

East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm

Chapter 7

Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes

Preliminary Environmental Information

Volume 1

Document Reference: EA1N-DEVWF-ENV-REP-IBR
000276

Prepared by:	Checked by:	Approved by:

Revision Summary

Rev	Date	Document status	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
01	11/01/2019	For issue	Paolo Pizzolla	Ian MacKay	Helen Walker

Description of Revisions

Rev	Page	Section	Description
01	n/a	n/a	Final draft

Table of Contents

7	Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes	1
7.1	Introduction	1
7.2	Consultation	2
7.3	Scope	8
7.4	Impact Assessment Methodology	21
7.5	Existing Environment	34
7.6	Potential Impacts	44
7.7	Cumulative Impacts	77
7.8	Transboundary Impacts	86
7.9	Interactions	86
7.10	Inter-relationships	92
7.11	Summary	93
7.12	References	96

The figures in **Chapter 7 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes** are listed in the table below and can be found in **Volume 2**.

Figure number	Title
7.1	Receptor groups for marine geology, oceanography and physical processes
7.2	Bathymetry and bedforms of the East Anglia ONE North windfarm area
7.3	Bathymetry and bedforms of the offshore cable corridor
7.4	Position of the amphidromic point
7.5	Sea bed sediment stations within the windfarm site
7.6	Sea bed sediment stations within the offshore cable corridor
7.7	Zone of potential influence on the tidal regime
7.8	Zone of potential influence on the wave regime
7.9	Refined offshore cable corridor
7.10	Zone of potential cumulative influence on the wave regime
7.11	Zone of potential cumulative influence on the tidal regime

The following appendices associated with **Chapter 7 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes** are listed in the table below.

Appendix number	Title
7.1	Individual Project and Cumulative Wave Modelling
7.2	Assessment of Transboundary Effects

Glossary of Acronyms

BGS	British Geological Society
CIA	Cumulative Impact Assessment
DCO	Development Consent Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPP	Evidence Plan Process
ES	Environmental Statement
GBS	Gravity Base Structure
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
km	Kilometre
km ²	Kilometre Squared
LAT	Lowest Astronomical Tide (CD)
m	Metre
m ²	Metre Squared
m ³	Metre Cubed
m/s	Metres Per Second
MCZ	Marine Conservation Zone
mg/l	Milligrams Per Litre
mm	Millimetre
MW	Megawatt
OD	Ordnance Datum
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
s	Second (unit of time)
SMP	Shoreline Management Plan
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPR	ScottishPower Renewables
S-P-R	Source-Pathway-Receptor conceptual model
SSC	Suspended Sediment Concentration
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
UK	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
ZEA	Zonal Environmental Appraisal

Glossary of Terminology

Accretion	The addition of newly deposited sediment vertically and/or horizontally.
Amphidromic point	The centre of an amphidromic system; a nodal point around which a standing-wave crest rotates once each tidal period.
Applicant	East Anglia ONE North Limited.
Astronomical tide	The predicted tide levels and character that would result from the gravitational effects of the earth, sun and moon without any atmospheric influences.
Bathymetry	Topography of the sea bed.
Beach	A deposit of non-cohesive sediment (e.g. sand, gravel) situated on the interface between dry land and the sea (or other large expanse of water) and actively 'worked' by present-day hydrodynamic processes (i.e. waves, tides and currents) and sometimes by winds.
Bedforms	Features on the sea bed (e.g. sand waves, ripples) resulting from the movement of sediment over it.
Bedload	Sediment particles that travel near or on the bed.
Clay	Fine-grained sediment with a typical particle size of less than 0.002 mm.
Climate change	A change in global or regional climate patterns. Within this chapter this usually relates to any long-term trend in mean sea level, wave height, wind speed etc., due to climate change.
Closure depth	The depth that represents the 'seaward limit of significant depth change', but is not an absolute boundary across which there is no cross-shore sediment transport.
Coastal processes	Collective term covering the action of natural forces on the coastline and nearshore sea bed.
Cohesive sediment	Sediment containing a significant proportion of clays, the electromagnetic properties of which causes the particles to bind together.
Construction, operation and maintenance platform	A fixed offshore structure required for construction, operation, and maintenance personnel and activities.
Crest	Highest point on a bedform or wave.
Cross-shore	Perpendicular to the coastline. Also referred to as shore normal.
Current	Flow of water generated by a variety of forcing mechanisms (e.g. waves, tides, wind).
East Anglia ONE North project	The proposed project consisting of up to 67 wind turbines, up to four offshore electrical platforms, up to one offshore construction, operation and maintenance platform, inter-array cables, platform link cables, up to one operational meteorological mast, up to two offshore export cables, fibre optic cables, landfall infrastructure, onshore cables and ducts, onshore substation, and National Grid infrastructure.
East Anglia ONE North windfarm site	The offshore area within which wind turbines and offshore platforms will be located.
Ebb tide	The falling tide, immediately following the period of high water and preceding the period of low water.
Episodic	Composed of a series of discrete events rather than as a continual process.
Erosion	Wearing away of the land or sea bed by natural forces (e.g. wind, waves, currents, chemical weathering).
Evidence Plan Process	A voluntary consultation process with specialist stakeholders to agree the approach to the EIA and the information required to support HRA.

Export cables	The cables which transmit electricity from the offshore electrical platform to the landfall.
Flood tide	The rising tide, immediately following the period of low water and preceding the period of high water.
Foreshore	A morphological term for the lower shore zone/area on the beach that lies between mean low and high water.
Glacial till	Poorly-sorted, non-stratified and unconsolidated sediment carried or deposited by a glacier.
Gravel	Loose, rounded fragments of rock larger than sand but smaller than cobbles. Sediment larger than 2mm (as classified by the Wentworth scale used in sedimentology).
Habitat	The environment of an organism and the place where it is usually found.
High water	Maximum level reached by the rising tide.
Holocene	The last 10,000 years of earth history.
Horizontal directional drilling (HDD)	A method of cable installation where the cable is drilled beneath a feature without the need for trenching.
Hydrodynamic	The process and science associated with the flow and motion in water produced by applied forces.
Inter-array cables	Offshore cables which link the wind turbines to each other and the offshore electrical platforms, these cables will include fibre optic cables.
Intertidal	Area on a coast that lies between Lowest Astronomical Tide (LAT) and Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT).
Landfall	The area (from Mean Low Water Springs) where the offshore export cables would make contact with land, and connect to the onshore cables.
Lithology	The description of the macro features of a rock or rock-type.
Longshore transport rate	Rate of transport of sediment parallel to the coast. Usually expressed in cubic metres per year.
Long-term	Refers to a time period of decades to centuries.
Low water	The minimum height reached by the falling tide.
Mean sea level	The average level of the sea surface over a defined period (usually a year or longer).
Megaripples	Bedforms with a wavelength of 0.6 to 10.0m and a height of 0.1 to 1.0m. These features are smaller than sand waves but larger than ripples.
Neap tide	A tide that occurs when the tide-generating forces of the sun and moon are acting at right angles to each other, so the tidal range is lower than average.
Nearshore	The zone which extends from the swash zone to the position marking the start of the offshore zone (~20m).
Numerical modelling	Refers to the analysis of coastal processes using computational models.
Offshore	Area to seaward of nearshore in which the transport of sediment is not caused by wave activity.
Offshore cable corridor	This is the area which will contain the offshore export cable between offshore electrical platforms and landfall jointing bay.
Offshore development area	The East Anglia ONE North windfarm site and offshore cable corridor (up to Mean High Water Springs).
Offshore electrical infrastructure	The transmission assets required to export generated electricity to shore. This includes inter-array cables from the wind turbines to the offshore electrical platforms, offshore electrical platforms, platform link cables and export cables from the offshore electrical platforms to the landfall.
Offshore electrical platform	A fixed structure located within the windfarm area, containing electrical equipment to aggregate the power from the wind turbine generators and

	convert it into a more suitable form for export to shore.
Offshore export cables	The cables which would bring electricity from the offshore electrical platforms to the landfall.
Offshore platform	A collective term for the construction, operation and maintenance platform and the offshore electrical platforms.
Platform link cables	Electrical cable which links one or more offshore platforms, these cables will include fibre optic cables.
Pleistocene	An epoch of the Quaternary Period (between about 2 million and 10,000 years ago) characterised by several glacial ages.
Quaternary Period	The last 2 million years of earth history incorporating the Pleistocene ice ages and the post-glacial (Holocene) Period.
Safety zone	A marine area declared for the purposes of safety around a renewable energy installation or works / construction area under the Energy Act 2004.
Sand	Sediment particles, mainly of quartz with a diameter of between 0.063mm and 2mm. Sand is generally classified as fine, medium or coarse.
Sand wave	Bedforms with wavelengths of 10 to 100m, with amplitudes of 1 to 10m.
Scour protection	Protective materials to avoid sediment being eroded away from the base of the foundations as a result of the flow of water.
Sea level	Generally refers to 'still water level' (excluding wave influences) averaged over a period of time such that periodic changes in level (e.g. due to the tides) are averaged out.
Sea-level rise	The general term given to the upward trend in mean sea level resulting from a combination of local or regional geological movements and global climate change.
Sediment	Particulate matter derived from rock, minerals or bioclastic matter.
Sediment transport	The movement of a mass of sediment by the forces of currents and waves.
Shallow water	Commonly, water of such depth that surface waves are noticeably affected by bottom topography. It is customary to consider water of depths less than half the surface wave length as shallow water.
Shore platform	A platform of exposed rock or cohesive sediment exposed within the intertidal and subtidal zones.
Short-term	Refers to a time period of months to years.
Significant wave height	The average height of the highest of one third of the waves in a given sea state.
Silt	Sediment particles with a grain size between 0.002mm and 0.063mm, i.e. coarser than clay but finer than sand.
Spring tide	A tide that occurs when the tide-generating forces of the sun and moon are acting in the same directions, so the tidal range is higher than average.
Storm surge	A rise in water level on the open coast due to the action of wind stress as well as atmospheric pressure on the sea surface.
Surge	Changes in water level as a result of meteorological forcing (wind, high or low barometric pressure) causing a difference between the recorded water level and the astronomical tide predicted using harmonic analysis.
Suspended sediment	The sediment moving in suspension in a fluid kept up by the upward components of the turbulent currents or by the colloidal suspension.
Swell waves	Wind-generated waves that have travelled out of their generating area. Swell characteristically exhibits a more regular and longer period and has flatter crests than waves within their fetch.
Tidal current	The alternating horizontal movement of water associated with the rise

	and fall of the tide.
Tidal range	Difference in height between high and low water levels at a point.
Tide	The periodic rise and fall of the water that results from the gravitational attraction of the moon and sun acting upon the rotating earth.
Wave climate	Average condition of the waves at a given place over a period of years, as shown by height, period, direction etc.
Wave height	The vertical distance between the crest and the trough.
Wavelength	The horizontal distance between consecutive bedform crests.

This page is intentionally blank

7 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes

7.1 Introduction

1. This chapter of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) describes the marine physical environment of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project, including the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site and the offshore cable corridor to the landfall location just north of Thorpeness.
2. This chapter provides a summary description of key aspects relating to existing marine physical processes followed by an assessment of the magnitude and significance of the effects upon the baseline conditions resulting from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project, as well as those effects resulting from cumulative interactions with other existing or planned projects.
3. This chapter of the PEIR was written by Royal HaskoningDHV marine physical processes specialists, and incorporates interpretation of geophysical survey data collected by Gardline (2017) and benthic survey data collected by Bibby Hydromap and Benthic Solutions (2018a, b).
4. This assessment process has been informed by the following, as explained in more detail throughout the chapter:
 - A Physical Process Method Statement (Appendix 2.1 of the Scoping Report (ScottishPower Renewables (SPR) (2017)), prepared as part of the Evidence Plan Process (EPP), incorporating a baseline assessment of winds, water levels, waves, sediment regime, process controls on sediment mobility and morphological regime, as well as detailed reviews of the findings from: (i) Zonal Cumulative Impact Assessment for the former East Anglia Zone; (ii) East Anglia ONE Environmental Statement (ES); and (iii) East Anglia THREE ES;
 - Interpretation of existing datasets collected for earlier projects (most notably the Zonal Cumulative Impact Assessment for the former East Anglia Zone) and survey data specifically collected for the present project including bathymetry, geophysical, geotechnical, metocean and environmental data;
 - The existing evidence base regarding the effects of offshore windfarm developments on the physical environment;
 - **Appendix 7.1** which provides an Individual Project and Cumulative Wave Modelling Study, assessing potential impacts of the proposed East Anglia

- ONE North project on the wave climate, alone and cumulatively with other windfarms;
- **Appendix 7.2** which provides an Assessment of Transboundary Effects;
 - Detailed numerical modelling studies undertaken previously for both the East Anglia Zonal Environmental Appraisal (ZEA) and the ES of East Anglia ONE;
 - Desk-based assessments undertaken for the East Anglia THREE ES and the Norfolk Vanguard ES;
 - Discussion and agreement with key stakeholders; and
 - Expert-based assessment and judgement by Royal HaskoningDHV.
5. The potential effects on marine physical processes are assessed conservatively using realistic worst-case scenarios for the project.
6. All figures referred to in this chapter are provided in Volume 2 of this PEIR.
7. The assessment of potential effects has been made with specific reference to the relevant National Policy Statements (NPS) (discussed further in **Chapter 3, Policy and Legislative Context**). These are the principal decision-making documents for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP). Those relevant to marine physical processes are:
- Overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1) (July 2011); and
 - NPS for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) (July 2011).

7.2 Consultation

8. Consultation is a key driver of the environmental impact assessment (EIA), and is an ongoing process throughout the lifecycle of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project, from the initial stages through to consent and post-consent. To date, consultation has been sought regarding marine geology, oceanography and physical processes through the Scoping Report submitted in November 2017 (SPR 2017). Additionally, a Marine Physical Processes Method Statement (Appendix 2.1 of SPR 2017) was submitted to the Benthic and Physical Processes Expert Topic Group (ETG) which includes: Natural England, the Marine Management Organisation (MMO), Cefas, the Environment Agency and Suffolk Coastal District Council. That document provided a method for the assessment of potential effects on the baseline marine physical processes due to the proposed project.

9. In response to feedback on the Physical Processes Method Statement, further consultation was undertaken with Cefas and the MMO in relation to wave modelling and with Suffolk Coastal District Council, Suffolk County Council and the Environment Agency in relation to the offshore export cable routing and landfall at two separate meetings in early 2018.
10. **Table 7.1** provides a summary of those consultation responses that have been received as a response to the Scoping Report (SPR 2017) and are relevant to marine geology, oceanography and physical processes.
11. Further consultation will continue to be undertaken once the PEIR is made available, and during further ETG meetings between now and the project Development Consent Order (DCO) application submission.

Table 7.1 Consultation Responses

Consultee	Date/ Document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the PEI
Cefas / MMO	09/09/2017 Method Statement Response	Concern with methodology used to assess the impact on sensitive receptors, both from a single windfarm and cumulatively, of a change in the wave regime.	In consultation with Cefas and the MMO through ETG meetings, a methodology which was transparent and robust was developed and used in the assessment. See Appendix 7.1 and section 7.7.1 .
Cefas / Natural England / MMO	09/09/2017 Method Statement Response	The list of impacts outlined in the method statement to be included in the ES is appropriate with the following caveats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational suspended sediment as a result of vertical turbulence. • Physical impacts to nearby SPA supporting sandbanks. • Suspended sediment due to cable installation works through SPA supporting sandbanks. 	Increase in suspended sediment created by scour is covered in section 7.6.2.4 . Physical impacts (tidal currents and waves) are assessed in sections 7.6.2.1 and 7.6.2.2 . Suspended sediment due to cable installation is covered in sections 7.6.1.3 and 7.6.1.5 .
Cefas / MMO	09/09/2017 Method Statement Response	The impact of spudcan marks on the sea bed from jack-up vessels should be assessed in the constructional phase.	The impacts of penetration by jack-up vessels is included in section 7.6.1.7 . This includes the impact of spudcan marks
Cefas / MMO	09/09/2017 Method Statement	The impact of cable protection measures on the sediment transport patterns and pathways should be assessed in the	The impact of cable protection during the operational phase is assessed in section 7.6.1.7 . As part of the DCO submission

Consultee	Date/ Document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the PEI
	Response	Operational phase. Specifically, this related to rock dumping on intra-array and export cables which could stand 2m proud of the seabed over considerable distance (normally addressed in a Depth of Burial/Cable Protection Plan reports).	a suite of outline documents providing indicative monitoring and management measures will be provided see section 7.3.2 .
Cefas / MMO	09/09/2017 Method Statement Response	Is it proposed to address Scour issues with a Scour Management plan report?	The extent to which scour management will be required will be determined post consent following the detailed technical design. An Outline Scour Protection and Cable Statement will be submitted with the DCO application
Natural England	08/12/2017 Scoping Response	NE acknowledges that further surveys will be carried out within the inshore areas of the export cable corridor to further inform the sediment composition.	Noted
Natural England	08/12/2017 Scoping Response	Due to the common nature of sand banks, sand waves and megaripples in this area, any future environmental assessments should determine the likelihood or necessity for sand wave clearance in relation to the construction and operation of any windfarm assets.	An impact assessment has been undertaken to determine the impact on sea bed formations, including sand waves, sand banks and mega ripples (see section 7.6.1). The impact assessment considers impacts from construction activities such as levelling and dredging, as well as impacts caused during the operational phase by the presence of physical infrastructure.
Natural England	08/12/2017 Scoping Response	Natural England notes that some of the data is now considered 'old' and collected from the overall East Anglia zone; therefore we advise that further consideration is given to the ability to potentially repeat these surveys post construction should any changes be noted. A (visual) representation of how much data has been collected would be useful	The approach to benthic data use and collection, and the suitability of the ZEA data to inform the PEIR was agreed with NE and MMO at the ETG meeting of the 19 th of April 2017 and subsequent Method Statements (see Appendix 2.1 of SPR 2017). It was agreed that given the nature of the sediment and benthic habitats

Consultee	Date/ Document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the PEI
		to fully quantify it.	in the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site and nearby vicinity that the use of ZEA survey data for the windfarm site and parts of the offshore cable corridor where available was sufficient. New data has been collected from previously un-surveyed areas of the cable corridor.
Natural England	08/12/2017 Scoping Response	The importance of focussing on the bathymetric data collection within the proposed array areas should not be underestimated. More site specific data will allow a larger data set to be collected and provide a further robust baseline, but also post construction to monitor any potential effects of the windfarm, if required.	New side-scan sonar, bathymetric data and sediment contaminant data has been collected within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site (see section 7.4.2)
Natural England	08/12/2017 Scoping Response	NE should also be consulted upon regarding the extent to which scour management will be required, particularly within any protected sites.	Worst case scenarios have been assumed within the assessments as defined in the Chapter 6 Project Description .
Natural England	08/12/2017 Scoping Response	Has the resuspension of contaminants from dredging been considered?	This has been considered as part of Chapter 8 Marine Water and Sediment Quality .
Natural England	08/12/2017 Scoping Response	There needs to be sufficient justification provided when proposing to use additional scour protection, particularly in a soft sediment dominated habitat. Careful placement of scour protection also needs to be considered as to not further encourage scour along the cable route, especially where there is obvious sand wave movement. Every effort should be made to bury the cable to the required depth in the first instance.	Cables would be buried wherever possible and it is not anticipated that scour protection would be required for cable laid in soft sediment areas. Scour protection requirements are clearly outlined in Chapter 6 Project Description .
Natural	08/12/2017	Changes to the sediment transport regime due to the presence of the	This has been considered in section 9.6.4.2 of Chapter 9

Consultee	Date/ Document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the PEI
England	Scoping Response	foundation structures; although the formation of turbid wakes is further understood, their potential effect on benthic ecology and thus recruitment and food availability should be fully assessed. Particularly as monopole foundations continue to increase in size.	Benthic Ecology.
Marine Management Organisation	07/12/2017 Scoping Response	The MMO suggests that, until the results of the cumulative wave assessment have been produced, transboundary effects during operation should be scoped in for consideration in the PEI.	Transboundary effects have been scoped out following cumulative wave modelling and subsequent agreement through ETG meetings (Appendix 7.2).
Marine Management Organisation	07/12/2017 Scoping Response	It is suggested that a section addressing the impacts of climate change on the structures, cable and infrastructure is included in the Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes chapter of the PEI.	The effects of climate change over the relatively short design life of the proposed development would not be significant in the context of natural variability in baseline conditions. Sea-level rise is a slow progressive factor that will have more measurable effects over timescales of 50+ years (see Section 7.5.10)
Environment Agency	08/12/2017 Scoping Response	The PEI should include a section on landfall physical processes. With regards to the baseline reporting, a lot of work has already been completed on this as part of the Sizewell C scheme. It would make sense to use this data if possible to help make the most informed decision.	The landfall baseline environment and potential effects have been informed by analysis of data kindly provided by the Environment Agency and EDF. Section 7.5.8 "Shoreline Transport Pathways and Coastal Erosion" covers landfall physical processes.
The Planning Inspectorate	20/12/2017 Scoping Response	It is not agreed that transboundary effects may be scoped out for the operational phase, since the presence of the foundation structures could cause changes to the wave regime, the impacts of which could extend beyond the site of the Proposed Development and this has not been addressed in the	Transboundary effects are scoped out following cumulative wave modelling (Appendix 2.1 in SPR (2017) and Appendix 7.2).

