Troup, Pennan and Lion's Heads SPA	Guillemot, breeding	Unfavourable recovering
UK9001182	East Caithness Cliffs SPA	Guillemot, breeding	Favourable maintained
		Razorbill, breeding	Favourable maintained
		Herring gull, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
		Kittiwake, breeding	Favourable maintained
UK9001181	North Caithness Cliffs SPA	Guillemot, breeding	Favourable maintained
UK9002121	Marwick Head SPA	Guillemot, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
UK9002081	Noss SPA	Guillemot, breeding	Unfavourable, no change
		Gannet, breeding	Favourable maintained
		Great skua, breeding	Unfavourable declining
UK9002011		Gannet, breeding	Favourable maintained

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
	Hermaness, Saxa Vord and Valla Field SPA	Great skua, breeding	Unfavourable declining
		Red-throated diver, breeding	Unfavourable declining
UK9002141	Hoy SPA	Great skua, breeding	Unfavourable declining
		Red-throated diver, breeding	Favourable maintained
UK9002041	Ronas Hill - North Roe and Tingon SPA, and	Great skua, breeding	Favourable maintained
		Red-throated diver, breeding	Favourable declining
UK9002111	Caithness and Sutherland Peatlands SPA	Red-throated diver, breeding	Favourable maintained
UK9002941	Otterswick and Graveland SPA	Red-throated diver, breeding	Unfavourable declining
UK9002311	Orkney Mainland Moors SPA	Red-throated diver, breeding	Favourable maintained

3.4 Onshore Ornithology

Table 3.4 Condition Status of sites screened into the shadow appropriate assessment for the effects on onshore ornithology

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
UK9009131	Hamford Water SPA	Little tern (breeding)	Unfavourable
		Avocet (wintering)	Favourable
		Dark bellied brent goose (wintering)	Favourable
		Shelduck (wintering)	Favourable
		Teal (wintering)	Favourable
		Ringed plover (wintering)	Unfavourable
		Grey plover (wintering)	Favourable
		Black-tailed godwit (wintering)	Unfavourable
		Redshank (wintering)	Favourable

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
UK11028	Hamford Water Ramsar	Ringed plover (migration)	Not Assessed
		Common redshank (migration)	Not Assessed
		Dark bellied brent goose (wintering)	Not Assessed
		Black-tailed godwit (wintering)	Not Assessed
		Grey plover (wintering)	Not Assessed
UK9009121	Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA	Avocet (breeding)	Favourable
		Redshank (migration)	Favourable
		Dark bellied brent goose (wintering)	Favourable
		Pintail (wintering)	Unfavourable
		Grey plover (wintering)	Favourable
		Knot (wintering)	Favourable
		Dunlin (wintering)	Unfavourable
		Black-tailed godwit (wintering)	Favourable
		Redshank (wintering)	Favourable
		Waterbird assemblage	Favourable
UK11067	Stour and Orwell Estuaries Ramsar	Waterfowl assemblage (wintering)	Not Assessed
		Common redshank (migration)	Not Assessed
		Dark bellied brent goose (wintering)	Not Assessed
		Northern pintail (wintering)	Not Assessed
		Grey plover (wintering)	Not Assessed
		Red knot (wintering)	Not Assessed

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
		Dunlin (wintering)	Not Assessed
		Black-tailed godwit (wintering)	Not Assessed
		Redshank (wintering)	Not Assessed
UK9009243	Colne Estuary (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 2) SPA	Little tern (breeding)	Unfavourable Declining
		Hen harrier (wintering)	Favourable
		Dark-bellied brent goose (wintering)	Favourable
		Redshank (wintering)	Favourable
		Ringed plover (breeding)	Unfavourable Declining
		Pochard (breeding)	Favourable
		Waterbird assemblage (breeding)	Favourable
UK11015	Colne Estuary (Mid-Essex Coast Phase 2) Ramsar	Waterfowl assemblage (wintering)	Not Assessed
		Dark bellied brent goose (wintering)	Not Assessed
		Common Redshank (wintering)	Not Assessed

3.5 Onshore Ecology

Table 3.5 Condition Status of sites screened into the shadow appropriate assessment for the effects on onshore ecology

Site code	Designation name	Qualifying feature	Condition Status
UK9009131	Hamford Water SAC	Fisher's estuarine moth	Favourable



NORTH FALLS

Offshore Wind Farm



HARNESSING THE POWER OF NORTH SEA WIND

North Falls Offshore Wind Farm Ltd

A joint venture company owned equally by SSE Renewables and RWE.

To contact please email contact@northfallsoffshore.com

© 2024 All Rights Reserved

North Falls Offshore Wind Farm Limited Registered Address: Windmill Hill Business Park, Whitehill Way, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN5 6PB, United Kingdom
Registered in England and Wales Company Number: 12435947