Consultee	Date/ Document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the PEI
		Scoping Report.	
The Planning Inspectorate	20/12/2017 Scoping Response	The Inspectorate advises that consideration should be given to the potential for impacts on the Orford Inshore recommended Marine Conservation Zone. If it is concluded that there could be significant impacts this receptor should be included in the assessment and the scope agreed with NE.	The implications of changes in physical processes on other topics (e.g. benthic ecology and fish and shellfish ecology) are assessed in Chapter 9 Benthic Ecology and Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology .
The Planning Inspectorate	20/12/2017 Scoping Response	Paragraph 83 of the Physical Processes MS (of the Scoping Report) explains that the cumulative impact assessment of East Anglia ONE will be undertaken on the basis of 102 wind turbines being present. The Inspectorate is aware that the authorised DCO for East Anglia ONE includes permission for up to 240 wind turbines. The cumulative impact assessment within the ES should address this position and explain how this has been taken into consideration ensuring a robust assessment is undertaken for each aspect chapter.	For the East Anglia ONE project, the previous modelling assessed a worst case of 240 wind turbines. This confirmed no significant effect on the wave climate. The Zonal Cumulative Impact Assessment, covering development across the whole former East Anglia Zone, concluded that potential cumulative impacts on the wave regime were not significant. The cumulative wave modelling undertaken for the present study adopted a realistic worst case of 102 wind turbines (see Appendix 2.1 of SPR (2017)). Additionally, this issue was discussed with Cefas who were content with using the planned rather than consented envelope.

12. Ongoing public consultation has been conducted through a series of Public Information Days (PIDs) and Public Meetings. These have been held throughout Suffolk in November 2017, March 2018 and June / July 2018 with further events planned in 2019. A series of stakeholder engagement events were also undertaken in October 2018 as part of consultation phase 3.5. These events were held to inform the public of potential changes to the onshore substation location. This consultation aims to ensure that concerns are well understood and that site specific conditions can be taken into account, where practicable.

13. **Table 7.2** summarises public consultation feedback pertaining to Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes. Consultation phases are explained further in **Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives**. Full details of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project consultation process will be presented in the Consultation Report, which will be submitted as part of the DCO application.

Table 7.2 Public Consultation Responses relevant to Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes

Topic	Response / where addressed in the PEI
Phase 1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coastal erosion from construction work and presence of offshore export cables Cumulative shoreline impacts outside natural variations in relation to wind pressure and velocity perturbation at the turbine array propagating along the wave fetch length 	<p>Project design decisions for the landfall and nearshore cable routing and protection are discussed in Chapter 4 Site Selection and Alternatives and Chapter 6 Project Description. Also see section 7.5.8 and 7.6.2.7</p> <p>Cumulative impacts with regards to the wave regime are discussed in section 7.7.1.</p>
Phase 2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over impact of windfarms on waves and shores 	<p>Wave modelling was conducted to assess the potential impacts of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project and cumulatively with other windfarms in the areas. This information is presented in Appendix 7.1</p>
Phase 3	
None	n/a
Phase 3.5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fragile coastline Impacts of vibration causing coastal erosion/ retreat and leading to impacts down the coast Unstable cliffs are receding Damage to Thorpeness cliffs Impacts on coastal processes 	<p>Wave modelling was conducted to assess the potential impacts of the proposed East Anglia TWO project and cumulatively with other windfarms in the areas. An assessment of the potential impacts of the project(s) on the shoreline has been produced and is presented in Appendix 7.1.</p> <p>The potential impacts of the project on sediment transport processes and morphological effects due to the installation of project infrastructure are assessed in section 7.6.2.</p>

7.3 Scope

7.3.1 Study Area

14. The East Anglia ONE North windfarm site is in the southern North Sea, encompassing a sea bed area of approximately 208km². It is located approximately 36km from its nearest point to the port of Lowestoft and 42km from the coast at Southwold. An offshore cable corridor joins the East Anglia

ONE North windfarm site to the landfall location just north of Thorpeness. The offshore infrastructure required for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project is outlined in **Chapter 6 Project Description**.

15. The assessment of effects on marine geology, oceanography and physical processes considers the direct footprint of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project (near-field) and the wider areas of sea bed and coast that potentially could be affected (far-field).

7.3.2 Worst Case

16. The design of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project (including number of wind turbines, layout configuration, requirement for scour protection, electrical design, etc.) is not yet fully determined, and may not be known until sometime after the DCO has been granted. Therefore, in accordance with the requirements of the Project Design Envelope (also known as the Rochdale Envelope) approach to EIA (Planning Inspectorate 2018) (as discussed in section **Chapter 4 Site selection and Assessment of Alternatives**), realistic worst case scenarios in terms of potential effects upon marine geology oceanography and physical processes are adopted to undertake a precautionary and robust impact assessment.
17. Definition of the worst case scenarios has been made from consideration of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project that is presented in **Chapter 6 Project Description**, alongside the mitigation measures that have been embedded in the design (**section 7.3.3**).

7.3.2.1 Foundation Layout

18. Within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site the maximum installed capacity would be 800MW, with turbine sizes within the range 250 to 300m blade tip height. The maximum number of wind turbines would be 67.
19. The wind turbines would be arranged with a minimum separation between each wind turbine of 800m in an in-row direction and 1,200m in an inter-row direction.

7.3.2.2 Foundation Type

20. There may be only one foundation type used or alternatively a combination of types and sizes could be used across the windfarm site. Some types and sizes of foundation are more favourable for certain water depths, ground conditions or wind turbine models and the final arrangements would be confirmed during detailed design.
21. Accordingly, to ensure that the proposed East Anglia ONE North project is adequately assessed for the purposes of EIA, foundation sizes covering the range from 250m to 300m wind turbines, and including monopiles, three or four-legged jackets on pin piles, three or four-legged jackets on suction caissons,

suction caissons and gravity base structures (GBS) have been considered to determine the worst case scenario. **Table 7.3** presents a summary of the physical properties of each of these foundation options to enable a direct comparison between them, to assist with defining the worst case scenario.

Table 7.3 Comparison of Physical Parameters for Different Foundation Types

Foundation Type	Wind Turbine Rating blade tip height (m)	Maximum Foundation Dimensions (m/foundation)	Maximum Foundation Footprint (m ² /foundation)	Maximum Foundation Footprint with Scour Protection (m ² /foundation)	Maximum Volume of Surface Sediment Release from Sea Bed Preparation (m ³ /foundation)	Maximum Volume of Sub-surface Sediment Release from Foundation Drilling (m ³ /foundation)
Gravity base structure	250	53 (basal diameter)	2,206	19,856	22,585	N/A
	300	60 (basal diameter)	2,827	25,447	25,875	N/A
Jacket with pin piles (4 no.)	250	45 x 45 (leg spacing)	2,025	4,726	19,125	3,016
	300	53 x 53 (leg spacing)	2,767	5,331	22,405	4,321
Jacket with suction caissons (4 no.)	250	14.5 (diameter per caisson)	3,080	9,801	23,732	N/A
	300	16 (diameter per caisson)	4,096	12,544	27,865	N/A
Suction caisson	250	31 (diameter)	755	3,020	13,840	N/A
	300	35 (diameter)	963	3,849	15,250	N/A
Monopile	250	13 (diameter)	133	3,319	8,485	5,973
	300	15 (diameter)	177	4,418	9,000	7,952

22. Due to their presence on the sea bed and/or in the water column, wind turbine foundations have the potential to cause the following principal effects on the physical environment:
- Footprint effects – the presence of a foundation would have a direct covering effect on the underlying sea bed morphology, resulting in direct loss of a feature.
 - Blockage effects – the presence of a foundation may modify the progression of waves, tidal currents, and sediment transport over the lifetime of a project.
 - Sediment disturbance effects – foundations may lead to disturbance of the sea bed sediments due to dredging or piling operations during the construction phase or scour hole formation during the operational phase.
23. With respect to footprint effects, jackets with (up to four) suction caissons present the greatest physical footprint on the sea bed without scour protection, whereas GBS present the greatest footprint when considered with scour protection. On an individual wind turbine basis without scour protection, the 300m jacket with suction caissons foundation has the greatest individual footprint at 4,096m² and 217,088m² respectively. When scour protection is considered, the 300m GBS foundation has the greatest individual footprint and overall footprint at 25,447m² and 1,348,686m² respectively.
24. With respect to blockage effects, there is now a considerable evidence base across the offshore windfarm industry derived from numerous EIA that are available in the public domain (confirmed by a review of modelling studies from around 30 windfarms in the UK and European waters presented in Seagreen, 2012) which indicates that the greatest potential effect is associated with conical GBS. This is because these structures occupy a significant proportion of the water column as a solid mass (as opposed to an open lattice of slender columns and cross-members, found in jackets or tripods, or a single slender column like a monopile). They do, therefore, have the potential to affect wave propagation and near-surface tidal currents in a manner that other foundation types do not. In addition, conical GBS can influence near-bed currents and sea bed sediment transport processes.
25. The greatest blockage effect from an individual wind turbine arises from a GBS for a 300m wind turbine. For the windfarm site as a whole, it is not possible to quantify whether a larger number of smaller rated wind turbines would cause worse blockage than a smaller number of larger rated wind turbines (or some combination in between) without detailed numerical modelling. As a conservative approach, the largest dimensions for a GBS (the 300m wind turbine foundation) together with the greatest number of wind turbines (the 250m layout) have been adopted as a worst case scenario. Whilst these

- arrangements would not be used in practice, their consideration avoids potential uncertainty if different combinations were considered.
26. With respect to sediment disturbance effects, these can be considered separately for the construction phase, the operational phase and the decommissioning phase.
 27. During the construction phase, it is probable that there would be a need for some sea bed preparation associated with all foundation types. This has the potential to disturb sediments at, or near to, the surface of the sea bed (down to relatively shallow depths below the bed), hereafter called near-surface sediments.
 28. The greatest volumes of near-surface sediment disturbance due to sea bed preparation activities during construction of individual wind turbines would be associated with jackets with suction caissons for the 300m wind turbines (this is marginally greater than for the conical GBS for the 300m wind turbines). When considering the whole windfarm site, the combined effects of the larger number of smaller (250m) wind turbines on jackets with suction caissons yields the greatest volumes (1,590,036 m³).
 29. In addition, there is potential that the installation of some foundation types (notably monopiles and jackets using three or four pin piles) may require drilling (although the preference is for driving the piles wherever it is feasible to achieve this). Any drilling of piles into the sea bed would have the greatest potential to release sediments from tens of metres below the sea bed, hereafter called sub-surface sediments, into the water column (to depths of up to 45m below the sea bed for monopiles and up to 65m below the sea bed for pin piles). These sub-surface sediments are likely to have a different physical composition to near-surface sediments and therefore may be more widely dispersed by tidal currents (i.e. the drill arisings may be overall finer than the near-surface sediments).
 30. The greatest volumes of sub-surface sediment disturbance due to drilling activities during construction of individual wind turbines would be associated with monopiles for the 300m wind turbines. When considering the windfarm site as a whole, the 53 300m wind turbines yields the greatest volumes (42,146m³).
 31. During the operational phase, there is potential, if no scour protection is provided, for the presence of the foundations to cause scour-hole formation in the sea bed adjacent to the foundation due to flow acceleration in its immediate vicinity (tens of metres).
 32. As the need for scour protection is not being determined until the wind turbine locations and the associated foundation types are known, the worst case

- scenario needs to consider both the formation of scour holes in the absence of scour protection (and the associated fate of the scoured sea bed sediment) and, as a corollary, the extent of scour protection that would be required if it is deemed necessary to limit scour hole development.
33. Scour assessments have been completed for other windfarms in the former East Anglia Zone using metocean data derived from earlier modelling studies (GL Noble Denton 2011) and both zone-wide and project-specific field surveys (water depth, soil type and soil strength), to enable first-order estimates of scour hole formation to be made for a range of different foundation types and sizes. These previous assessments identified that the scour volumes for all foundation types considered were greatest in relatively shallow water and reduced with increasing water depth. This was primarily because of a reduction in wave-induced stirring at the sea bed with greater water depth.
 34. These previous scour assessments showed that the maximum volumes of sediment likely to be released from sea bed preparation are considerably greater (greater than five times) than the maximum volumes likely to be released by scour, even under the conservative worst case scour scenarios considered. Due to this, the assessment of scour during the operational phase (in the absence of scour protection) has been based on the findings from the assessments of the effect of sea bed preparation, and scaled down by a factor of five.
 35. During the decommissioning phase, worst case scenarios involve activities that are similar to those that would take place during the construction phase.
 36. **Table 7.4** presents a summary of the worst case scenarios for individual wind turbine foundations and whole-windfarm foundations.

Table 7.4 Summary of Realistic Worst Case Scenarios for Wind Turbine Foundations

Type of Effect	Individual wind turbine	Whole windfarm site
Footprint - Foundation only	Jacket with suction caissons (300m wind turbine)	Jackets with suction caissons (300m wind turbine)
Footprint - Foundation and scour protection	GBS (300m wind turbine)	GBS (300m wind turbine)
Blockage	GBS (300m wind turbine)	GBS (300m wind turbine) conservatively applied to maximum turbine number layout (250m wind turbine)
Near-surface sediment disturbance (construction/decommissioning)	Jacket with suction caissons (300m wind turbine)	Jackets with suction caissons (300m wind turbine)
Sub-surface sediment disturbance (construction/decommissioning)	Monopile (300m wind turbine)	Monopile (300m wind turbine)
Near-surface sediment disturbance (scour during operation, in the absence of scour protection)	Jacket with suction caissons (300m wind turbine), reduced by a factor of five	Jackets with suction caissons (300m wind turbine), reduced by a factor of five

7.3.2.3 Meteorological Masts

37. One operational meteorological mast may be installed within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site. This may be installed on a monopile, four-legged jacket on pin piles, four-legged jacket on suction caissons, a suction caisson or GBS foundation.
38. **Table 7.5** presents a summary of the worst case scenarios for a single meteorological mast foundation.

Table 7.5 Summary of Realistic Worst Case Scenarios for a Meteorological Mast Foundation

Type of Effect	Whole windfarm
Footprint - Foundation only	Jacket with suction caissons (650m ²)
Footprint - Foundation and scour protection	GBS (based on 300m wind turbine foundation) (2,450m ²)
Blockage	GBS (based on 300m wind turbine foundation)
Near-surface sediment disturbance (construction/decommissioning)	Jacket with suction caissons (based on 300m wind turbine foundation)
Sub-surface sediment disturbance	Monopile (based on 300m wind turbine foundation)

Type of Effect	Whole windfarm
(construction/decommissioning)	
Near-surface sediment disturbance (scour during operation, in the absence of scour protection)	Jacket with suction caissons (based on 300m wind turbine foundation), reduced by a factor of five

7.3.2.4 Offshore Platforms

39. Up to four offshore electrical platforms and up to one construction, operation and maintenance platform could be used within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site. The offshore platforms would be installed on three or four legged jackets on pin piles, three or four legged jackets on suction caissons, or GBS foundations.
40. **Table 7.6** presents a summary of the worst case scenarios for offshore platform foundations.

Table 7.6 Summary of Realistic Worst Case Scenarios for Offshore Platform Foundations

Type of Effect	Individual platform	Whole Windfarm
Footprint - Foundation only	Jacket with suction caissons (5,676m ²)	Jackets with suction caissons (28,380m ²)
Footprint - Foundation and scour protection	Jacket with suction caissons (15,276m ²)	Jackets with suction caissons (76,380m ²)
Blockage	GBS (based on 300m turbine foundation)	
Near-surface sediment disturbance (construction/decommissioning)	Jacket with suction caissons (based on 300m wind turbine foundation)	
Sub-surface sediment disturbance (construction/decommissioning)	Jacket with pin piles (based on 300m wind turbine foundation)	
Near-surface sediment disturbance (scour during operation, in the absence of scour protection)	Jacket with suction caissons (based on 300m wind turbine foundation), reduced by a factor of five	

7.3.2.5 Cables

41. There would be export cables, inter-array cables and platform link cables installed. The maximum length of each export cable required would be 76km.
42. Up to two export cables would each be located within the offshore cable corridor, making landfall just north of Thorpeness in Suffolk. In addition, there would be up to 75km of platform link cables and up to 200km of inter-array cables installed (under the worst case).

7.3.2.5.1 Cable Laying

43. It is intended that the cables for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project would be buried below the sea bed to depths of 0.5 to 5.0m. The actual depths would be determined following detailed investigations and design. In some areas, where large sand waves or megaripples are present, sea bed levelling may be required before the cables can be installed. Such levelling would only be intended to prevent exposure of the cables and the formation of free-spans. None of the levelling would affect areas close to the coast where large sand waves have a wave-breaking effect.
44. Indicative volumes of sediment removed for sand wave levelling (pre-sweeping) would be up to 1,050,000m³ (550,000m³ in the windfarm site and 500,000m³ in the offshore cable corridor). This volume is based on the under-construction East Anglia ONE project which is similar in scale and has a similar geographical area to the proposed East Anglia ONE North project. The sediment released at any one time would depend on the capacity of the dredger. For pre-sweeping in the offshore cable corridor, the profile of levelling works along the export cables would be 60m wide, with an average depth of 2.5m and a slope gradient of 1:4. An assumption of 10km of sand wave levelling / pre-sweeping in the offshore cable corridor results in an area of sea bed of up to 800,000m² being affected. Any required sand wave levelling is anticipated to be in discrete areas and not along the full length of the corridor. Sediment arising from sand wave clearance in the offshore cable corridor would be deposited back within the corridor at locations which avoid sensitive features. These locations would be determined post consent in consultation with Natural England and the MMO.
45. Indicative installation methods and rates presently being considered are described in **Table 7.7**.

Table 7.7 Cable Installation Methods and Rates

Technique	Description	Installation Rate (m/hour)
Ploughing	Cutting through the sea bed with a blade, behind which the cable is laid	300
Trenching or cutting	Excavating a trench whilst temporarily placing the excavated sediment adjacent to the trench and back-filling the trench once the cable has been laid	30-80
Jetting	Fluidising the sea bed using a combination of high-flow low pressure and low-flow high pressure water jets, enabling the	150-450

Technique	Description	Installation Rate (m/hour)
	cable to sink beneath the sediment surface	
Vertical injector (shallow water only)	Using a large jetting or cutting share strapped to the side of a barge for cable laying at the foot of a trench in shallow waters	30-80

46. Jetting is considered to be the worst case cable installation technique since it results in the largest volume of suspended sediment off the sea bed and into the water column.
47. For purposes of the EIA, the worst case scenario assumes that some form of cable protection measures would be required in areas where the cable cannot be buried (e.g. areas of exposed bedrock) and at cable crossings. Cable protection measures presently being considered include rock placement, concrete mattresses, fronded concrete mattresses, and uraduct shell.
48. The worst case scenario assumes that all cable crossings and up to 10% of the length of the export cables, inter-array cables and platform link cables would be unburied and require protection. This would amount to a combined sea bed area of 406,640m², representing 0.12% of the offshore development area.
49. The maximum height of cable protection measures above the sea bed would range up to 2.25m.
50. During the construction phase, cables would be installed using a best practice approach with the objective of minimising, as far as practicable, possible effects on key receptors (e.g. marine water and sediment quality, fish and shellfish ecology, commercial fisheries, benthic ecology, etc.). A detailed cable laying plan would be developed pre-construction which would incorporate a cable burial risk assessment. This would ascertain burial depths and cable laying techniques in accordance with the DCO, and with the objective of achieving optimum cable burial, thereby minimising the lengths of remaining unburied cable that would require protection.
51. The Applicant would adopt a hierarchical approach to cable protection options. Cable will be buried where this can be practicably achieved. In the event that full burial of lengths of inter-array, platform links and export cable cannot be achieved, protection options would be assessed using a number of criteria, including selection of protection methods that would cause least disturbance to sensitive receptors.

7.3.2.6 Cable Landfall

52. The export cables would make landfall just to the north of Thorpeness in Suffolk. Assessments of coastal erosion have been undertaken to ensure that the cable ducts will be installed onshore with a suitable setback distance to allow for natural coastal erosion.
53. Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) techniques will be used to install the export cable at the landfall, ensuring no impacts on the intertidal zone. Although the achievable length of HDD will be affected by limitations of cable characteristics and the drill profile (i.e. the angle of the bore), the maximum length would be 2km.

7.3.3 Embedded Mitigation Specific to Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes

54. The proposed East Anglia ONE North project would have a total capacity of up to 800MW, with between 67 (250m) and 53 (300m) wind turbines being present. To mitigate the effects on marine geology, oceanography and physical processes, a minimum separation of 800m has been defined between adjacent wind turbines within each row and a minimum spacing of 1,200 has been defined between rows in order that the potential interactions between adjacent wind turbines are minimised.
55. The selection of appropriate foundation designs and sizes would be based on a number of factors including technology availability, supply chain, cost and suitability of ground conditions at the time of detailed project design, which could result in the use of one or more foundation designs as detailed within the design envelope described in **Chapter 6 Project Description**.
56. For the foundation types that would experience the potential for greatest scour, protection material is likely to be installed during the construction process in order to mitigate the effects of scour, increased suspended sediment concentrations, and bed level changes in the vicinity of each wind turbine.
57. For other foundation types, where the scour potential involves smaller volumes of sediment release due to scour processes, the design would, where feasible to do so, allow for local scour around the piles to minimise the scour protection footprint that is introduced on the sea bed.
58. For piled foundation types, such as monopiles and jackets with pin piles, pile-driving will be used in preference to drilling where it is practicable to do so (where ground conditions allow). This would minimise the quantity of sub-surface sediment that is released into the water column from the installation process.

59. Micro-siting will be used to minimise the requirement for sea bed preparation prior to foundation installation. GBS will not be used in areas characterised by sand banks or sand waves with heights greater than 5m in further pursuance of this aim.
60. Cables will be buried where possible, to within target depths of 0.5 to 5.0m. The optimum burial depths will be determined during pre-construction engineering studies. Cable burial to appropriate depths will reduce the risk of its exposure due to bed level changes, reducing the need for subsequent re-burial, which would cause further disturbance to the sea bed. In addition, ensuring cable burial in areas where it is practicable to do so would minimise the requirement for cable protection measures. Cable protection would only be applied in areas where burial is not possible. These would include where the proposed cables are required to cross existing cables or in areas of hard ground.
61. The landfall location has been chosen and refined based on consideration of the physical process interactions and marine geology along the Suffolk coast and adjacent nearshore sea bed, including the role of the nearshore Sizewell and Dunwich banks, the outcrop of Coralline Crag offshore from Thorpeness and the rates of erosion of the Sizewell cliffs, as well as the circulatory sediment transport pathways between the shore and nearshore. Consideration has also been given to the proximity to the Sizewell nuclear power station cooling water infrastructure with respect to tidal streams. This has led to the preference for a location for cable installation towards the southern side of the cable corridor, and an extension of the original corridor further to the south in order to accommodate this.
62. A commitment has also been made to install the export cable at the landfall using HDD techniques, thus minimising disturbance and avoiding the need for cable protection in the intertidal and shallowest nearshore zones. It is likely that the HDD pop-out location will be in water depths greater than 2m with respect to LAT (although most likely greater than 5m water depth with respect to LAT) and to the south of the outcrop of Coralline Crag (see **section 7.6.2.7**). Hence, there will be no interruption of the circulatory sediment transport pathways between the coast and Sizewell Bank and there is a strong likelihood of the export cable requiring no protection measures within the closure depth of the active beach profile, due to the presence of a veneer of sand on the sea bed in this location.

7.3.4 Monitoring

63. Post-consent, the final detailed design of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project and the development of the relevant Management Plan will refine the worst-case parameters assessed in this PEIR. It is recognised that monitoring is

an important element in the management and verification of the actual proposed East Anglia ONE North project impacts. Outline Management Plans, across a number of environmental topics, will be submitted with the DCO application. These Outline Management Plans will contain key principles that provide the framework for any monitoring that could be required. The requirement for and final appropriate design and scope of monitoring will be agreed with the relevant stakeholders and included within the relevant Management Plan, submitted alongside a suite of certified consent discharge documents, prior to construction works commencing.

7.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

7.4.1 Guidance

64. The assessment of potential impacts on marine geology, oceanography and physical processes has been made with specific reference to the relevant NPS. These are the principal decision making documents for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs). Those relevant to the proposed East Anglia ONE North project are:

- Overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1) (Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC), 2011a); and
- NPS for Renewable Energy Infrastructures (EN-3) (DECC 2011b).

65. **Table 7.8** summarises the relevant NPS text and provides references to sections in this PEIR where each is addressed.

Table 7.8 NPS Assessment Requirements

NPS Requirement	NPS Reference	Section Reference
EN-1 NPS for Energy (EN-1)		
'where relevant, applicants should undertake coastal geomorphological and sediment transfer modelling to predict and understand impacts and help identify relevant mitigating or compensatory measures'	Section 5.5, paragraph 5.5.6	The approach adopted in this PEIR is a conceptual model based on expert judgement. This was agreed in general terms through the Benthic and Physical Processes ETG.
'the ES should include an assessment of the effects on the coast. In particular, applicants should assess: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of the proposed project on coastal processes and geomorphology, including by taking account of potential impacts from climate change. If the development will have an impact on coastal processes the applicant must demonstrate how the impacts will be managed to minimise adverse impacts 	Section 5.5, paragraph 5.5.7	The assessment of potential construction and operation and maintenance impacts are described in sections 7.6.1 and 7.6.2 respectively. The project will not affect the Shoreline Management Plan and allowance has been made for predicated erosion rates during the project design (further detail is provided in Chapter 4 Site

NPS Requirement	NPS Reference	Section Reference
<p>on other parts of the coast.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The implications of the proposed project on strategies for managing the coast as set out in Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs) and any relevant Marine Plans and capital programmes for maintaining flood and coastal defences. The effects of the proposed project on marine ecology, biodiversity and protected sites. The effects of the proposed project on maintaining coastal recreation sites and features. The vulnerability of the proposed development to coastal change, taking account of climate change, during the project's operational life and any decommissioning period.' 		<p>Selection and Assessment of Alternatives). Embedded mitigation to minimise potential impacts at the coast of cable installation and operation are described in section 7.3.3</p> <p>Effects on marine ecology biodiversity and protected sites are assessed in Chapter 9 Benthic Ecology, Chapter 10 Fish and Shellfish Ecology, Chapter 11 Marine Mammals and Chapter 12 Offshore Ornithology</p> <p>Effects on recreation are assessed in Chapter 30 Tourism Recreation and Socio-Economics.</p> <p>As described above the project has been designed so that it is not vulnerable to coastal change or climate change.</p>
<p>'the applicant should be particularly careful to identify any effects of physical changes on the integrity and special features of Marine Conservation Zones, candidate marine Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), coastal SACs and candidate coastal SACs, coastal Special Protection Areas (SPAs) coastal SPAs, Sites of Community Importance (SCIs), potential SCIs and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).'</p>	<p>Section 5.5, paragraph 5.5.9</p>	<p>The East Anglia ONE North windfarm site and offshore cable corridor does not overlap with any international, national or local sites designated for sea bed features.</p>
<p>NPS for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)</p>		
<p>'The assessment should include predictions of physical effect that will result from the construction and operation of the required infrastructure and include effects such as the scouring that may result from the proposed development.'</p> <p>Geotechnical investigations should form part of the assessment as this will enable design of appropriate construction techniques to minimise any adverse effects.</p>	<p>Section 2.6, paragraph 2.6.193 and 2.6.194</p>	<p>Each of the impacts in sections 7.6.1 and 7.6.2 cover the potential magnitude and significance of the physical (waves, tides and sediments) effects upon the baseline conditions resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project.</p>

NPS Requirement	NPS Reference	Section Reference
<p>'where necessary, assessment of the effects on the subtidal environment should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of habitat due to foundation type including associated seabed preparation, predicted scour, scour protection and altered sedimentary processes. • Environmental appraisal of inter-array and cable routes and installation methods. • Habitat disturbance from construction vessels extendible legs and anchors. • Increased suspended sediment loads during construction. • Predicted rates at which the subtidal zone might recover from temporary effects.' 	<p>Section 2.6, paragraph 2.6.113</p>	<p>The quantification and potential impact of seabed loss due to the footprints of the project infrastructure is covered in section 7.6.2.5. A worst-case scenario of all foundations having scour protection is considered to provide a conservative assessment.</p> <p>The worst-case scenario cable-laying technique is jetting and is considered as such in all the cable construction assessments.</p> <p>The disturbance to the subtidal sea bed caused by indentations due to installation vessels is assessed in section 7.6.2.9.</p> <p>The potential increase in suspended sediment concentrations and change in seabed level is assessed in sections 7.6.1.1 to 7.6.1.8</p> <p>The recoverability of receptors is assessed for all the relevant impacts, particularly those related to changes in seabed level due to export cable installation (section 7.6.1.6), interruptions to bedload sediment transport due to sand wave levelling in the offshore cable corridor (section 7.6.2.3) and morphological and sediment transport effects due to cable protection measures for export cables (section 7.6.2.8).</p>
<p>'an assessment of the effects of installing cable across the intertidal zone should include information, where relevant, about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any alternative landfall sites that have been considered by the applicant during the design phase and an explanation of the final choice. • Any alternative cable installation methods that have been considered by the applicant during the design phase and an explanation for the final choice. • Potential loss of habitat. 	<p>Section 2.6, paragraph 2.6.81</p>	<p>Landfall Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives are provided in Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives.</p> <p>A range of cable installation methods are required and these are detailed in Chapter 6 Project Description. The worst-case scenario for marine physical processes is provided in section 7.3.2. Potential habitat loss in the intertidal zone is covered in</p>

NPS Requirement	NPS Reference	Section Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disturbance during cable installation and removal (decommissioning). Increased suspended sediment loads in the intertidal zone during installation. Predicted rates at which the intertidal zone might recover from temporary effects.' 		<p>Chapter 9 Benthic Ecology. Assessment of the potential disturbance and increased suspended sediment concentrations in the nearshore (including the intertidal zone) due to cable installation is provided in section 7.6.1.5</p> <p>The recoverability of the coastal receptor (East Anglia coastline) is assessed for morphological and sediment transport effects due to cable protection measures at the coast (section 7.6.2.8).</p>

66. The Marine Policy Statement (MPS, HM Government, 2011; discussed further in **Chapter 3 Policy and Legislative Context**) provides the high-level approach to marine planning and general principles for decision making that contribute to achieving this vision. It also sets out the framework for environmental, social and economic considerations that need to be considered in marine planning. With regard to the topics covered by this chapter the key reference is in section 2.6.8.6 of the MPS which states:

“...Marine plan authorities should not consider development which may affect areas at high risk and probability of coastal change unless the impacts upon it can be managed. Marine plan authorities should seek to minimise and mitigate any geomorphological changes that an activity or development will have on coastal processes, including sediment movement.”

67. The MPS is also the framework for preparing individual Marine Plans and taking decisions affecting the marine environment. England currently has nine marine plans; those relevant to the proposed East Anglia ONE North project are the East Inshore and the East Offshore Marine Plans (HM Government, 2014; discussed further in **Chapter 3 Policy and Legislative Context**). Objective 6 “To have a healthy, resilient and adaptable marine ecosystem in the East Marine Plan areas” is of relevance to this Chapter as this covers policies and commitments on the wider ecosystem, set out in the MPS including those to do with the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and the Water Framework Directive (**see Chapter 3 Policy and Legislative Context**), as well as other environmental, social and economic considerations. Elements of the ecosystem considered by this objective include:

“coastal processes and the hydrological and geomorphological processes in water bodies and how these support ecological features”.

68. In addition to NPS, MPS and East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans, guidance on the generic requirements, including spatial and temporal scales, for marine physical process studies associated with offshore windfarm developments is provided in six main documents:
- Offshore windfarms: guidance note for Environmental Impact Assessment in respect of Food and Environmental Protection Act (FEPA) and Coast Protection Act (CPA) requirements: Version 2 (Cefas 2004).
 - Coastal Process Modelling for Offshore Windfarm Environmental Impact Assessment (Lambkin et al. 2009).
 - Review of Cabling Techniques and Environmental Effects applicable to the Offshore Windfarm Industry (BERR 2008).
 - General advice on assessing potential impacts of and mitigation for human activities on Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) features, using existing regulation and legislation (JNCC & Natural England 2011).
 - Guidelines for data acquisition to support marine environmental assessments of offshore renewable energy projects (Cefas 2011).
 - East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan Areas: Evidence and Issues (MMO 2012).

7.4.2 Data Sources

69. Information to support this PEIR has come from a series of previous surveys (**Table 7.9**) (Gardline, 2011; MESL, 2011; EMU, 2013), along with further project-specific surveys to inform the proposed East Anglia ONE North project (**Table 7.10**) (Bibby Hydromap, 2018a, b, c).
70. Previous studies include numerical modelling studies, which were undertaken to inform the ZEA (GL Noble Denton 2011; ABPmer 2012a; Deltares 2012) and the EIAs for the proposed East Anglia ONE (ABPmer 2012b) and East Anglia THREE projects (EATL 2015).

Table 7.9 Available Relevant Physical Environment Datasets

Data set	Spatial coverage	Survey year
Geophysical Survey (Gardline)	East Anglia ONE (covering part of the windfarm site)	2010/2011
Geophysical Survey (EMU)	East Anglia THREE (covering of part of the windfarm site)	2012

Data set	Spatial coverage	Survey year
Benthic survey (PSA analysis of grab samples) (Marine Ecological Surveys)	East Anglia Zone	2010
Metocean Survey (current speed, water levels and wave heights) (Cefas)	East Anglia Zone	2012

Table 7.10 Site Specific Survey Data

Data set	Year collected	Spatial coverage
Geophysical Survey (Gardline, 2017): side-scan sonar multibeam echosounder	2017	Part of East Anglia ONE North windfarm site
Geophysical Survey (Bibby Hydromap, 2018a, b): side-scan sonar multibeam echosounder	2018	East Anglia ONE North offshore cable corridor
Benthic survey (Bibby Hydromap, 2018c): PSA analysis of grab samples	2018	East Anglia ONE North offshore cable corridor

71. The interpretation of bathymetry and geology of the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site has been compiled from the amalgamation of three different geophysical surveys, undertaken at different times, but collectively covering the entire windfarm site. These are:

- The northern tip of the East Anglia ONE survey undertaken by Gardline (2011) between September 2010 and February 2011 covering the southeast corner of East Anglia ONE North windfarm site;
- The north-central part of the East Anglia THREE survey completed by EMU (2013) between July and October 2012 covering a northeast to southwest strip through the centre of East Anglia ONE North windfarm site; and
- The northwest part of East Anglia ONE North windfarm site surveyed between May 2017 and July 2017 by Gardline (2017).

72. The bathymetry and geology of the offshore cable corridor were reported in Bibby Hydromap (2018a, b). Both the inshore part of the cable corridor (Area A) and the offshore part (Area B) was surveyed between March and May 2018.

73. Sea bed sediment samples were not collected specifically for the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site, and data collected as part of the East Anglia Zonal Survey have been used (MESL 2011). For the offshore cable corridor, a combination of Zonal data and data collected specifically for East Anglia ONE North (Bibby Hydromap 2018c) have been combined.
74. Other information that is available and has helped to inform this chapter of the PEIR includes:
- Marine Renewable Atlas (BERR, 2008);
 - Wavenet (Cefas);
 - National Tide and Sea Level Forecasting Service;
 - Extreme sea levels database (Environment Agency);
 - TotalTide (UK Hydrographic Office tidal diamonds);
 - British Oceanography Data Centre (BODC);
 - National Oceanographic Laboratory Class A tide gauges;
 - UK Climate Projections '09 (UKCP09, Lowe et al., 2009);
 - British Geological Survey 1:250,000 sea bed sediment mapping;
 - British Geological Survey bathymetric contours and paper maps;
 - Admiralty Charts and UK Hydrographic Office raw survey data;
 - Southern North Sea Sediment Transport Study;
 - Futurecoast;
 - Shoreline Management Plans;
 - Thames Regional Environmental Characterisation; and
 - East Coast Regional Environmental Characterisation.

7.4.3 Impact Assessment Methodology

75. In **Chapter 5 EIA Methodology**, an overarching method is presented for enabling assessments of the potential impacts arising from the proposed East Anglia ONE North project on the receptors under consideration. Such assessments incorporate a combination of the sensitivity of the receptor, its value (if applicable) and the magnitude of the change to determine a significance of impact. This method has been followed for the assessment of marine geology, oceanography and physical processes receptors.
76. For the impacts on marine geology, oceanography and physical processes a number of discrete receptors can be identified. These include certain morphological features with ascribed inherent values, such as:

- Offshore sand banks – these morphological features play an important role in influencing the baseline tidal, wave and sediment transport regimes;
 - Nearshore intertidal and subtidal rock platforms – these morphological features play an important role in anchoring the coastal form; and
 - Beaches, dunes and sea cliffs - these morphological features play an important natural coastal defence role.
77. In respect of the above considerations, the East Anglia ZEA identified 17 receptor groups in total. The location of these is shown in **Figure 7.1**.
78. Seven receptor groups covered sensitive coasts in both eastern England (two receptor groups, ‘East Anglia’ and ‘Essex & Kent’) and across northern mainland Europe (five receptor groups, including ‘France’, ‘Belgium’, ‘Southern Netherlands’, ‘Western Netherlands’ and ‘Northern Netherlands’).
79. Nine further receptor groups were identified to cover the designated Natura 2000 sites in eastern England (five receptor groups, ‘The Wash’, ‘Central North Sea’, ‘Norfolk’, ‘Kent & Essex’ and ‘Suffolk’) and wider Europe (four receptor groups, ‘France’, ‘Belgium’, ‘Southern Netherlands’ and ‘Northern Netherlands’). It should be noted that the Natura 2000 sites often comprise groupings of multiple distinct (and designated) features, such as sand banks, sand dunes, and sand and shingle beaches.
80. One further receptor group covered nearby ‘non-designated sand banks’ in the Outer Thames Estuary, including Inner Gabbard, Outer Gabbard, The Galloper, North Falls and one un-named bank.
81. The East Anglia ZEA assessed the potential cumulative impacts arising from development of the whole East Anglia Zone in relation to marine geology, oceanography and physical processes (ABPmer 2012a). It concluded there would be:
- No significant impacts on all 17 receptor types in relation to changes in the wave regime. However, it was recommended that the potential impact should be considered further to confirm this at EIA stage for individual projects for four receptor groupings (the sensitive ‘East Anglia’ coast, ‘Norfolk’ Natura 2000 site, ‘Suffolk’ Natura 2000 site and ‘non-designated sand banks’) due to some uncertainty regarding the magnitude of changes to the wave regime outside the East Anglia Zone.
 - No significant impacts on all 17 receptor types in relation to changes in the tidal regime. However, it was recommended that the potential impact should be considered further to confirm this at EIA stage for individual projects for three receptor groupings (the ‘Norfolk’ Natura 2000 site, ‘Suffolk’ Natura

2000 site and ‘non-designated sand banks’) due to some uncertainty regarding the magnitude of changes to the flow speed outside the East Anglia Zone.

- Impacts of moderate significance on the sensitive ‘East Anglia’ coast, with no significant impacts on the other 16 receptor types in relation to changes in the sediment transport regime. However, it was recommended that the potential impact should be considered further to confirm this at EIA stage for individual projects for one receptor grouping (the ‘Norfolk’ Natura 2000 site) due to some uncertainty regarding the importance of different sediment transport pathways to morphological features within this receptor group.

82. The specific features defined within the four receptor groupings mentioned above as requiring further assessment at the EIA stage for individual projects are listed in **Table 7.11**.

Table 7.11 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes Receptors

Receptor group (see <i>Figure 7.1</i>)	Extent of coverage	Description of features
East Anglian coast (waves and sediment transport)	Felixstowe to King’s Lynn	Shingle and sand beaches, dunes and cliffs
Norfolk Natura 2000 Site (waves, currents and sediment transport)	Haisborough, Hammond and Winterton SAC	Offshore sand banks
	North Norfolk Sand banks and Saturn Reef SA	Offshore sand banks and reef
	Great Yarmouth and North Denes SPA	Shingle beach and sand dunes
Suffolk Natura 2000 Site (waves and currents)	Outer Thames Estuary SPA	Sand banks and associated channels
	Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SAC and SPA	SAC: sand dunes, sand and shingle beaches SPA: beach, spit and bars
	Alde, Ore and Butley Estuaries SAC	Mudflats, saltmarsh and embayments
	Alde-Ore Estuary SPA	Mudflats, saltmarsh and shingle beach
	Orfordness – Shingle Street SAC/ GCR	Shingle beach, spits and bars
	Benacre to Easton Bavents SPA	Estuary, mud and sandflats, sand dunes and shingle beach

Receptor group (see <i>Figure 7.1</i>)	Extent of coverage	Description of features
Nearby non-designated sand banks (waves and currents)	Inner Gabbard Outer Gabbard The Galloper North Falls un-named bank	Offshore sand banks

83. This chapter assesses the significance of potential impacts on the wave and/or current and/or sediment transport regimes on the receptor groups of the sensitive 'East Anglia' coast, the 'Norfolk' Natura 2000 site, the 'Suffolk' Natura 2000 site and the 'non-designated sand banks'.
84. However, in addition to identifiable receptors listed above, there are other changes to the marine geology, oceanography and physical processes which may potentially be caused by the proposed East Anglia ONE North project which in themselves are not impacts to which significance can be ascribed. Rather, these changes (such as a change in the wave climate, a change in the tidal regime or a change in the suspended sediment concentrations in the water column) represent an 'effect' which may manifest itself as an impact upon other receptors, most notably water and sediment quality, benthic ecology, fisheries or navigation (e.g. in terms of increased suspended sediment concentrations or erosion or smothering of habitats on the sea bed).
85. Hence, the assessment presented in this chapter follows two approaches. The first assessment approach is designed for situations where potential impacts can be defined as directly affecting receptors which possess their own intrinsic morphological value. In this case, the determination of significance of the impact is based on an assessment of sensitivity of the receptor and magnitude of effect (**section 7.4.3.1**) by means of an impact significance matrix (**section 7.4.3.2**).
86. The second assessment approach is designed for situations where effects (or changes) in the baseline marine geology, oceanography or physical processes conditions may occur which could potentially manifest as impacts upon other receptors. In this case, the magnitude of effect is determined in a similar manner to the first assessment method but the sensitivity of the other receptors and the significance of impacts on them is assessed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR pertaining to those receptors.

7.4.3.1 Sensitivity, Value and Magnitude

87. The sensitivity and value of discrete morphological receptors and the magnitude of effect are assessed using expert judgement and described with a standard semantic scale. These expert judgements of receptor sensitivity, value and magnitude of effect are guided by the conceptual understanding of baseline conditions presented in detail in Appendix 2.1 of the Scoping Report (SPR 2017) and summarised in **section 7.5**.
88. The sensitivity of a receptor (**Table 7.12**) is dependent upon its:
- *Tolerance*: the extent to which the receptor is adversely affected by an effect;
 - *Adaptability*: the ability of the receptor to avoid adverse impacts that would otherwise arise from an effect; and
 - *Recoverability*: a measure of a receptor's ability to return to a state at, or close to, that which existed before the effect caused a change.

Table 7.12 Definitions of Sensitivity Levels for a Morphological Receptor

Sensitivity	Definition
High	<p><u>Tolerance</u>: Receptor has very limited tolerance of effect</p> <p><u>Adaptability</u>: Receptor unable to adapt to effect</p> <p><u>Recoverability</u>: Receptor unable to recover resulting in permanent or long-term (greater than ten years) change</p>
Medium	<p><u>Tolerance</u>: Receptor has limited tolerance of effect</p> <p><u>Adaptability</u>: Receptor has limited ability to adapt to effect</p> <p><u>Recoverability</u>: Receptor able to recover to an acceptable status over the medium term (5-10 years)</p>
Low	<p><u>Tolerance</u>: Receptor has some tolerance of effect</p> <p><u>Adaptability</u>: Receptor has some ability to adapt to effect</p> <p><u>Recoverability</u>: Receptor able to recover to an acceptable status over the short term (1-5 years)</p>
Negligible	<p><u>Tolerance</u>: Receptor generally tolerant of effect</p> <p><u>Adaptability</u>: Receptor can completely adapt to effect with no detectable changes</p> <p><u>Recoverability</u>: Receptor able to recover to an acceptable status near instantaneously (less than one year)</p>

89. In addition, a *value* component may also be considered when assessing a receptor (**Table 7.13**). This ascribes whether the receptor is rare, protected or threatened.

Table 7.13 Definitions of the Value Levels for a Morphological Receptor

Value	Definition
High	<u>Value:</u> Receptor is designated and/or of national or international importance for marine geology, oceanography or physical processes. Likely to be rare with minimal potential for substitution. May also be of significant wider-scale, functional or strategic importance
Medium	<u>Value:</u> Receptor is not designated but is of local to regional importance for marine geology, oceanography or physical processes
Low	<u>Value:</u> Receptor is not designated but is of local importance for marine geology, oceanography or physical processes
Negligible	<u>Value:</u> Receptor is not designated and is not deemed of importance for marine geology, oceanography or physical processes

90. The magnitude of an effect (**Table 7.14**) is dependent upon its:

- Scale (i.e. size, extent or intensity);
- Duration;
- Frequency of occurrence; and
- Reversibility (i.e. the capability of the environment to return to a condition equivalent to the baseline after the effect ceases).

Table 7.14 Definitions of the Magnitude of Effect Levels for a Morphological Receptor

Value	Definition
High	Fundamental, permanent / irreversible changes, over the whole receptor, and / or fundamental alteration to key characteristics or features of the particular receptors character or distinctiveness
Medium	Considerable, permanent / irreversible changes, over the majority of the receptor, and / or discernible alteration to key characteristics or features of the particular receptors character or distinctiveness
Low	Discernible, temporary (throughout project duration) change, over a minority of the receptor, and / or limited but discernible alteration to key characteristics or features of the particular receptors character or distinctiveness
Negligible	Discernible, temporary (for part of the project duration) change, or barely discernible change for any length of time, over a small area of the receptor, and/or slight alteration to key characteristics or features of the particular receptors character or distinctiveness

7.4.3.2 Impact Significance

91. Following the identification of receptor sensitivity and value, and magnitude of effect, it is possible to determine the significance of the impact. A matrix is presented in **Table 7.15** as a framework to show how a judgement of the significance of an impact has been reached.

Table 7.15 Impact Significance Matrix

		Negative Magnitude				Beneficial Magnitude			
		High	Medium	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Low	Medium	High
Sensitivity	High	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Moderate	Major	Major
	Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor	Moderate	Major
	Low	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	Minor	Minor	Moderate
	Negligible	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Minor

92. Through use of this matrix, an assessment of the significance of an impact can be made in accordance with the definitions in **Table 7.16**. Impacts may be deemed as being either positive (beneficial) or negative (adverse).

Table 7.16 Impact Significance Definitions

Value	Definition
Major	Very large or large change in receptor condition, both adverse or beneficial, which are likely to be important considerations at a regional or district level because they contribute to achieving national, regional or local objectives, or, could result in exceedance of statutory objectives and / or breaches of legislation
Moderate	Intermediate change in receptor condition, which are likely to be important considerations at a local level
Minor	Small change in receptor condition, which may be raised as local issues but are unlikely to be important in the decision-making process
Negligible	No discernible change in receptor condition
No change	No impact, therefore no change in receptor condition

93. For the purposes of this PEIR, 'major' and 'moderate' impacts are deemed to be significant (in EIA terms). In addition, whilst 'minor' impacts may not be significant, it is important to distinguish these from other non-significant (negligible) impacts as they may contribute to significant impacts cumulatively.

94. Following initial assessment, if the impact does not require additional mitigation (or none is possible) the residual impact will remain the same. If however, additional mitigation is proposed there will be an assessment of the post-mitigation residual impact.

7.4.4 Cumulative Impact Assessment

95. Cumulative impacts are assessed through consideration of the extent of influence of changes or effects upon marine geology, oceanography and physical processes arising from the proposed East Anglia ONE North project alone and those arising from the proposed project cumulatively with other offshore windfarm developments (particularly East Anglia ONE and the proposed East Anglia TWO project, East Anglia THREE, Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas projects). Consideration is also given to the export cables crossing those for Greater Gabbard and Galloper and other nearby sea bed activities, including marine aggregate extraction and marine disposal.
96. The cumulative impact assessment draws from findings of earlier studies undertaken to inform the East Anglia ZEA (ABPmer 2012a), which considered cumulative effects arising from development of the whole zone, and the ES for the proposed East Anglia ONE project (ABPmer 2012b), which considered cumulative effects from that project and marine aggregate extraction activities in proximity to the offshore cable corridor.

7.4.5 Transboundary Impact Assessment

97. Transboundary impacts are assessed through consideration of the extent of influence of changes or effects and their potential to impact upon marine geology, oceanography and physical processes receptor groups that are located within other EU member states. It is concluded that transboundary impacts are unlikely to occur or are unlikely to be significant.
98. This conclusion is supported by the assessments that have previously been completed in the East Anglia ZEA (ABPmer 2012a), the ES of the East Anglia ONE project (ABPmer 2012b) and the ES's of the proposed East Anglia THREE and Norfolk Vanguard projects (EATL 2015; Norfolk Vanguard Limited 2018) (see **Appendix 7.2**).

7.5 Existing Environment

99. This section provides an overview of the key information from the assessment of the existing physical environment.
100. Given the extensive work that has previously been undertaken to characterise the baseline physical environment across the former East Anglia Zone, the approach taken in the proposed East Anglia ONE North project has been to:

- Review existing relevant data and reports from across the former East Anglia Zone;
 - Acquire additional data to fill any gaps specific to the proposed East Anglia ONE North project;
 - Undertake wave modelling to assess the individual and cumulative effects of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project on the wave regime; and
 - Formulate a conceptual understanding of the baseline physical environment, specific to the proposed East Anglia ONE North project.
101. It is important to recognise that the baseline physical environment is not static, but instead will exhibit considerable variability due to cycles or trends of natural change. These can include (for example) the short-term effects of storms and surges, the well-observed patterns in the movement of tides during spring and neap cycles and the longer-term effects of sea-level rise associated with global climate change.

7.5.1 Bathymetry

102. The East Anglia ONE North windfarm site covers an area of approximately 208km² of sea bed in the southern North Sea, off the coast of East Anglia. The offshore cable corridor covers an additional 133km² of sea bed, extending from the windfarm site to the landfall just north of Thorpeness in Suffolk.

7.5.1.1 Windfarm Site

103. Water depths within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site vary from a minimum depth of 33m below LAT to a maximum depth of 59m below LAT (**Figure 7.2**).
104. The bathymetry of the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site is dominated by relatively large areas of sand waves and megaripples located on north to south oriented shoals, separated by smaller areas of flatter deeper sea bed. The largest sand waves are generally up to 10m high (with one reaching 16m) with wavelengths of 500-900m. The smaller sand waves are approximately 2-6m high with a wavelength of between 80m and 120m.
105. Crests range in orientation from southeast to northwest, to east to west. Most sand waves are asymmetrical, with the steeper flank facing northeast to north (indicating a prevailing current direction and sediment transport direction ranging from northeast and north).
106. Megaripples and ripples are common throughout the windfarm site, oriented in similar directions to the sand waves. However, there are several areas where there are no bedforms. In the absence of bedforms, the sea bed is flat but irregular depending on the underlying geology, such as where London Clay

sub-crops. Across these areas the sea bed contains sets of north-northeast to south-southwest oriented striations.

7.5.1.2 Offshore Cable Corridor

107. Water depths across the offshore cable corridor vary from a minimum depth of 2m below LAT inshore (across an area of outcropping rock), to a maximum depth of 61m below LAT at the seaward end (**Figure 7.3**).
108. The inshore 3km of the offshore cable corridor is dominated by rock outcrop with an irregular surface formed of southwest to northeast oriented ridges between 0.5m and 3m high. East of the rock outcrop is an area of featureless sea bed formed of gravelly sands as a veneer over harder substrate (which is exposed in places), cut by a suite of trawl scars.
109. Further offshore the hard substrate is deeper sub-sea bed and the bathymetry is dominated by an irregular area of megaripples composed of gravelly sand, with some sand waves. The larger bedforms are predominantly oriented between west to east and west-northwest to east-southeast, and are generally up to 4.5m high (although a height of 9.5m was recorded) with wavelengths of 20-140m.
110. East of the point where the cable becomes oriented west to east, the sea bed is generally featureless with irregular low-lying mounds up to 0.5m high. Patches of megaripples with occasional sand waves do occur oriented between west-northwest to east southeast and west to east. The megaripples are generally less than 0.2m high and exhibit wavelengths of 3-12m.
111. The eastern end of the offshore cable corridor is dominated by two channels; a western channel oriented north-south and an eastern channel adjacent to the windfarm site oriented north-northeast to south-southwest, where the maximum depth of 61m below LAT was recorded. Both channels contain some west to east, or west-northwest to east-southeast oriented sand waves, between 2m and 12m high, with wavelengths of 50-300m.

7.5.2 Geology

7.5.2.1 Windfarm Site

112. EMU (2013) described three geological formations under the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site. The Yarmouth Roads Formation and Brown Bank Formation are Pleistocene in age, whereas the Superficial Sediments are Holocene (**Table 7.17**). The geology of the East Anglia ONE North site generally consists of Holocene deposits overlying a series of Pleistocene sands and clays.

Table 7.17 Geological formations present under East Anglia ONE North (EMU 2013)

Formation	Description (BGS Lexicon)
Superficial Sediments	Undifferentiated
Brown Bank	Brackish-marine, grey-brown silty clays. Pass upwards into lacustrine clays in the east, include interbeds gravelly sand towards base in west
Yarmouth Roads	Mainly riverine, fine or medium-grained grey-green sands, typically non-calcareous, with variable clay lamination and local intercalations of reworked peat

7.5.2.2 Offshore Cable Corridor

113. The geology of the offshore cable corridor close to the coast comprises mainly Coralline Crag Formation (cemented shelly sandstone) outcropping at the sea bed (Bibby Hydromap 2018a). This extends offshore for a maximum of about 3km.
114. Further offshore, Westkapelle Ground Formation overlies the Red Crag Formation (Bibby Hydromap 2018b). There is a buried channel up to 20m deep infilled with Brown Bank Formation near the offshore end of the cable corridor. The offshore section of the route is overlain by Holocene sediments as described in **section 7.5.1.2**.

7.5.3 Water Levels

115. Marine water levels are predominantly governed by astronomical effects but can also be significantly influenced (elevated or depressed) by meteorological influences and surge effects.

7.5.3.1 Astronomical Tidal Levels

116. The East Anglia ONE North windfarm site, and the former East Anglia Zone in general, is within a micro-tidal regime. The average spring tidal range varies between 0.1m and 2.0m (EAOW 2012) and typically weakens towards deeper areas.
117. This relatively low tidal range is due to general proximity to an amphidromic point in the southern North Sea that is positioned just outside the central, eastern boundary of the former East Anglia Zone (**Figure 7.4**). Due to this, the tidal range across the windfarm site is modest (0.5-1.2m) and not extreme. At the amphidromic point, the tidal range is near zero. Tidal range then increases with radial distance from this point.
118. At the coast, tidal range reaches 2.55m on mean spring tides at Sizewell (just to the north of the offshore cable corridor landfall).

7.5.3.2 Non-tidal Water Levels

119. The North Sea is particularly susceptible to storm surges and water levels can become elevated around 2.05m above astronomical tidal levels during a one-year return period surge event, and around 3.09m during a 100-year return period surge event, as measured at Sizewell.

7.5.4 Tidal Currents

120. Within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site, tidal currents are strongest across the west of the site, reaching up to 1.4m/s on spring tides and 0.9m/s on neap tides at an Admiralty Diamond close to the offshore cable corridor. Tidal streams are directed towards the south-southwest on a flooding tide and towards the north-northeast on the ebbing tide. Speeds reduce to around 0.7m/s on spring tides and 0.4m/s on neap tides in shallow water just off the Suffolk coast.
121. The southern North Sea is prone to storm surges, with a predicted maximum surge current of 0.4m/s (HSE 2002). Whilst this is less than the typical daily current speeds recorded within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site and offshore cable corridor, surge currents can combine with tidal currents to create faster overall currents.

7.5.5 Waves

122. The baseline offshore wave climate can comprise both swell waves and wind waves.
123. Offshore, waves in the southern North Sea are frequently directed away from the coast. This is due to the prevailing wind direction being from the southwest. However, waves from the north through to the south-eastern sector are also recorded, and it is waves from these approach directions which have the greatest potential to interact with the windfarm and cause effects on the identified receptors.
124. The significant wave heights from these sectors are greatest from a northerly approach, reaching 4.77m in a one-year return period event and 7.59m in a 50-year return period event.
125. As waves approach the shallower nearshore waters, they become transformed and generally reduce in height. The nearshore Dunwich and Sizewell banks also play an important sheltering effect to the coast.
126. Further details on the baseline wave conditions is presented in **Appendices 7.1 and 7.2**.

7.5.6 Sea Bed Sediments

7.5.6.1 Windfarm Site

127. As part of the zone-wide survey between September 2010 and January 2011, a total of 35 samples were collected within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site by Marine Ecological Surveys Limited (MESL 2011). No additional samples were collected as the zone-wide survey covered all the site (**Figure 7.5**). The median particle size (d_{50}) and percentages of mud, sand and gravel are available from this dataset.
128. The 35 samples collected during the zone-wide survey show that the predominant sea bed sediment along the cable route is sand (**Table 7.17**). The proportion of sand ranges from 62% to 99% (apart from a single anomalous sample where the sand content is 24%), with most samples (30 no.) containing greater than 82% sand. The gravel content varies from zero to 14% in 29 samples, with five containing between 16% and 34%, and a single anomalous sample with 72% gravel. Most samples contain less than 4% mud with only one containing more (9%). The d_{50} within the site ranges from 0.28mm to 0.42mm (medium sand) with a single sample with a d_{50} of 17mm (pebble) (**Table 7.16**).

Table 7.18 Particle size classification of sea bed sediment samples within the windfarm site

Station	Gravel (%)	Sand (%)	Mud (%)	d_{50} (mm)
400	3.82	95.03	1.15	0.36
401	2.73	96.36	0.91	0.36
402	0.69	98.20	1.11	0.33
403	7.90	90.65	1.45	0.36
404	1.82	96.46	1.72	0.34
409	0.51	97.55	1.94	0.34
410	7.71	91.25	1.04	0.34
411	6.82	92.20	0.98	0.38
412	7.61	91.02	1.37	0.37
413	0.50	98.50	1.00	0.35
420	19.85	78.33	1.82	0.36
421	1.81	95.67	2.52	0.34
422	9.00	89.92	1.09	0.37
423	0.77	98.35	0.88	0.36

Station	Gravel (%)	Sand (%)	Mud (%)	d ₅₀ (mm)
424	2.64	96.20	1.16	0.36
432	10.29	88.01	1.71	0.36
433	4.42	94.53	1.05	0.41
434	0.76	98.16	1.08	0.42
442	6.93	91.60	1.47	0.39
443	10.21	88.25	1.54	0.41
444	11.67	86.71	1.62	0.36
452	9.15	89.68	1.17	0.39
453	3.21	95.16	1.64	0.37
454	6.34	92.67	0.99	0.38
463	13.95	83.15	2.90	0.34
464	1.41	97.74	0.85	0.36
561	0.94	97.74	1.32	0.36
566	0.63	98.16	1.20	0.34
571	0.54	98.15	1.32	0.34
747	28.47	69.34	2.19	0.39
750	34.49	61.73	3.78	0.42
768	8.53	82.80	8.68	0.28
769	71.91	24.36	3.73	16.98
770	20.01	78.24	1.74	0.37
771	16.26	82.05	1.69	0.38

7.5.6.2 Offshore Cable Corridor

129. The particle size characteristics of all the seabed samples collected along the offshore cable corridor (a total of 46) are presented in **Figure 7.6** and **Table 7.19**. Sediment distribution is variable depending on location. However, the dominant sediment size is sand. Higher proportions of mud (greater than 50%) were found in 22% of samples with seven samples closer to the coast containing greater than 80% mud. Gravel content was variable, between zero and 53%.

Table 7.19 Particle size classification of sea bed sediment samples within the offshore cable corridor

Station	% Gravel	% Sand	% Mud	d ₅₀ (mm)
445	1.66	96.86	1.48	0.36
446	41.49	57.65	0.86	0.47
447	25.27	73.02	1.71	0.45
448	1.68	96.87	1.45	0.40
450	8.13	90.46	1.41	0.41
455	44.61	54.47	0.92	0.80
456	0.09	79.80	20.11	0.29
457	21.18	77.37	1.45	0.37
458	33.61	60.06	6.33	0.45
459	24.19	74.53	1.28	0.39
465	8.75	89.91	1.34	0.35
740	18.08	72.50	9.42	0.34
745	17.05	79.17	3.79	0.34
B03	0.85	48.80	50.35	-
B04	35.91	31.10	33.00	0.41
B05	34.19	43.45	22.35	0.38
B06	12.67	61.23	26.11	0.25
B07	33.95	44.35	21.71	0.49
B08	2.30	96.95	0.75	0.46
B09	53.16	46.44	0.41	3.11
B10	1.30	98.70	0.00	0.34
B11	35.84	62.15	2.01	0.68
B12	36.74	58.16	5.11	0.57
B13	20.11	71.48	8.41	0.39
B14	37.37	59.66	2.97	0.43
B15	0.65	99.35	0.00	0.31
B16	3.72	94.93	1.35	0.38

Station	% Gravel	% Sand	% Mud	d ₅₀ (mm)
B17	3.33	95.61	1.07	0.23
B18	7.83	84.92	7.25	0.72
B19	0.00	11.29	88.72	-
B20	0.28	19.69	80.03	-
B21	23.46	63.52	13.02	0.32
B22	35.24	47.11	17.66	0.43
B23	3.54	96.46	0.00	0.40
B24	45.02	54.61	0.37	0.74
B25	0.49	98.05	1.46	0.19
B26	0.30	74.62	25.08	0.14
B27	0.89	18.57	80.54	-
B28	0.74	17.78	81.48	-
B29	0.00	11.28	88.72	-
B30	0.00	9.79	90.21	-
B31	16.20	82.45	1.35	0.53
B32	0.60	52.13	47.27	0.08
B33	0.06	23.74	76.20	-
B34	0.23	13.44	86.33	-
B35	0.00	20.57	79.43	-

7.5.7 Suspended Sediments

130. Baseline suspended sediment concentrations within the former East Anglia Zone are typically between 1mg/l and 35mg/l, with a clear pattern of enhancement due to wave-stirring of sediment from the sea bed during storm conditions. During such conditions, values can reach greater than 80mg/l offshore, with up to 170mg/l having been recorded at the coast.
131. These suspended sediment concentrations provide a natural background context for the assessment of effects of any temporary increases that may arise due to the proposed East Anglia ONE North project.

7.5.8 Shoreline Transport Pathways and Coastal Erosion

132. Based on analysis of erosion rates along the coast between Dunwich and Thorpeness, using survey data of changes over time, it is known that the coast is relatively stable with rates of cliff recession generally being less than 0.1m/year. However, these are longer-term average values and larger episodes of recession can occur during individual storms if they are particularly severe. The relative stability is due largely to the sheltering presence of the Dunwich and Sizewell sand banks and the sheltering presence of Thorpe Ness.
133. Projections have been made of future coastal erosion in different zones along the coast and these have been used to inform engineering decisions about the location of onshore infrastructure to ensure they are suitably set back from projected erosion.
134. Consideration has also been given to sediment transport processes operating along the coast to inform decisions about the landfall location for the offshore cable corridor. The findings of relevance are:
- Net transport of sediment along the coast is limited, but gross transport can be higher and its direction is dependent on the prevailing wave conditions.
 - Alongshore transport of shingle is restricted to the surf zone under predominantly storm conditions.
 - Under normal conditions sand moves alongshore in the intertidal zone; under storm conditions, sand transport predominantly takes place along nearshore bars.
 - The nearshore area is characterised predominantly by fine to medium sand, with only minimal shingle present.
 - Sediments greater than 2mm in size are not mobilised in offshore regions; therefore, it is unlikely that shingle is transported onshore.
 - Thorpe Ness, while limiting supply to the south plays a major role in retaining material to the north. Most of the sand transported south each year is therefore likely to be recirculated north into the Sizewell and Dunwich sand banks. Indeed, sand has been noted to move offshore at Thorpe Ness from the coast onto the Sizewell bank system.
 - The Sizewell and Dunwich banks are sinks for medium to fine sand, with no shingle. There is potential for movement of sand on the banks under both average and storm wave conditions, and sand within the first 4km offshore could be mobilised and moved onshore under both storm and moderate wave conditions.
 - There may be some re-circulation of sediment from the Sizewell and Dunwich banks to the Dunwich coastline.

7.5.9 Designated Sites

135. The East Anglia ONE North windfarm site and offshore cable corridor does not overlap with any international, national or local sites designated for sea bed features. The East Anglia ONE North offshore cable corridor is adjacent to sand banks which are supporting features of the Outer Thames Estuary SPA.
136. A HRA screening exercise has been undertaken which concluded no impact on any sites designated for sea bed or benthic ecology features (see Appendix 1 of the Draft Report to Inform the HRA EA1N-DEVWF-ENV-REP-IBR000307).

7.5.10 Climate Change and Natural Trends

137. Due to global climate change and local land level changes, mean sea level at the coast is expected to be between 0.19 and 0.27m higher by 2050 compared to 1990 values (Lowe et al. 2009). This is not deemed particularly significant over the lifetime of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project and is well within the range of natural variability in water levels.
138. Climate change is projected to have an insignificant effect on the height of storm surges over the lifetime of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project (Lowe et al. 2009), although there is generally expected to be an increase in their frequency of occurrence.
139. Climate projections indicate that wave heights in the southern North Sea will increase by 0.05m by 2100 (Lowe et al. 2009). This is not significant over the lifetime of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project and is well within the range of natural variability in wave heights.

7.6 Potential Impacts

140. Potential effects in relation to marine physical processes to be considered within the EIA have been agreed with statutory advisors (MMO, Natural England and Cefas) through the EPP (Expert Topic Group meeting 12th April, 2017). A briefing document outlining the refinements made to the East Anglia ONE North offshore cable corridor was submitted to stakeholders in July / August, 2017 detailing the approach to filling data gaps. An updated method statement combining both documents can be found in Appendix 2.1 of SPR (2017). This method statement provides a full list of impacts to be assessed as part of the EIA.
141. As far as practically possible, works will be undertaken in such a way as to reduce the volume of suspended sediment released and minimise the use of cable or scour protection. Specific mitigation, if required will be identified through the EIA.

7.6.1 Potential Impacts during Construction

142. During the construction phase of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project, there is potential for wind turbine, foundation and cable installation activities to cause sediment disturbance effects, potentially resulting in changes in suspended sediment concentrations and / or sea bed or, in the case of nearshore cable installation, shoreline levels due to deposition or erosion.

7.6.1.1 Impact 1 Changes in Suspended Sediment Concentrations due to Foundation Installation

143. The installation of wind turbine foundations has the potential to disturb sediments from (i) the sea bed (near-surface sediments); and (ii) from several tens of metres below the sea bed (sub-surface sediments), depending on foundation type and installation method. The worst case scenario assumes that the disposal of any sediment that would be disturbed or removed during foundation installation would occur within the East Anglia ONE North site.

7.6.1.1.1 Near-surface Sediments

144. Sea bed sediments and shallow near-bed sediments within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site would be disturbed during any levelling or dredging activities that may be needed at each foundation location to create a suitable base prior to installation.

145. This process would cause localised and short-term increases in suspended sediment concentrations both at the point of dredging at the sea bed and, more importantly, at the point of its discharge back into the water column which, in the worst case scenario, would be at the water surface.

146. Activities such as sand wave levelling may be required up to a sediment depth of 5m. The worst case scenario considers the maximum volumes of sediment disturbed during any levelling or dredging for the project and assumes sediment would be dredged and returned to the water column at the sea surface during disposal from the dredger vessel.

147. Mobilised sediment from these activities may be transported by wave and tidal action in suspension in the water column. The disturbance effects at each wind turbine, meteorological mast or offshore platform location are likely to last for no more than a few days of construction activity.

148. Baseline suspended sediment concentrations within the former East Anglia Zone are typically between 1mg/l and 35mg/l, with a clear pattern of enhancement in values due to wave-stirring of sediment from the sea bed during storm conditions. During such conditions, values can reach greater than 80mg/l offshore, with up to 170mg/l recorded at the coast.

149. The sea bed sediments across the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site are typically characterised by medium sand with some coarser biogenic material (shells and shell fragments), with only a very small percentage content of mud-sized material (typically less than 5%).
150. The worst case scenario involves the maximum volume of sediment released through sea bed preparation activities for the worst case foundations being considered:
 - jackets with caissons for the maximum number (i.e. 67) of 250m wind turbines; and
 - jackets with caissons (equivalent to those used for 300m wind turbines) for one meteorological mast and five offshore platforms.
151. For the total volume released during the construction phase, the worst case assumes that up to 2,286,701m³ of near-surface sediment would be removed by means of dredging and returned to the water column at its surface layer as overflow from a dredger vessel.
152. Expert-based assessment suggests that, due to the sediment particle sizes present across the windfarm site, the sediment disturbed from the sea bed by the drag head of the dredger would remain close to the bed and rapidly settle. Most of the sediment released at the water surface from the dredger vessel would rapidly (order of minutes or tens of minutes) fall to the sea bed as a highly turbid dynamic plume immediately upon its discharge.
153. Some of the finer sand fraction from this release and the very small proportion of mud that is present are likely to stay in suspension for longer and form a passive plume which would become advected by tidal currents. Due to the sediment sizes present, this is likely to exist as a measurable but modest concentration (tens of mg/l) plume for around half a tidal cycle (up to six hours). Sediment would eventually fall to the sea bed in relatively close proximity to its release (within a few hundred metres up to around a kilometre, along the axis of the tidal flow) within a short period of time (hours).
154. This assessment is supported by the findings of a review of the evidence base into the physical impacts of marine aggregate dredging on sediment plumes and sea bed deposits (Whiteside et al. 1995; John et al. 2000; Hiscock and Bell 2004; Newell et al. 2004; Tillin et al. 2011; Cooper and Brew 2013). This review identified that the highest suspended sediment concentrations associated with dredging occur for only a short duration and remain local to the point of sediment release into the water column, while within the wider licensed dredge area concentrations typically remain modest (i.e. of the order of tens of mg/l). Whilst lower concentrations extend beyond licensed dredge areas, along the

axis of predominant tidal flows, the magnitudes are indistinguishable from background levels.

155. Modelling simulations undertaken for the East Anglia ONE windfarm site using the Delft3D plume model (ABPmer 2012b) confirm the above expert-based assessments of suspended sediment concentrations arising from disturbance of near-surface sediments. There are good similarities in sediment types and distributions between the East Anglia ONE (5% gravel, 93% sand and 2% mud) and East Anglia ONE North windfarm sites. The water depths for each site are also similar. Overall, therefore, the modelling studies for the East Anglia ONE windfarm site represent a suitable analogue for verifying the conclusions of the more qualitative expert-based assessment described above.
156. In the East Anglia ONE modelling studies, consecutive daily releases of 22,500m³ of sediment (mostly medium-grained sand, but also with small proportions of gravel, other sand fractions and muds) were simulated at the water surface at 15 wind turbine locations. This sediment release represents a suitable analogue for the type and magnitude of effect that would be anticipated from the proposed East Anglia ONE North project.
157. The previous modelling predicted that close to the release locations, suspended sediment concentrations would be very high (orders of magnitude greater than natural background levels), but of very short duration (seconds to minutes) as the dynamic plume falls to the sea bed. Within the passive plume, suspended sediment concentration above background levels were low (less than 10mg/l) and within the range of natural variability. Net movement of fine-grained sediment retained within the passive plume was in accordance with the direction of residual tidal flow. Sediment concentrations rapidly (within a small number of hours) returned to background levels after cessation of the release into the water column.
158. Given this finding from modelled consecutive installation of 15 wind turbine foundations, it is expected that effects from installation across the whole East Anglia ONE North windfarm site would be similar, although with the point of release moving across the site with progression of the construction sequence.

7.6.1.1.2 Sub-surface Sediments

159. Deeper sub-surface sediments within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site would become disturbed during any drilling activities that may be needed at the location of each monopile or three or four-legged jacket (with pin piles).
160. For the total volume released during the construction phase, the worst case is associated with:
 - monopiles for the maximum number (i.e. 53) of 300m wind turbines;

- monopile (equivalent to that of a 300m wind turbine foundation) for the meteorological mast; and
 - jackets with four pin piles (equivalent to those used for 300m turbines) for five offshore platforms.
161. This worst case assumes that up to 93,308m³ of sub-surface sediment would be released in total throughout the anticipated construction programme.
162. The drilling process would cause localised and short-term increases in suspended sediment concentrations at the point of discharge of the drill arisings. Released sediment may then be transported by wave and tidal action in suspension in the water column.
163. The disturbance effects at each wind turbine location are only likely to last for a few days of construction activity, with the overall construction programme expected to last up to 27 months.
164. Although the sub-surface sediment release volumes under a worst case scenario are considerably lower than those for the worst case scenario for the near-surface sediments, the sediment types would differ, with a larger proportion of finer materials.
165. Expert-based assessment suggests that the coarser sediment fractions (medium and coarse sands and gravels) and aggregated 'clasts' of finer sediment would settle out of suspension close to the foundation location, whilst disaggregated finer sediments (fine sands and muds) would be more prone to dispersion. Due to the small quantities of sediment release involved, however, these disaggregated finer sediments are likely to be widely and rapidly dispersed, resulting in only low elevations in suspended sediment concentration.
166. Modelling simulations undertaken for East Anglia ONE (ABPmer 2012b) confirm the above expert-based assessments of suspended sediment concentrations arising from disturbance of deeper sub-surface sediments. These modelling studies make a suitable analogue for the present assessments, with any key differences between the two windfarm sites being noted.
167. In the East Anglia ONE modelling studies, 982m³ of variably graded fine sediment (sand, clay and silt) was released into the water column once every two days to simulate the construction of eight consecutively drilled (jacket) foundations over a 15-day simulation period. This value is acknowledged to be less than the worst case scenario for the monopile foundations being considered for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project but, nonetheless, the previous modelling results support the general principles of the expert-

based assessments. Away from the immediate release locations, near-field elevations in suspended sediment concentration above background levels were low (less than 10mg/l) and within the range of natural variability. Indeed, concentrations were generally no greater than 5mg/l at 5km from the release location, indicating wide dispersion in low concentrations. Net movement of fine-grained sediment retained within the plume was to the north, in accordance with the direction of residual tidal flow, although gross movement to both the north and south was possible depending on the timing of release. Sediment concentrations arising from installation of one foundation were deemed unlikely to persist for sufficiently long that they significantly interact with subsequent operations and therefore no cumulative effect was anticipated.

168. The larger release volumes associated with the worst case scenario for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project may result in larger concentrations above background levels than previously modelled. However, these are likely to still be modest (tens of mg/l) due to the low volumes of disaggregated fine-grained sediment in the drill arisings. Hence, the principle of wide dispersion in relatively low concentrations remains valid. Also, a conservative scenario was made in the modelling that all drilled sediment would disperse. However, in reality some of the drill arisings would arrive at the sea surface as larger aggregated clasts which would settle rapidly.
169. The changes in suspended sediment concentrations (magnitudes, geographical extents and durations of effect) that are anticipated above would move across the windfarm site with progression of the construction sequence as the point of sediment release (and hence geographic location of the zone of effect) changes with the installation of foundations at different wind turbine locations.

7.6.1.1.3 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and / or Impact Significance

170. Given that the expert-based assessments of the dynamic and passive plume effects on suspended sediment concentrations for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project are consistent with the findings of the earlier modelling studies for the East Anglia ONE project, there is high confidence in the assessment of effects.
171. The worst case changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to foundation installation are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.20**).

Table 7.20 Magnitude of Effect on Suspended Sediment Concentrations due to Foundation Installation Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field*	High	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Medium

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Far-field	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Low

* The near-field effects are confined to a small area (likely to be of the order of several hundred metres up to a kilometre from each foundation location), and would not cover the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site.

172. The effects on suspended sediment concentrations due to foundation installation for the proposed project do not directly impact upon the identified receptor groups for marine geology, oceanography and physical processes, so there is no impact associated with the proposed East Anglia ONE North project.
173. The effects do have the potential to impact upon other receptors and therefore the assessment of impact significance is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

7.6.1.2 Impact 2 Changes in Sea Bed Level due to Foundation Installation

174. The increases in suspended sediment concentrations associated with Impact 1 (**section 7.6.1.1**) have the potential to deposit sediment and raise the sea bed level slightly. There would be different settling rates for the sediment types associated with the near-surface sediment disturbance compared to the deeper sub-surface sediment disturbance, so each is discussed in turn.

7.6.1.2.1 Near-surface Sediments

175. Expert-based assessment suggests that the coarser sediment would rapidly (within the order of minutes or tens of minutes) fall to the bed as a highly turbid dynamic plume immediately upon its discharge. Deposition of this sediment would form a 'mound' local to the point of release. Due to the sediment particle sizes observed across the windfarm site (predominantly medium sand or coarser, with very little fine sand or muds), a large proportion of the disturbed sediment would behave in this manner.
176. The resulting mound would be a measurable protrusion above the existing sea bed (likely to be tens of centimetres to a few metres high) but would remain local to the release point. The precise configuration of height and spreading distance of each mound would vary across the windfarm site, depending on the prevailing physical conditions, but in all cases the sediment within the mound would be similar to that on the existing sea bed. This would mean that there would be no discernible change in sea bed sediment type.
177. In addition to the localised mounds, some of the sediment from this release (mainly the fine sand fraction and the very small proportion of muds) is likely to form a passive plume and become more widely dispersed before settling on the sea bed. Expert-based assessment suggests that due to the dispersion by tidal

currents, the thickness of deposits from the plume across the wider sea bed area would be very small (order of millimetres).

178. This assessment is supported by an evidence-base obtained from research into the physical impacts of marine aggregate dredging on sediment plumes and sea bed deposits (Whiteside et al. 1995; John et al. 2000; Hiscock and Bell 2004; Newell et al. 2004; Tillin et al. 2011; Cooper and Brew 2013) which also indicates the propensity for wide dispersion and only small thicknesses of deposits on the sea bed from the release of similar sediments in similar physical environments.
179. The Delft3D plume modelling studies for East Anglia ONE (ABPmer 2012b) considered the bed level changes resulting from deposition of sediments from the passive plume due to sea bed preparation for 15 foundations. This involved a worst case near-surface sediment release of 22,500m³ per foundation (i.e. around 80% of the value of the average conservative volume considered as the worst case for an individual wind turbine in East Anglia ONE North). For the most part, the deposited sediment layer across the wider sea bed was found to be less than 0.2mm thick and did not exceed 2mm anywhere. The area of sea bed upon which deposition occurred (at these low values) extended a considerable distance from the site boundary (around 50km), but in doing so only covered a very narrow width of sea bed (a few hundred metres). This is because the dispersion of the plume followed the axis of tidal flow. The previous assessment also concluded that this deposited sediment has the potential to become re-mobilised and therefore would rapidly become incorporated into the mobile sea bed sediment layer, thus further reducing any potential effect.

7.6.1.2.2 Sub-surface Sediments

180. Expert-based assessment suggests that due to the finer-grained nature of any sub-surface sediment released into the water column from drilling, there would be greater dispersion across a wider area, in keeping with the pattern of the tidal ellipses.
181. The earlier Delft3D plume modelling studies (ABPmer 2012b) considered sea bed level changes resulting from deposition of sediments from drilling eight piled (jacket) foundations. The coarser sediment deposited near to the point of release to thicknesses of up to a few centimetres and over a sea bed area within a few hundred metres of each foundation. For the most part, the deposited sediment layer across the wider sea bed area was predicted to be less than 0.025mm thick.

182. Although the modelling used a smaller volume of sediment than the worst case scenario for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project, it does support the principles of the expert-based assessment that the envisaged scale of sea bed level change would be very small (largely immeasurable).
183. The sea bed-level changes that are anticipated above would move across the site with progression of the construction sequence as the point of sediment release (and hence geographic location of the zone of effect) changes with the installation of foundations.

7.6.1.2.3 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

184. Given that the expert-based assessment of the sea bed level changes associated with foundation installation for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project are consistent with the findings of the modelling studies for the East Anglia ONE project, there is high confidence in the assessment of effects, including their scaling up from modelling results of a sub-set of wind turbines to the whole windfarm site.
185. The worst case changes in sea bed levels due to foundation installation are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.21**).

Table 7.21 Magnitude of Effects on Seabed Level Changes due to Foundation Installation Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field*	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Low
Far-field	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

* The near-field effects are confined to a small area of sea bed (likely to be of the order of several hundred metres up to a kilometre from each foundation location), and would not cover the whole East Anglia ONE North windfarm site.

186. These effects on sea bed level have the potential to impact directly upon the identified receptor groups at the maximum values for the given water depth. In practice, the volumes of sediment released would be lower than the worst case at many wind turbine locations because the detailed design process would optimise the foundation type and installation method to the site conditions.
187. The effects on sea bed level have the potential to impact upon other receptors and therefore the assessment of impact significance is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

7.6.1.3 Impact 3 Changes in Suspended Sediment Concentrations During Inter-Array Cable and Platform Link Cable Installation

188. The details of the inter-array and platform link cabling are dependent upon the final project design, but present estimates are that the total length of inter-array

cables would be up to 200km, and the total length of platform link cable may be up to 75km. The worst case cable laying technique is considered to be jetting.

189. The installation of the cabling has the potential to disturb the sea bed down to a sediment thickness of up to 5m, either directly through the installation method chosen, or through sea bed levelling of any large sand waves that may be present along the route of any cables prior to cable installation.
190. The volume of sediment affected due to sand wave excavation for inter-array and platform link cable installation is estimated to be up to 550,000m³ (400,000m³ and 150,000m³, respectively). The sediment released at any one time would depend on the capacity of the dredger.
191. The types and magnitudes of effects that could be caused have previously been assessed within an industry best practice document on cabling techniques (BERR 2008). This document has been used alongside expert-based judgement and analysis of site conditions to inform the assessments presented below.

7.6.1.3.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

192. It is anticipated using expert-based assessment that the changes in suspended sediment concentration due to inter-array cable and platform link cable installation would be lower than those arising from the disturbance of near-surface sediments during foundation installation activities including sea bed preparation. This is because the overall sediment release volumes would be low and confined to near the sea bed (rather than higher in the water column) along the alignment of the cables, and the rate at which sediment is released from the jetting process would be relatively slow.
193. Using this evidence, the worst case changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to inter-array cable and platform link cable installation are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.22**).

Table 7.22 Magnitude of Effect on Suspended Sediment Concentrations due to Inter-Array Cable and Platform Link Cable Installation Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field*	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Low
Far-field	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

* The near-field effects are confined to a small area (likely to be of the order of several hundred metres up to a kilometre from the cable), and would not cover the entirety of the sea bed area within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site.

194. The effects do have the potential to impact upon other receptors and therefore the assessment of impact significance is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

7.6.1.4 Impact 4 Changes in Sea Bed Level due to Inter-array Cable and Platform Link Cable Installation

195. The increases in suspended sediment concentrations associated with Impact 3 (**section 7.6.1.3**) have the potential to result in changes in sea bed level as the suspended sediment deposits.

196. As discussed in **section 7.6.1.3** up to 400,000m³ of sediment may be released as a result of pre-sweeping up to 200km of inter-array cables plus 150,000m³ of sediment from up to 75km of platform link cables. The dynamic nature of the sand waves in this area means that any direct changes to the seabed level associated with sand wave levelling are likely to recover over a short period of time due to natural sand transport pathways.

197. Any excavated sediment due to sand wave levelling for the inter-array and platform link cables would be disposed of within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site itself. This means there will be no net loss of sand from the site. It is likely that some of this sand would be disposed in areas of the windfarm site where tidal currents would, over time, re-distribute the sand back over the levelled area (as re-formed sand waves). The extent of sand wave levelling required and specific disposal locations within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site would be determined post consent following detailed geophysical surveys, however, given the relatively low volumes of sand likely to be affected, the overall effect of changes to the seabed would be minimal.

7.6.1.4.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

198. The changes in suspended sediment concentration due to inter-array cable and platform link cable installation would be less than those arising from the disturbance of near-surface sediments during foundation installation activities. Therefore, the sea bed level changes would also be lower.

199. Using this as a basis, the worst case changes in sea bed level due to inter-array cable and platform link cable installation are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.23**).

Table 7.23 Magnitude of Effect on Sea Bed Level Changes due to Inter-Array Cable and interconnector cable Installation Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field*	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Low

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Far-field	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

* The near-field effects are confined to a small area of sea bed (likely to be of the order of several hundred metres up to a kilometre from the inter-array cable), and would not cover the whole East Anglia ONE North windfarm site.

200. These effects on sea bed level are considered highly unlikely to have the potential to impact directly upon the identified receptor groups for marine geology, oceanography and physical processes. This is because the magnitude of effect is smaller than that associated with foundation installation and there is a large separation distance (greater than one tidal ellipse) which does not support the existence of a pathway between the source and receptor.
201. The overall impact of inter-array cable and platform link cable installation activities on sea bed level changes under a worst case scenario for identified morphological receptor groups is regarded as **no impact**.
202. In many parts of the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site there would not be the need for release of volumes of sediment considered under this worst case scenario. Optimisation of inter-array cable and platform link cable alignment, depth and installation methods during detailed design would ensure that impacts are minimised.
203. The effects do have the potential to impact upon other receptors and therefore the assessment of impact significance is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

7.6.1.5 Impact 5 Changes in Suspended Sediment Concentrations During Export Cable Installation

204. The assessment of changes in suspended sediment concentration during export cable installation has been considered separately from those for the inter-array and platform link cables because parts of the offshore cable corridor are in shallower water and closer to the identified morphological receptor groups.
205. The detail of the export cabling is dependent upon the final project design, but present estimates are that the maximum length of each export cable could be up to 76km. Up to two cables would be installed providing a total maximum length of 152km of export cable. The worst case cable laying technique is considered to be jetting.
206. The installation of the export cables has the potential to disturb the sea bed down to a sediment thickness of up to 5m, either directly through the installation

method chosen, or through sea bed levelling of any large sand waves that may be present along the offshore cable corridor prior to cable installation. The release of sediment from both construction phase activities, with the release points along the offshore cable corridor, has been considered here.

207. The volume of sediment affected due to sand wave levelling for the export cable installation is estimated to be up to 500,000m³. The sediment released at any one time would depend on the capacity of the dredger.
208. The types and magnitudes of effects that could be caused have previously been assessed within an industry best-practice document on cabling techniques (BERR 2008). This document has been used alongside expert-based judgement and analysis of site conditions to inform the assessments presented below.

7.6.1.5.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

209. It is anticipated using expert-based assessment that the changes in suspended sediment concentration due to export cable installation would be less than those arising from the disturbance of near-surface sediments during foundation installation activities, although the location of effect would differ as it would be focused along the offshore cable corridor.
210. This assessment is based on the overall sediment release volumes being low and confined to near the sea bed (rather than higher in the water column) along the alignment of the offshore cable corridor, and the rate at which the sediment is released into the water column from the jetting process being relatively slow.
211. It is likely that the concentrations would be enhanced by the greatest amount in the shallowest sections of the offshore cable corridor, but in these locations the background concentrations are also greater than in deeper waters, typically up to 180mg/l.
212. Modelling simulations undertaken for East Anglia ONE (ABPmer 2012b) confirm the expert-based assessment and provided the following quantification of magnitude of change:
 - Sand-sized sediment (which represents most of the disturbed sediment) would settle out of suspension within less than 1km from the point of installation within the offshore cable corridor and persist in the water column for less than a few tens of minutes.
 - Mud-sized material (which represents only a very small proportion of the disturbed sediment) would be advected a greater distance and persist in the water column for hours to days.

- In water depths greater than 20m LAT, peak suspended sediment concentrations would be typically less than 100mg/l, except in the immediate vicinity (a few tens of metres) of the release location.
- In shallow water depths nearer to the coast (less than 5m LAT) the potential for dispersion is more limited and therefore the concentrations are likely to be greater, approaching 400mg/l at their peak. However, these plumes would be localised to within less than 1km of the location of installation and would persist for no longer than a few hours.
- After 180 hours following cessation of installation activities any plume would have been fully dispersed.

213. There are similarities in water depth, sediment types and metocean conditions between the offshore cable corridor for East Anglia ONE and for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project making the earlier modelling studies a suitable analogue for the present assessments.

214. Using this as a basis, the worst case changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to export cable installation are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.24**).

Table 7.24 Magnitude of Effect on Suspended Sediment Concentrations due to Export Cable Installation Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field* (nearshore)	High	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Medium
Near-field* (offshore)	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Low
Far-field	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

* The near-field effects are confined to a small area (likely to be of the order of several hundred metres up to a kilometre from the offshore cable corridor), and would not cover the whole offshore cable corridor.

215. These effects on suspended sediment concentrations are considered highly unlikely to have the potential to impact directly upon the identified receptor groups for marine geology, oceanography and physical processes due to separation distances, except for parts of the Suffolk Natural 2000 site across which part of the offshore cable corridor crosses.

216. Effects will be spread along the offshore cable corridor with the slow progression of the cable installation.

217. Given these aspects, the sensitivity and value of the ‘Suffolk Natura 2000’ site are presented in **Table 7.25**.

Table 7.25 Sensitivity and Value Assessment for the ‘Suffolk Natura 2000’ Site

Receptor	Tolerance	Adaptability	Recoverability	Value	Sensitivity
‘Suffolk Natura 2000’ site	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	High	Negligible

218. The overall impact of export cable installation activities under a worst case scenario on suspended sediment concentrations for the identified morphological receptor groups is considered to be **no impact**, except for the ‘Suffolk Natura 2000’ site which is assessed to have an impact of **minor adverse to negligible** significance.
219. The impacts arising from subsequent deposition of the suspended sediments on the sea bed are discussed under Impact 6 (**section 7.6.1.6**).
220. The effects do have the potential to impact upon other receptors and therefore the assessment of impact significance is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

7.6.1.6 Impact 6 Changes in Sea Bed Level due to Export Cable Installation

221. The increases in suspended sediment concentration associated with Impact 5 have the potential to result in changes in sea bed level as the suspended sediment deposits.
222. As discussed in **section 7.6.1.5** up to 500,000m³ of sediment may be released as a result of pre-sweeping of up to 152km of export cables. The dynamic nature of the sand waves in this area means that any direct changes to the seabed elevation associated with sand wave levelling are likely to recover over a short period of time due to natural sand transport pathways.
223. Any excavated sediment due to sand wave levelling for the export cables would be disposed of within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site itself. This means there will be no net loss of sand from the site. It is likely that some of this sand would be disposed in areas of the windfarm site where tidal currents would, over time, re-distribute the sand back over the levelled area (as re-formed sand waves). The extent of sand wave levelling required and specific disposal locations within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site would be determined post consent following detailed geophysical surveys, however, given the relatively low volumes of sand likely to be affected, the overall effect of changes to the seabed would be minimal.

7.6.1.6.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

224. The changes in suspended sediment concentration due to export cable installation would be lower than those arising from the disturbance of near-surface sediments during foundation installation activities. Therefore, the magnitude of bed level changes would also be lower, although the location of effect would differ as it would be focused along the offshore cable corridor.
225. Modelling simulations undertaken for East Anglia ONE (ABPmer 2012b) confirm that sea bed level changes of up to 2mm would be observed within a few hundred metres of the inshore sections of the offshore cable corridor and further afield the sea bed level changes are not expected to be measurable.
226. Using this as a basis, the worst case changes in sea bed level due to export cable installation are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.26**).

Table 7.26 Magnitude of Effect on Sea Bed Level Changes due to Export Cable Installation Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field*	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Low
Far-field	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

* The near-field effects are confined to a small area of sea bed (likely to be of the order of several hundred metres up to a kilometre from the offshore cable corridor), and would not cover the whole offshore cable corridor.

227. These effects on sea bed level are considered highly unlikely to have the potential to impact directly upon the identified receptor groups for marine geology, oceanography and physical processes due to separation distances, except for parts of the Suffolk Natural 2000 site across which part of the offshore cable corridor crosses.
228. For most receptor groups the magnitude of effect is lower than that associated with foundation installation and there is a large separation distance (greater than one tidal ellipse) which does not support the existence of a pathway between the source and receptor.
229. Given these aspects, the sensitivity and value of the 'Suffolk Natura 2000' site are presented in **Table 7.27**.

Table 7.27 Sensitivity and Value Assessment for the 'Suffolk Natura 2000' Site

Receptor	Tolerance	Adaptability	Recoverability	Value	Sensitivity
'Suffolk Natura 2000' site	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	High	Negligible

230. The overall impact of export cable installation activities under a worst case scenario on bed level changes for the identified morphological receptor groups is considered to be no impact, except for the 'Suffolk Natura 2000' site which is assessed to have an impact of **negligible** significance.
231. In many parts of the offshore cable corridor there would not be the need for release of such volumes of sediment as considered under this worst case scenario, and optimisation of the export cable route selection within the offshore cable corridor, depth and installation methods during detailed design would ensure that impacts are minimised.
232. The effects do have the potential to impact upon other receptors and therefore the assessment of impact significance is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

7.6.1.7 Impact 7 Indentations on the Sea Bed due to Installation Vessels

233. There is potential for certain vessels used during the installation of the windfarm and cable infrastructure to directly impact the sea bed. This applies for those vessels that utilise jack-up legs or several anchors to hold station and to provide stability for a working platform. Where legs or anchors (and associated chains) have been inserted into the sea bed and then removed, there is potential for an indentation to remain, proportional to the dimensions of the object. The worst case scenario is considered to correspond to the use of jack-up vessels, since the depressions would be greater than the anchor scars.
234. As the leg is inserted, the sea bed sediments would primarily be compressed vertically downwards and displaced laterally. This may cause the sea bed around the inserted leg to be raised in a series of concentric pressure ridges. As the leg is retracted, some of the sediment would return to the hole via mass slumping under gravity until a stable slope angle is achieved. Over the longer term, the pit would become shallower and less distinct due to infilling with mobile sediments.
235. A single jack-up barge leg would have a footprint of 50 to 500m² and a jack-up vessel would have up to six legs. Each leg could penetrate up to 20m into the sea bed and may be cylindrical, triangular, truss leg or lattice.
236. The worst case assumes that legs could be deployed on up to three different occasions around a single foundation as the jack-up barge manoeuvres into different positions.

7.6.1.7.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

237. The worst case changes in terms of indentations on the sea bed due to installation vessels are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.28**).

Table 7.28 Magnitude of Effect on Sea Bed Level Changes Due to Installation Vessels Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field (immediate vicinity of leg)	High	Negligible	Negligible	Medium	Medium
Near-field (beyond immediate vicinity of leg)	No change	-	-	-	No change
Far-field	No change	-	-	-	No change

238. There is **no impact** under a worst case scenario on the identified morphological receptor groups since they are remote from the immediate vicinity of each leg.

239. The significance of these effects on other receptors is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

7.6.1.8 Impact 8 Changes to Suspended Sediment Concentrations and Coastal Morphology at the Landfall

240. At the landfall just north of Thorpeness, the worst case scenario includes installation of two cables using HDD techniques. As a consequence of the chosen method there would be **no impacts** on the morphology within the intertidal zone.

7.6.1.8.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

241. The worst case changes to suspended sediment concentrations and coastal morphology at the cable landfall are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.29**).

Table 7.29 Magnitude of Effects on Suspended Sediment Concentrations and Coastal Morphology at the Cable Landfall Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field	No change	-	-	-	No change
Far-field	No change	-	-	-	No change

7.6.2 Potential Impacts during Operation

242. During the operational phase of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project, there is potential for the presence of the foundations of the turbines, meteorological masts and offshore platforms to cause changes to the tidal and wave regimes due to physical blockage effects. These changes could potentially affect the sediment regime and / or sea bed morphology. These potential effects are considered as Operational Impacts 1 to 5. Effects due to the presence of cable protection measures are considered in Operational Impacts 6 to 8. In addition, there is potential for the temporary presence of engineering equipment, for example, jack-up barges or anchored vessels to have local effects on the hydrodynamic and sediment regimes during maintenance activities. These potential effects are considered as Operational Impact 9.

7.6.2.1 Impact 1 Changes to the Tidal Regime due to the Presence of Foundation Structures

243. The presence of foundation structures within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site has the potential to alter the baseline tidal regime, particularly tidal currents and water levels. Any changes in the tidal regime may have the potential to contribute to changes in the sea bed morphology due to alteration of sediment transport patterns (see operational impact 3, **section 7.6.2.3**) or due to initiation of sea bed scour (see operational impact 4, **section 7.6.2.4**).
244. Expert-based assessment suggests that each foundation would present an obstacle to the passage of currents locally, causing a small modification to the height and/or phase of the water levels and a wake in the current flow. This latter process involves a deceleration of flow immediately upstream and downstream of each foundation and an acceleration of flow around the sides of each foundation. Current speeds return to baseline conditions with progression downstream of each foundation and generally do not interact with wakes from adjacent foundations due to the separation distances.
245. There is a pre-existing evidence base which demonstrates that changes in the tidal regime due to the presence of foundation structures are both small in magnitude and localised in spatial extent. This is confirmed by existing guidance documents (ETSU 2000; ETSU 2002; Lambkin et al. 2009) and numerous EIAs for offshore windfarms, including Delft3D numerical modelling of changes in hydrodynamics associated with East Anglia ONE (ABPmer 2012b). This modelling was based on a worst case of 240 GBS (50m base diameter and height up to 10m above the sea bed) and showed changes in water level of less than $\pm 0.007\text{m}$ across a small geographical area.

246. With respect to changes in tidal currents, the previous modelling (see **section 7.4.2**) predicted maximum reductions in peak flow speeds of 0.05 to 0.1m/s and maximum increases in peak flow speeds of 0.05m/s, from peak baseline values of around 1m/s. The geographical extent of these maximum changes was largely confined to the near-field environment (a wake zone local to each wind turbine foundation).

7.6.2.1.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

247. Given that the expert-based assessments of the changes in the tidal regime associated with the presence of foundation structures for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project are consistent with the findings of the earlier modelling studies for East Anglia ONE, there is high confidence in the assessment of effects.

248. The worst case changes to tidal currents due to the presence of GBS foundations are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.30**).

Table 7.30 Magnitude of Effects on Tidal Currents due to the Presence of Foundations Under the Worst Case Scenarios

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field	Low	High	Medium	Negligible	Low
Far-field	No change	-	-	-	No change

249. These effects on the tidal regime have been translated into a 'zone of potential influence' based on an understanding of the tidal ellipses. It is expected that changes to the tidal regime would have returned to background levels well within the excursion of one tidal ellipse, and this threshold has been used to produce the maximum 'zone of potential influence' on the tidal regime, as presented in **Figure 7.7**.

250. The identified receptor groups for marine geology, oceanography and physical processes are remote from the 'zone of potential influence' on the tidal regime. Due to this, no pathway exists between the source and the receptor, so in terms of impacts on these receptor groups there is **no impact** associated with the proposed East Anglia ONE North project.

7.6.2.2 Impact 2 Changes to the Wave Regime due to the Presence of Foundation Structures

251. The presence of foundation structures within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site has the potential to alter the baseline wave regime, particularly in respect of wave heights and directions. Any changes in the wave regime may

- have the potential to contribute to changes in the sea bed morphology due to alteration of sediment transport patterns (see operational impact 3, **section 7.6.2.3**) or due to initiation of sea bed scour (see operational impact 4, **section 7.6.2.4**).
252. Expert-based assessment suggests that each foundation would present an obstacle to the passage of waves locally, causing a small modification to the height and / or direction of the waves as they pass. Generally, this causes a small wave shadow effect to be created by each foundation. Wave heights return to baseline conditions with progression downstream of each foundation and generally do not interact with effects from adjacent foundations due to the separation distances.
253. There is a strong evidence base which demonstrates that the changes in the wave regime due to the presence of foundation structures, even under a worst case scenario of the largest diameter GBS, are both relatively small in magnitude (typically less than 10% of baseline wave heights in close proximity to each wind turbine, reducing with greater distance from each wind turbine). Effects are relatively localised in spatial extent, extending as a shadow zone typically up to several tens of kilometres from the site along the axis of wave approach, but with low magnitudes (only a few percent change across this wider area). This is confirmed by a review of modelling studies from around 30 windfarms in the UK and European waters (Seagreen 2012), existing guidance documents (ETSU 2000; ETSU 2002; Lambkin et al. 2009), published research (Ohl et al. 2001) and post-installation monitoring (Cefas 2005).
254. This is further supported by numerical modelling of changes in the wave regime under return period events of 0.1 year, one year and ten years, for East Anglia ONE (ABPmer 2012b). This wave modelling incorporated a worst case of 240 gravity base structures with a basal diameter of 50m and up to 10m in height above the sea bed. The results were:
- Maximum percentage reductions in baseline wave height occur within or along the boundary of the East Anglia ONE windfarm site.
 - During ten-year storm events, the percentage reductions in wave heights may be up to approximately 20% within the East Anglia ONE windfarm site.
 - At approximately 40km from the East Anglia ONE windfarm site, maximum percentage reductions in wave height are typically less than about 2%.
 - Regardless of return period or direction of the incoming wave conditions, the presence of an array of foundations within the East Anglia ONE windfarm site does not cause a measurable change in wave characteristics at the coast.

255. Due to proximity of the East Anglia ONE windfarm site to the ‘non designated sand banks’ receptor group and also the Galloper Offshore Windfarm site, wave height reductions of up to about 5% were observed under the largest storm events considered at these locations. These were not considered to be significant impacts by the East Anglia ONE assessment (either alone or cumulatively with Galloper). Changes under lesser magnitude events were not noticeable at the ‘non designated sand banks’ receptor group or the Galloper site.
256. The worst case scenario included in the East Anglia ONE wave modelling considered 240 GBS with a basal diameter of 50m and up to 10m in height above the sea bed. The likely envelope of wind turbine numbers and GBS foundation sizes for the East Anglia ONE North site is presented in **Table 7.31**.

Table 7.31 Likely Turbine Arrangements for Worst Case Scenario at East Anglia ONE North

Turbine model	No. turbines	Maximum basal diameter of gravity base structure (m)
250m	67	53
300m	53	60

257. The modelling for East Anglia ONE is considerably more conservative in terms of the number of foundations being considered for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project.
258. Expert-based assessment suggests, therefore, that both the magnitude and spatial extent of effects on the wave climate at the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site would be less than those previously assessed for East Anglia ONE.
259. For the purposes of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project assessments, a wave modelling exercise was completed to assess the effects of a worst case scenario of 67 GBS turbine foundations, each with a basal diameter of 60m, with one meteorological mast and five offshore platforms based on identical foundation types and sizes (i.e. 65 foundations in total).
260. The wave modelling involved three stages: (i) defining a suitable offshore wave climate based on data analysis; (ii) local-scale wave modelling using DIFFRACT to characterise wave reflection properties of different foundation types and sizes to determine a worst case; and (iii) regional-scale wave modelling using the MIKE21-SW (spectral wave) model to quantify far-field effects.

261. The modelling results presented in **Figure 7.8** show that the effects on baseline wave conditions from the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site alone cover only a small spatial extent. The magnitude of modelled changes in significant wave height is typically less than 1% only a short distance away from the windfarm array. Further information about the wave modelling is provided in **Appendix 7.1**.

7.6.2.2.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

262. The worst case changes to the wave regime due to the presence of foundations are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.32**).

Table 7.32 Magnitude of Effect on the Wave Regime due to the Presence of Foundations Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field	Low	High	Medium	Negligible	Low
Far-field	Negligible	High	Medium	Negligible	Negligible

263. The identified receptor groups for marine geology, oceanography and physical processes are remote from the zone of effect arising from changes in the baseline wave regime. Due to this, no pathway exists between the source and the receptor, so in terms of impacts on these receptor groups there is **no impact** associated with the proposed East Anglia ONE North project.

7.6.2.3 Impact 3 Changes to the Sediment Transport Regime due to the Presence of Foundation Structures

264. Modifications to the tidal regime and/or the wave regime due to the presence of the foundation structures during the operational phase may affect the sediment regime.

265. This section addresses patterns of suspended and bedload sediment transport across, and beyond, the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site and littoral sediment transport at the coast. The issue of local scour around the foundations is considered separately (see operational impact 4, **section 7.6.2.4**).

7.6.2.3.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

266. The predicted reductions in tidal flow (operational impact 1) and wave height (operational impact 2) associated with the presence of the worst case foundation structures during the operational phase would result in a reduction in the sediment transport potential across the areas where such changes are observed. Conversely, the areas of increased tidal flow around each wind

turbine would result in increased sediment transport potential (and in so doing generate local scour – see operational impact 4 **section 7.6.2.4**).

267. These changes to the marine physical processes would be low in magnitude and largely confined to local wake or wave shadow effects attributable to individual wind turbine foundations and, therefore, would be small in geographical extent. In the case of wave effects, there would also be reductions due to a shadow effect across a greater sea bed area, but the changes in wave heights across this wider area would be notably lower (typically less than 1%) than the changes local to each wind turbine foundation. Since it is expected that the changes in tidal flow and wave heights during the operational phase would have no significant far-field effects, then the changes in sediment transport would be similar, with the likely following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.33**).

Table 7.33 Magnitude of Effects on the Sediment Transport Regime due to the Presence of Foundations Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field	Low	High	Medium	Negligible	Low
Far-field	Negligible	High	Medium	Negligible	Negligible

268. The impacts on the sediment transport regime would not extend beyond the zones of influence previously illustrated for the changes to the tidal and wave regimes (**Figure 7.7** and **Figure 7.8** respectively) and therefore, there is **no impact** associated with the proposed project on the marine geology, oceanography and physical processes receptor groups.

7.6.2.4 Impact 4 Changes in Suspended Sediment Concentrations due to Scour Around Foundation Structures

269. Findings from the approaches have previously been verified against field measurements and laboratory scale physical model tests (Bolle et al. 2009; 2010; Khalfin 2007; Larsen and Frigaard 2005; Margheritini 2012; Raaijmakers and Rudolph 2008; Stahlmann and Schlurmann 2010; Whitehouse et al. 2010; Yeow and Cheng 2003; Yang et al. 2010).
270. Using these approaches, the previous studies have revealed (overly-conservative) a worst case scour volume under a 50-year return period event of about 5,000m³ per wind turbine, for an individual foundation of similar type and size to the worst case for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project. This value is considerably less than the worst case volume of sediment potentially released following sea bed preparation activities (which are around five times

greater per wind turbine) and therefore the magnitude of effect would be much lower than previously assessed for that impact.

271. In addition, given the sediment types prevalent across the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site, most of the relatively small quantities of sediment released at each wind turbine foundation due to scour processes would rapidly settle within a few hundred metres of each one.

7.6.2.4.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and / or Impact Significance

272. The worst case changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to scour around foundation structures are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.34**).

Table 7.34 Magnitude of Effects on the Suspended Sediment Regime due to Scour Around Foundations Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field*	Low	High	Medium	Negligible	Low
Far-field	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

* The near-field effects are confined to a small area (likely to be of the order of several hundred metres up to a kilometre from the foundation), and would not cover the whole East Anglia ONE North windfarm site.

273. The effects on suspended sediment transport arising from scour processes would not extend more than a few hundred metres away from each wind turbine location before the sediment settles on the sea bed. Therefore, there is **no impact** associated with the proposed project on the marine geology, oceanography and physical processes receptor groups since these are located remotely from this zone of potential effect.
274. However, the effects do have the potential to impact upon other receptors and therefore the assessment of impact significance is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

7.6.2.5 Impact 5 Changes to the Sea Bed Morphology due to the Footprint of the Foundation Structures

275. The sea bed morphology would directly be impacted by the footprint of each foundation structure on the sea bed within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site. This would constitute a 'loss' in natural sea bed area during the operational life of the proposed project.
276. This direct footprint could be further enhanced due to the presence of foundation structures in one of two ways. Under a scenario of no scour protection, a scour hole would be likely to develop around each foundation.

This would have two implications for sea bed morphology, in addition to the direct foundation footprint. The scour hole would directly affect an area of the sea bed, lowering sea bed levels locally around each foundation and mobile sediments would become suspended into the water column. These sediments would ultimately settle back to the sea bed potentially causing bed level changes due to deposition.

277. Under an alternative scenario of scour protection being provided, the sea bed would be further occupied by material that is ‘alien’ to the baseline environment, such as concrete mattresses, fronded concrete mattresses, rock dumping, bridging or positioning of gravel bags.
278. The worst case of these two scenarios is associated with the provision of scour protection. For the whole windfarm site, the maximum footprint on the sea bed from the foundation and scour protection for each wind turbine, meteorological mast and offshore platform is 1,275,339m². This is associated with the jacket foundations on suction caissons.

7.6.2.5.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

279. The worst case changes to the sea bed morphology due to the presence of foundation structures are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.35**).

Table 7.35 Magnitude of Effects on Sea Bed Morphology due to the Presence of Foundations Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field*	High	High	High	Negligible	High
Far-field	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

* The near-field effects are confined to within the footprint of scour protection (should it be provided), and would not cover the whole East Anglia ONE North windfarm site.

280. The effects on sea bed morphology arising from the presence of foundation structures are manifest upon other topics, such as benthic ecology. The significance of these effects on other receptors is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

7.6.2.6 Impact 6 Morphological and Sediment Transport Effects due to Cable Protection Measures for Inter-array Cables and Platform Link Cables

281. As a worst case scenario it has been assumed that up to 10% of the inter-array cables and platform link cables cannot be buried and must instead be surface-laid and protected in some manner, and that cable protection would also be required at any cable crossings.

282. Cable protection may take the form of rock placement, concrete mattresses, fronded concrete mattresses, or uraduct shell.
283. The effects that such works may have on marine geology, oceanography and physical processes primarily relate to the potential for interruption of sediment transport processes and the footprint they present on the sea bed.
284. In areas of active sediment transport, any linear protrusion on the sea bed may interrupt bedload sediment transport processes during the operational phase of the proposed project. There is unlikely to be any significant effect on suspended sediment processes since armoured cables or cable protection works are relatively low above the sea bed (a maximum of 1m), except in areas where the cable crosses other sub-marine infrastructure (e.g. pipelines and cables) where it may extend to a height of up to 4m.
285. The presence and asymmetry of sand waves across some of the sea bed within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site indicates that some bedload sediment transport exists. There are also megaripples present across the windfarm site. Protrusions from the sea bed are unlikely to significantly affect the migration of sand waves, since sand wave heights (up to 10m) in most areas would exceed the height of cable protection works, and would pass over them. There may be localised interruptions to bedload transport in other areas, but the gross patterns of bedload transport across the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site would not be affected significantly.
286. The presence of cable protection works on the sea bed would represent the worst case in terms of a direct loss of sea bed area, but this footprint is likely to be lower than that of the foundations (and associated scour hole or scour protection works) within the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site.

7.6.2.6.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

287. The worst case changes to the sea bed morphology and sediment transport due to cable protection measures for inter-array cables and platform link cables are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.36**).

Table 7.36 Magnitude of Effects on Sea Bed Morphology and Sediment Transport due to Cable Protection Measures for Inter-Array Cables and Platform Link Cables Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field*	High	High	High	Negligible	High
Far-field	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

* The near-field effects are confined to a small area (likely to be within the footprint of cable protection works), and would not cover the whole East Anglia ONE North site.

288. The effects on sea bed morphology and sediment transport arising from the presence of inter-array cable and platform link cable protection measures would not extend far beyond the direct footprint. Therefore, there is **no impact** associated with the proposed project on the identified marine geology, oceanography and physical processes receptor groups since these are located remotely from this zone of potential effect.
289. The significance of these effects on other receptors is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

7.6.2.7 Impact 7 Morphological and Sediment Transport Effects due to Cable Protection Measures for Export Cables

290. As a worst case scenario it has been assumed that burial of the export cables would not practicably be achievable within some areas of the offshore cable corridor and, instead, cable protection measures would need to be provided to surface-laid cables in these areas.
291. The locations where cable protection measures are most likely to be required are areas of cable crossings and in areas of sea bed characterised by exposed bedrock.
292. Cable protection may take the form of rock placement, concrete mattresses, fronded concrete mattresses, or uraduct shell.
293. The effects that cable protection may have on marine geology, oceanography and physical processes primarily relate to the potential for interruption of sediment transport processes and the footprint they present on the sea bed.
294. In areas of active sediment transport, any linear protrusion on the sea bed may interrupt bedload sediment transport processes during the operational phase. There is likely to be a difference in effect depending on whether the cable protection works are in 'nearshore' or 'offshore' areas within the offshore cable corridor. Any works in areas closest to the coast have the potential to affect alongshore sediment transport processes and circulatory pathways across the nearshore banks and those areas further offshore potentially affecting sediment transport processes across the sea bed.
295. The seaward limit which marks the effective boundary of wave-driven sediment transport pathway mechanisms is called the 'closure depth' of the shore profile and can be calculated using the methods of Hallermeier (1978). For the sea bed offshore from the landfall, this would be typically located in around 5m of water.
296. In addition, tidally-driven sediment transport occurs in a circulatory motion between the coast and the nearshore banks, where these are present within the

offshore cable corridor (i.e. the southern end of the nearshore Sizewell Bank occupies a small part of the cable corridor across its northern boundary). These circulatory sediment transport processes occur inshore of the 10m depth contour, but only in the northern part of the offshore cable corridor, due to the physical location of the nearshore Sizewell Bank.

297. Any protrusions from the sea bed associated with cable protection measures inshore of the closure depth (i.e. shallower than -5m CD) or within the active circulatory pathway between the coast and sand banks (i.e. shallower than -10m CD in areas occupied by sand banks) could potentially have an effect on sediment transport in the nearshore and along the coast. Any interruptions to sediment transport locally within this zone could, in turn, affect the morphological response of wider areas (e.g. frontages along the sediment transport pathway, links with the nearshore banks, etc.) due to reductions in sediment supply to those areas.
298. Along the sections of the offshore cable corridor that are located seaward of the closure depth and/or seaward of the active circulatory pathway between the coast and sand banks (where present), any protrusions from the sea bed associated with cable protection measures are unlikely to significantly affect the migration of sand waves, since their heights would in most areas where they are present exceed the likely height of cable protection works (up to 2.25m). There may be localised interruptions to bedload transport in some areas, especially at cable crossings, but the gross patterns of bedload transport would not be affected significantly.
299. In recognition of these potential effects, considerable effort has been given to selecting an appropriate landfall location and export cable route within the offshore cable corridor to minimise sediment transport effects as far as practicably achievable. The different important marine geological and geomorphological features that are present include the outcrop of Coralline Crag, the ness at Thorpeness and the nearshore Sizewell and Dunwich Banks. Importantly, there are also physical process interactions between these features. This understanding has led to selection of a preferred location for the export cable landfall towards the southern end of the offshore cable corridor at the coast. To ensure that such a location is achievable, the offshore cable corridor in the landfall area has been refined (area increased to the south) to create additional sea bed area within which to accommodate a southern export cable route within the offshore cable corridor (see **Figure 7.9**).
300. A commitment has also been made to install the export cable at the landfall using HDD techniques, thus minimising disturbance and avoiding the need for cable protection in the intertidal and shallowest nearshore zones. It is likely that the HDD pop-out location would be in water depths greater than 2m LAT

(although most likely greater than 5m water depth) and to the south of the outcrop of Coralline Crag. Hence, there would be no interruption of the circulatory sediment transport pathways between the coast and Sizewell Bank and there is a strong likelihood of the export cable requiring no protection measures within the closure depth of the active beach profile, due to the presence of sand on the sea bed in this location.

301. As a consequence of this embedded mitigation, the proposed HDD method and pop-out location:

- Avoids direct physical disruption to the nearshore Sizewell Bank;
- Avoids direct physical disruption to the outcrop of Coralline Crag;
- Avoids direct physical disruption to the ness at Thorpeness;
- Avoids interruption of circulatory sediment transport pathways;
- Avoids disturbance to the alongshore sediment transport processes;
- Reduces the risk of suspended sediment (during construction) affecting the Sizewell Nuclear Power Station’s cooling water infrastructure;
- Avoids the need for cable protection measures in the intertidal and shallowest nearshore zones; and
- Minimises the need for cable protection measures elsewhere across the sea bed.

302. The effects of export cable protection directly at the landfall (on the ‘East Anglia’ coast) are assessed under Operational Impact 8 in light of the above embedded mitigation (**section 7.6.2.8**).

7.6.2.7.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

303. The worst case changes to the sea bed morphology and sediment transport due to cable protection measures for export cables are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.37**).

Table 7.37 Magnitude of Effect on Sea Bed Morphology and Sediment Transport due to Cable Protection Measures for Export Cables Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Inshore of the closure depth and/or within active circulatory sediment transport pathways between the coast and banks	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
Offshore of the closure	Low	High	High	Negligible	Low

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
depth and/or beyond active circulatory sediment transport pathways between the coast and banks					

304. Offshore of the closure depth and/or beyond active circulatory sediment transport pathways between the coast and Sizewell Bank, the effects on sea bed morphology and sediment transport arising from the presence of export cable protection measures would not extend far beyond the direct footprint. Therefore, there is **no impact** in these locations associated with the proposed project on the identified marine geology, oceanography and physical processes receptor groups since these are located remotely from this zone of potential effect.

305. However, inshore of the closure depth and/or within the active circulatory sediment transport pathways between the coast and Sizewell Bank, these effects could potentially affect parts of the ‘Suffolk Natura 2000’ site and, indirectly, parts of the ‘East Anglia’ coast. Given this, the sensitivity and value of these receptors are presented in **Table 7.38**.

Table 7.38 Sensitivity and Value Assessment for the ‘Suffolk Natura 2000 Site and ‘East Anglia’ Coast

Receptor	Tolerance	Adaptability	Recoverability	Value	Sensitivity
‘Suffolk Natura 2000’ site	Medium	Low	Negligible	High	Medium
‘East Anglia’ coast	Medium	Low	Negligible	High	Medium

306. In areas inshore of the closure depth and/or within the active circulatory sediment transport pathways between the coast and Sizewell Bank there would be direct impacts of **negligible significance** on the ‘Suffolk Natura 2000’ site and these, in turn, would cause **no change** or indirect impacts of **negligible significance** on the East Anglia coast due to interruptions to sediment transport processes.

307. There would be **no impact** on the other identified marine geology, oceanography and physical processes receptor groups since these are located remotely from the locations of potential effect.

308. The significance of these effects on other receptors is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

7.6.2.8 Impact 8 Morphological Effects due to Cable Protection Measures at the Export Cable Landfall

309. As the export cables would remain buried at the landfall throughout the design life of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project, no cable protection would be required and as such no morphological effects would take place.

310. Analysis of past coastal change and future coastal projections would inform detailed engineering decisions about cable burial depths.

7.6.2.8.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and/or Impact Significance

311. The worst case effects on the coastal morphology at the cable landfall during the operational phase of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project are **no impact**.

7.6.2.9 Impact 9 Indentations on the Sea Bed due to Maintenance Vessels

312. There is potential for certain vessels used during maintenance of the windfarm and cable infrastructure to directly impact the sea bed. This applies for those vessels that utilise jack-up legs or several anchors to hold station and to provide stability for a working platform. Where legs or anchors (and associated chains) have been inserted into the sea bed and then removed, there is potential for an indentation to remain, proportional to the dimensions of the object.

7.6.2.9.1 Assessment of Effect Magnitude and / or Impact Significance

313. The changes in terms of indentations on the sea bed due to maintenance vessels are likely to have the following magnitudes of effect (**Table 7.39**).

Table 7.39 Magnitude of Effect on Sea Bed Level Changes Due to Maintenance Vessels Under the Worst Case Scenario

Location	Scale	Duration	Frequency	Reversibility	Magnitude of Effect
Near-field (immediate vicinity of leg)	High	Negligible	Negligible	Medium	Medium
Near-field (beyond immediate vicinity of leg)	No change	-	-	-	No change
Far-field	No change	-	-	-	No change

314. There is **no impact** under a worst case scenario on the identified morphological receptor groups since they are remote from the immediate vicinity of each leg.

315. The significance of these effects on other receptors is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR.

7.6.3 Potential Impacts during Decommissioning

316. There is a statutory requirement for the applicant to decommission the proposed East Anglia ONE North project. The scope of the decommissioning works would most likely involve removal of the accessible installed components. Offshore, this is likely to include removal of all the wind turbine components, part of the foundations (those above sea bed level) and the sections of the inter-array cables and platform link cables.

317. With regards to export cables, general UK practice would be followed. Buried cables would be cut at the ends and left *in situ*, except for the intertidal zone where the cables could be at risk of becoming exposed over time.

318. During the decommissioning phase, there is potential for wind turbine, foundation and (where undertaken), cable removal activities to cause changes in suspended sediment concentrations and / or sea bed or shoreline levels as a result of sediment disturbance effects. The types of effect would be comparable to those identified for the construction phase:

- Impact 1 Changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to foundation removal;
- Impact 2 Changes in sea bed levels due to foundation removal;
- Impact 3 Changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to removal of parts of the inter-array and platform link cables;
- Impact 4 Changes in sea bed levels due to removal of parts of the inter-array and platform link cables;
- Impact 5 Changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to removal of parts of the export cable;
- Impact 6 Changes in sea bed levels due to removal of parts of the export cable;
- Impact 7 Indentations on the sea bed due to decommissioning vessels; and
- Impact 8 Changes to suspended sediment concentrations and coastal morphology at the offshore cable corridor landfall due to removal of the export cable.

319. The magnitude of effects would be comparable to those identified for the construction phase. Accordingly, given that no significant impact was assessed

for the identified marine geology, oceanography and physical processes receptors during the construction phase, it is anticipated that the same would be valid for the decommissioning phase.

320. The significance of effects on other receptors is addressed within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

7.7 Cumulative Impacts

321. The potential for all previously identified impacts to act in a cumulative manner are assessed in **Table 7.40**.

Table 7.40 Potential Cumulative Impacts

Impact	Potential for cumulative impact	Data confidence	Rationale
Construction			
Construction Impact 1 Changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to foundation installation	No	High	Impacts occur at discrete locations for a time-limited duration and are low or negligible in magnitude. Suspended sediment rationale is further discussed in section 7.7.3 .
Construction Impact 2 Changes in sea bed levels due to foundation installation	No	High	
Construction Impact 3 Changes in suspended sediment concentrations during inter-array cable and platform link cable installation	No	High	
Construction Impact 4 Changes in sea bed levels due to inter-array cable and platform link cable installation	No	High	
Construction Impact 5 Changes in suspended sediment concentrations during export cable installation	No	High	
Construction Impact 6 Changes in sea bed levels due to export cable installation	No	High	
Construction Impact 7 Indentations on the sea bed due to installation vessels	No	High	
Construction Impact 8 Changes to suspended sediment concentrations and coastal morphology at the offshore cable landfall	No	High	
Operation			

Impact	Potential for cumulative impact	Data confidence	Rationale
Operation Impact 1 Changes to the tidal regime due to the presence of foundation structures	Yes	High	Impacts could potentially coalesce with those arising from other windfarm projects
Operation Impact 2 Changes to the wave regime due to the presence of foundation structures	Yes	High	
Operation Impact 3 Changes to the sediment transport regime due to the presence of foundation structures	Yes	High	
Operation Impact 4 Changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to scour around foundation structures	No	High	Impacts occur at discrete locations for a time-limited duration and are low or negligible in magnitude.
Operation Impact 5 Changes to the sea bed morphology due to the presence of foundation structures	No	High	Footprint affects a discrete area of sea bed
Operation Impact 6 Morphological and sediment transport effects due to cable protection measures for inter-array cables and platform link cables	No	High	Impacts are in a sufficient depth of water to not cause cumulative effects on identified sensitive receptors
Operation Impact 7 Morphological and sediment transport effects due to cable protection measures for export cables	Yes	High	Impacts could potentially coalesce with those arising from other windfarm projects and disturb sediment transport pathways, particularly if protection measures are near to shore
Operation Impact 8 Morphological effects due to cable protection measures at the export cable landfall	No	High	No cable protection measures at the offshore cable landfall
Operation Impact 9 Indentations on the sea bed due to maintenance vessels	No	High	Impacts occur at discrete locations for a time-limited duration and are low or negligible in magnitude.
Decommissioning			
Decommissioning Impact 1 Changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to foundation removal	No	High	Impacts occur at discrete locations for a time-limited duration and are low or

Impact	Potential for cumulative impact	Data confidence	Rationale
Decommissioning Impact 2 Changes in sea bed levels due to foundation removal	No	High	negligible in magnitude
Decommissioning Impact 3 Changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to removal of inter-array cables and platform link cables	No	High	
Decommissioning Impact 4 Changes in sea bed levels due to removal of inter-array cables and platform link cables	No	High	
Decommissioning Impact 5 Changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to removal of export cables	No	High	
Decommissioning Impact 6 Changes in sea bed levels due to removal of export cables	No	High	
Decommissioning Impact 7 Indentations on the sea bed due to decommissioning vessels	No	High	
Decommissioning Impact 8 Changes to suspended sediment concentrations and coastal morphology at the offshore cable landfall due to removal of the export cables	No	High	

Table 7.41 Summary of Projects Considered for the CIA in Relation to the Topic (see *Appendices 7.1* and *7.2* for full discussions)

Project	Status	Construction period	Distance from East Anglia ONE North windfarm site (km) ¹	Distance from East Anglia ONE North offshore cable corridor (km) ²	Project definition	Project data status	Included in CIA	Rationale
Hornsea Project 1	Under construction	2018-2020	154	163	Project Design Statement (PDS) available	Complete / high	No	Screened out following cumulative wave modelling
Hornsea Project 2	Consented	2020-2022	162	168	PDS available	Incomplete / low	No	Screened out following cumulative wave modelling
Hornsea Project 3	Pre-Application	2022-2025	141	151	Outline only	Incomplete / low	No	Screened out following cumulative wave modelling
Norfolk Boreas	Pre-Application	2024-2026	51	64	Outline only	Incomplete / low	Yes	Potential cumulative effect on wave regime
Norfolk Vanguard	Pre-Application	2024-2026	41	50	Outline only	Incomplete / low	Yes	Potential cumulative effect on wave

¹ Shortest distance between the considered project and the East Anglia ONE North windfarm site – unless specified otherwise

² Shortest distance between the considered project and the East Anglia ONE North offshore cable corridor

Project	Status	Construction period	Distance from East Anglia ONE North windfarm site (km) ¹	Distance from East Anglia ONE North offshore cable corridor (km) ²	Project definition	Project data status	Included in CIA	Rationale
West								regime
Norfolk Vanguard East	Pre-Application	2024-2026	38	53	Outline only	Incomplete / low	Yes	Potential cumulative effect on wave regime
East Anglia ONE	Under construction	2018-2020	1	11	PDS available	Complete / high	Yes	Potential cumulative effect on wave, tidal and sediment regimes
East Anglia TWO	Pre-Application	2024-2026	10	0	Outline only	Incomplete / low	Yes	Potential cumulative effect on wave, tidal and sediment regimes
East Anglia THREE	Consented	2022-2025		35	PDS available	Complete / high	Yes	Potential cumulative effect on wave, tidal and sediment regimes

Project	Status	Construction period	Distance from East Anglia ONE North windfarm site (km) ¹	Distance from East Anglia ONE North offshore cable corridor (km) ²	Project definition	Project data status	Included in CIA	Rationale
Greater Gabbard	Active / in operation	2010-2013	43	27	'As Built' available	Complete / high	Yes	Potential cumulative effect on wave, tidal and sediment regimes
Galloper	Under construction	2016-2018	39	27	'As Built' available	Complete / high	Yes	Potential cumulative effect on wave, tidal and sediment regimes

7.7.1 Wave Regime

322. **Appendix 7.1** presents the results of wave modelling undertaken to assess the potential cumulative effects of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project with other existing and proposed windfarm projects in the relevant section of the southern North Sea. Key cumulative wave modelling outputs are summarised in **Figure 7.10**.
323. No potential for cumulative effects on the wave regime exists between the Hornsea Projects 1, 2 and 3 and the windfarms within the former East Anglia Zone (Norfolk Boreas, Norfolk Vanguard East, Norfolk Vanguard West, East Anglia ONE, East Anglia ONE North, East Anglia TWO, East Anglia THREE).
324. The cumulative zone of effect arising from the Norfolk Boreas, Norfolk Vanguard East, Norfolk Vanguard West, East Anglia ONE, the proposed East Anglia ONE North project, the proposed East Anglia TWO project, East Anglia THREE, Greater Gabbard and Galloper windfarms is considerably greater in spatial extent than that arising from each of these projects individually.
325. Under some wave approach directions, the zone of cumulative effect can impinge upon some of the identified sensitive receptors identified for marine geology, oceanography and physical processes. However, the magnitude of effect is typically less than 1%, although increasing locally to typically less than 2% close to array boundaries. In the rare occasions where higher values are recorded close to array boundaries, the change is always less than 5% of baseline conditions, which would represent a low to negligible magnitude, and is the accepted threshold of significance.
326. Cumulatively with other windfarms, the proposed East Anglia ONE North project would cause **no significant cumulative impact on the baseline wave regime**.

7.7.2 Tidal Regime

327. To assess the potential for cumulative effects on the tidal regime, a 'zone of potential cumulative influence' approach has been adopted. This approach has previously been used for other windfarm projects in the former East Anglia Zone, such as East Anglia THREE, and was agreed with Cefas during the Evidence Plan Process.
328. The zone of potential cumulative influence on the baseline tidal regime is based on an understanding of the tidal ellipses in the area and knowledge that effects arising from wind turbine and platform foundations on the tidal regime are relatively small in magnitude, and local. It is likely that effects on the tidal regime are dissipated within one tidal ellipse of the obstacle.

329. Based on this principle, a zone of potential cumulative influence on the tidal regime has been derived from all projects within the former East Anglia Zone as well as Galloper and Greater Gabbard (**Figure 7.11**). This shows that the zone of potential cumulative influence from these projects cumulatively can be separated into four distinct locations, with no potential interaction between them:
- Norfolk Vanguard West only;
 - Norfolk Boreas, Norfolk Vanguard East and East Anglia THREE cumulatively;
 - East Anglia ONE, the proposed East Anglia ONE North project and the proposed East Anglia TWO project cumulatively; and
 - Galloper and Greater Gabbard cumulatively.
330. The cumulative zone of influence arising from the East Anglia ONE, East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO windfarm sites does marginally impinge upon the edge of part of the ‘Suffolk Natura 2000’ receptor and the non-designated sand banks. However, the magnitude of change at these locations would be at its lowest value since it is the most remote area of the zone of influence from the windfarms. Due to this, it is deemed that there would be **no significant cumulative impact on the baseline tidal regime**.

7.7.3 Sediment Regime

331. Cumulative effects on the sediment regime could arise from foundation installation, in the form of a sediment plume, or potentially during the operational phase if there are significant changes to the wave and / or tidal regimes due to the presence of the foundations.
332. Potential construction effects would be temporary in duration. Sediment disturbed from the sea bed during installation of cables or foundations may become entrained in a sediment plume and advected by tidal currents until the sediment re-settles on the sea bed. The distance that any plume would travel, and the concentrations of the suspended sediment in the water column would depend on both the direction and magnitude of the tidal currents and the particle size (and hence settling velocity) of the sediments.
333. Any plume that does occur would move in the direction of the tidal currents, which are governed by the tidal ellipses. There is potential physical connection, in terms of tidal currents, between the proposed East Anglia ONE North project and the proposed East Anglia ONE and East Anglia TWO projects to the south and south west respectively, and the Greater Gabbard and Galloper projects further to the south. However, these windfarm site areas are separated from the proposed East Anglia ONE North project and it is inconceivable that

sediment entrained within a plume would reside in the water column in sufficient quantities to reach measurable values to cause a significant effect.

334. Operational effects on the sediment regime arising due to the foundations may result from changes in the wave or tidal regimes. Any such changes could potentially alter pathways or rates of sediment transport across the sea bed. However, since no significant operational cumulative effects are predicted to arise from changes to the wave or tidal regimes there are, in turn, no significant effects on the sediment transport regime.
335. Due to the above considerations, it is deemed that there would be **no significant cumulative impact** on the baseline sediment regime associated with the foundations.
336. Changes in active sediment transport processes could potentially arise from projects cumulatively due to physical blocking effects of any cable protection measures that are placed in areas of unburied offshore cable. There will be no cable protection measures in the intertidal zone or shallow nearshore zone arising from the proposed East Anglia ONE North project or any other windfarm project since all propose to use HDD for offshore cable installation at the landfall. However, the possibility of cable protection measures elsewhere along the offshore cable has not been ruled out in **Chapter 6 Project Description** for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project or other planned projects in the former East Anglia Zone. Due to this there could be potential cumulative effects arising, with their magnitude being dependent on the location and extent of such measures. This, in turn, could potentially affect the features and attributes of the sea bed, nearshore banks, beaches and cliffs.
337. Due to the embedded mitigation associated with offshore cable installation for the proposed East Anglia ONE North project, such potential effects for that project (both alone and cumulatively with other projects) has either been avoided (i.e. in the intertidal zone and shallow nearshore zone) or minimised (i.e. through routing measures to limit cable crossings). Due to this, there would be **no cumulative impact** on the other identified marine geology, oceanography and physical processes receptor groups located offshore of the closure depth and / or beyond active circulatory sediment transport pathways between the shore and Sizewell Bank (since these receptor groups are located remotely from the locations of potential effect). In areas inshore of the closure depth of the active beach profile (i.e. within 5m water depth), there would be cumulative impacts of **negligible significance** on the Suffolk Natura 2000 site and, in turn, **no cumulative impact** or indirect cumulative impacts of **negligible significance** on the East Anglia coast.

7.8 Transboundary Impacts

338. An assessment of transboundary effects was completed and is presented in **Appendix 7.2** and concludes that there is no potential for transboundary effects arising from changes to the wave, tidal or sediment regimes associated with the proposed East Anglia ONE North project.

7.9 Interactions

339. The impacts identified and assessed in this chapter have the potential to interact with each other, which could give rise to synergistic impacts as a result of that interaction. The worst case impacts assessed within the chapter take these interactions into account and therefore the impact assessments are considered conservative and robust. For clarity, the areas of interaction between impacts are presented in **Table 7.42**, along with an indication as to whether the interaction may give rise to synergistic impacts.

Table 7.42 Interaction Between Impacts

Potential Interaction between impacts

Construction

	Changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to foundation installation	Changes in sea bed level due to foundation installation	Changes in suspended sediment concentrations during inter-array and platform link cable installation	Changes in sea bed level during inter-array and platform link cable installation	Changes in suspended sediment concentrations during export cable installation	Changes in sea bed level due to export cable installation	Indentations on the sea bed due to installation vessels	Changes to suspended sediment concentrations and coastal morphology at the landfall
Changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to foundation installation	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Changes in sea bed level due to foundation installation	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Changes in suspended sediment concentrations during inter-array and platform link cable installation	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Potential Interaction between impacts								
Changes in sea bed level during inter-array and platform link cable installation	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Changes in suspended sediment concentrations during export cable installation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
Changes in sea bed level during export cable installation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes
Indentations on the sea bed due to installation vessels	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes
Changes to suspended sediment concentrations and coastal morphology at the landfall	Yes	-						

Potential Interaction between impacts

Operation

	Changes to the tidal regime due to the presence of foundation structures	Changes to the wave regime due to the presence of foundation structures	Changes to the sediment transport regime due to the presence of foundation structures	Changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to scour around foundation structures	Changes to the sea bed morphology due to the footprint of the foundation structures	Morphological and sediment transport effects due to cable protection measures for inter-array cables and platform link cables	Morphological and sediment transport effects due to cable protection measures for export cables	Morphological effects due to cable protection measures at the export cable landfall	Indentations on the sea bed due to maintenance vessels
Changes to the tidal regime due to the presence of foundation structures	-	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Changes to the wave regime due to the presence of foundation structures	Yes	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Changes to the sediment transport regime due to the presence of foundation structures	No	No	-	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No

Potential Interaction between impacts									
Changes in suspended sediment concentrations due to scour around foundation structures	No	No	Yes	-	No	No	No	No	No
Changes to the sea bed morphology due to the footprint of the foundation structures	No	No	No	No	-	No	No	No	No
Morphological and sediment transport effects due to cable protection measures for inter-array cables and platform link cables	No	No	Yes	No	No	-	Yes	Yes	No
Morphological and sediment transport effects due to cable protection measures for export cables	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	-	Yes	No
Morphological effects due to cable protection measures at the export cable	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	-	No

Potential Interaction between impacts									
landfall									
Indentations on the sea bed due to maintenance vessels	No	-							
Decommissioning									
<p>The magnitude of effects would be comparable to those identified for the construction phase. Accordingly, given that no significant impact was assessed for the identified marine geology, oceanography and physical processes receptors during the construction phase, it is anticipated that the same would be valid for the decommissioning phase.</p>									

7.10 Inter-relationships

340. There are strong inter-relationships between the marine geology, oceanography and physical processes topic and several other topics that have been considered within this PEIR. **Table 7.43** provides a summary of the principal inter-relationships and sign-posts where those issues have been addressed in relevant chapters.

Table 7.43 Chapter Topic Inter-relationships

Topic and description	Related Chapter	Where addressed in this Chapter	Rationale
Effects on water column (suspended sediment concentrations)	<p>Chapter 8 Marine water and sediment quality</p> <p>Chapter 10 Fish and shellfish ecology</p> <p>Chapter 13 Commercial fisheries</p> <p>Chapter 9 Benthic ecology</p>	<p>Section 7.6.1.1 (foundation installation)</p> <p>Section 7.6.1.3 (inter-array cables installation)</p> <p>Section 7.6.1.5 (export cables installation)</p> <p>Section 7.6.2.4 (foundation scour)</p>	Suspended sediment could be contaminated and could cause disturbance to fish and benthic species through smothering.
Effects on sea bed (morphology / sediment transport / sediment composition)	<p>Chapter 9 Benthic ecology</p> <p>Chapter 10 Fish and shellfish ecology</p> <p>Chapter 13 Commercial fisheries</p> <p>Chapter 14 Shipping and navigation</p> <p>Chapter 16 Offshore archaeology and cultural heritage</p> <p>Chapter 17 Infrastructure and other users</p>	<p>Section 7.6.1.2 (foundation installation)</p> <p>Section 7.6.1.4 (inter-array cables installation)</p> <p>Section 7.6.1.6 (export cables)</p> <p>Section 7.6.1.7 (installation vessels)</p> <p>Section 7.6.2.3 (sediment transport regime)</p> <p>Section 7.6.2.5 (foundation scour/scour protection)</p> <p>Section 7.6.2.6 (inter-array cable protection)</p> <p>Section 7.6.2.7 (export cable protection in offshore zone)</p>	Disruption to sediment morphology, transport processes and composition could affect these receptors by altering the existing sedimentary environment however this is unlikely to be to levels which are significant.

Topic and description	Related Chapter	Where addressed in this Chapter	Rationale
Effects on shoreline (morphology / sediment transport / sediment composition)	<p>Chapter 10 Benthic ecology</p> <p>Chapter 20 Water resources and flood risk</p> <p>Chapter 28 Seascape, landscape and visual amenity</p>	<p>Section 7.6.1.8 (cable landfall)</p> <p>Section 7.6.2.7 (export cable protection in nearshore and intertidal zone)</p>	Disruption to shoreline morphology could potentially impact on these chapters through a change to the existing shoreline environment which could have implications for the receptors associated with these chapters.

7.11 Summary

341. The construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project would cause a range of effects on the marine geology, oceanography and physical processes. The magnitude of these effects has been assessed using expert assessment, drawing from a wide science base that includes project-specific surveys and previous numerical modelling activities.
342. The receptors that have been specifically identified in relation to marine geology, oceanography and physical processes are the sensitive 'East Anglia' coast, the 'Norfolk' Natura 2000 site, the 'Suffolk' Natura 2000 site, and nearby 'non-designated sand banks'.
343. The effects that have been assessed are mostly anticipated to result in **no impact** to the above-mentioned receptors because they are located remotely from the zones of influence and no pathway has been identified that can link the source to the receptor. The only exceptions to this which could potentially result in impacts to these receptors are listed in **Table 7.44**.

Table 7.44 Potential Impacts Identified for Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes Receptor Groups

Potential Impact	Receptor	Value/ Sensitivity	Magnitude	Significance	Mitigation	Residual Impact
Construction						
Changes in Suspended Sediment Concentrations	'Suffolk Natura 2000' site	Negligible	Medium (near field inshore only)	Negligible	None	Negligible
Changes in sea bed levels due to export cable installation	'Suffolk Natura 2000' site	Negligible	Low (near field only)	Negligible	Optimisation of offshore cable route alignment, depth and installation methods	Negligible
Operation						
Morphological and sediment transport effects due to cable protection measures for offshore cables	'Suffolk Natura 2000' site (inshore of closure depth)	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Optimisation of offshore cable route alignment cable installation techniques to avoid or minimise requirement for cable protection works inshore of closure depth (~5mCD)	Negligible to no impact (depending on % burial of cable length within closure depth and/or within sediment circulatory pathways between shore and banks)
	'East Anglia' coast	Medium	Low	No change or negligible		
Decommissioning						
None identified						

344. The significance of all changes in marine geology, oceanography and physical processes on other receptors has been assessed, where relevant, within the relevant chapters of this PEIR (see **Table 7.41**).

345. No significant cumulative impacts have been identified on the marine geology, oceanography and physical processes receptor groups between the proposed East Anglia ONE North project and other nearby marine developments and activities (including other windfarm developments, marine aggregate dredging and marine disposal).

Table 7.45 Potential Cumulative Impacts identified for Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes Receptor Groups

Potential Cumulative Impact	Receptor	Value/ Sensitivity	Magnitude	Significance	Mitigation	Residual Impact
Morphological and sediment transport effects due to cable protection measures for offshore cables	'Suffolk Natura 2000' site (inshore of closure depth)	Medium	Negligible	Negligible	Optimisation of offshore cable route alignment cable installation techniques to avoid or minimise requirement for cable protection works inshore of closure depth (~5mCD)	Negligible to no impact (depending on % burial of cable length within closure depth and/or within sediment circulatory pathways between shore and banks)
	'East Anglia' coast	Medium	Low	No change or negligible		

346. No transboundary impacts have been identified on the marine geology, oceanography and physical processes receptor groups located within other EU member states.

7.12 References

- ABPmer (ABP Marine Environmental Research Ltd). (2012a). *East Anglia Offshore Wind Zonal Environmental Appraisal Report. Appendix G – Physical Processes Baseline and References.*
- ABPmer (ABP Marine Environmental Research Ltd). (2012b). *East Anglia Offshore Wind Project ONE Windfarm: Marine geology, oceanography and physical processes environmental baseline.* Report R3945. May 2012.
- BERR. (2008). Review of Cabling Techniques and Environmental Effects applicable to the Offshore Windfarm Industry.
- Bibby Hydromap and Benthic Solutions. (2018a). East Anglia One North and Two Geophysical and Benthic Survey. Volume 3 – Area A Results Report Rev 01. August 2018.
- Bibby Hydromap and Benthic Solutions. (2018b). East Anglia One North and Two Geophysical and Benthic Survey. Volume 3 – Area B Results Report Rev 01. August 2018.
- Bibby Hydromap and Benthic Solutions. (2018c). East Anglia One North (EA1N) and East Anglia TWO (EA2) Benthic Survey Factual Data Report.
- Bolle, A., Haerens, P., Trouw, K., Smits, J. and Dewaele, G. (2009). *Scour around gravity-based wind turbine foundations – prototype measurements.* In: *Coasts, Marine Structures and Breakwaters. Adapting to Change.* Ed Allsop, W. 103-118. Thomas Telford Books, London.
- Bolle, A., Mercelis, P., Goossens, W. and Haerens, P. (2010). Scour monitoring and scour protection solution for offshore gravity based foundations. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Scour and Erosion, San Francisco, 7-10 November 2010.* Geotechnical Special Publication No. 120, ASCE (ISBN 978-0-7844-1147-6)
- Cefas. (2011). Guidelines for data acquisition to support marine environmental assessments of offshore renewable energy projects.
- Cefas. (2005). Assessment of the significance of changes to the inshore wave regime as a consequence of an offshore wind array. Defra R&D report.
- Cefas. (2004). *Offshore wind farms: guidance note for Environmental Impact Assessment in respect of FEPA and Coast Protection Act requirements.*
- Cooper, N.J. and Brew, D.S. (2013). Impacts on the physical environment. In: R.C. Newell and T.A. Woodcock (Eds.). *Aggregate dredging and the marine environment: an overview of recent research and current industry practice.* The Crown Estate.
- Deltares. (2012). *East Anglia Offshore Wind Farm: Metocean Study.* Report to East Anglia Offshore Wind Ltd., October 2012.

EAW. (East Anglia Offshore Wind) (2012). East Anglia Offshore Wind Zonal Environmental Appraisal Report, March 2012.

EATL. (East Anglia Three Limited). (2015). East Anglia THREE Environmental Statement. Report to East Anglia Offshore Wind, November 2015.

ETSU. (Energy Technology Support Unit). (2002). *Potential effects of offshore wind farms on coastal processes*. Report No. ETSU W/35/00596/REP.

ETSU. (Energy Technology Support Unit). (2000). *An assessment of the environmental effects of offshore wind farms*. Report No. ETSU W/35/00543/REP.

Gardline. (2017). East Anglia Two Geophysical Survey May – June 2017.

GL Noble Denton. (2011). *Metocean Conditions Study*. Report No. L24718.

Hiscock, D.R. and Bell, S. (2004). Physical impacts of aggregate dredging on sea bed resources in coastal deposits. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 20 (10), 101-114.

IPC (The Planning Inspectorate). (2011). Using the Rochdale Envelope. Advice Note 9: Rochdale Envelope

John, S.A., Challinor, S.L., Simpson, M., Burt, T.N. and Spearman, J. (2000). *Scoping the assessment of sediment plumes from dredging*. CIRIA Publication.

JNCC (Joint Nature Conservancy Committee) and Natural England. (2011). General advice on assessing potential impacts of and mitigation for human activities on Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) features, using existing regulation and legislation.

Khalfin, I. Sh. (2007). Modelling and calculation of bed score around large-diameter vertical cylinder under wave action. *Water Resources*, Vol 34, No 1, 49-59.

Lambkin, D.O., Harris, J.M., Cooper, W.S. and Coates, T. (2009). Coastal Process Modelling for Offshore Wind Farm Environmental Impact Assessment: Best Practice Guide. Report to COWRIE, September 2009.

Larsen, B.J. and Frigaard, P. (2005). *Scour and scour protection for wind turbine foundations for the London Array*. University of Aalborg Coastal Engineering report No. 17, ISSN 1603-9874

Lowe, J. A., Howard, T. P., Pardaens, A., Tinker, J., Holt, J., Wakelin, S., Milne, G., Leake, J., Wolf, J., Horsburgh, K., Reeder, T., Jenkins, G., Ridley, J., Dye, S. and Bradley, S. (2009). *UK Climate Projections science report: Marine and coastal projections*. Met Office Hadley Centre, Exeter, UK.

Margheritini, L. (2012). Scour around offshore wind turbine foundations (comparison between monopiles and bucket foundations). Presentation at DTU May 15th, 2012.

MMO (Marine Management Organisation). (2012). East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan Areas: Evidence and Issues.

McBreen, F., Askew, N., Cameron, A., Connor, D., Ellwood, H. and Carter, A. (2011). UKSeaMap 2010 Predictive mapping of seabed habitats in UK waters, JNCC Report 446.

Newell, R.C., Seiderer, L.J., Robinson, J.E., Simpson, N.M., Pearce, B and Reeds, K.A. (2004). *Impacts of overboard screening on sea bed and associated benthic biology community structure in relation to marine aggregate extraction*. Technical Report to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and Minerals Industry Research Organisation. Project No. SAMP 1.022, Marine Ecological Surveys Ltd, St. Ives, Cornwall.

Norfolk Vanguard Limited. (2018). Norfolk Vanguard Limited Environmental Statement, June 2018.

Ohl, C.O.G., Taylor, P.H., Eatock Taylor, R. and Borthwick, A.G.L. (2001). Water wave diffraction by a cylinder array part II: irregular waves. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 442, 33 – 66.

Raaijmakers, T. and Rudolph, D. (2008). Time-dependent scour development under combined current and waves conditions – laboratory experiments with online monitoring technique. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Scour and Erosion* (2008).

Planning Inspectorate. (2018). Using the Rochdale Envelope: Advice Note Nine. Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Advice-note-9.-Rochdale-envelope-web.pdf>

ScottishPower Renewables (2017). Scoping Report. Available at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010077/EN010077-000030-EA1N%20-%20Scoping%20Report.pdf>

Seagreen. (2012). The Seagreen Project Environmental Statement. September 2012.

Stahlmann, A. and Schlurmann, T. (2010). Physical Modelling of Scour Around Tripod Foundation Structures for Offshore Wind Energy Converters. *Proc Conf Coastal Engrg*

Tillin, H.M., Houghton, A.J., Saunders, J.E. Drabble, R. and Hull, S.C. (2011). Direct and indirect impacts of aggregate dredging. *Science Monograph Series No. 1*. MEPF 10/P144

Whitehouse, R.J.S., Harris, J. and Sutherland, J. (2010). *Evaluating scour at marine gravity structures*. First European IAHR Congress, Edinburgh, 4th – 6th May 2010

Whiteside, P.G.D., Ooms, K. and Postma, G.M. (1995). Generation and decay of sediment plumes from sand dredging overflow. *Proceedings of the 14th World Dredging Congress*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands. World Dredging Association, 877 – 892.

Yang, R-Y., Chen, H-H., Hwung, H-H., Jiang, W-P. and Wu, N-T. (2010). Experimental study on the loading and scour of the jacket-type offshore wind turbine foundation. *Proc Intl Conf Coastal Engrg*, 32

Yeow, K. and Cheng, L. (2003). Local scour around a vertical pile with a caisson foundation. *Proc. Cong Asian and Pacific Coasts 2003*.

This page is intentionally blank