2016-08-01

The turbulent wake of a monopile foundation

Rogan, C

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/5430>

10.1016/j.renene.2016.02.050

Renewable Energy

Elsevier BV

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

The Turbulent Wake of a Monopile Foundation

C.Rogan*, J.Miles**, D.Simmonds**, G.Iglesias**

*School of Marine Science and Engineering, Plymouth University, Plymouth, PL4 8AA,
UK*

Abstract

An experimental programme is presented, examining the turbulent wake of a monopile foundation in a current. Velocity was recorded across an extensive domain downstream of a model monopile in a 0.5 m deep basin, using an acoustic Doppler velocimeter array. The distribution of turbulent kinetic energy (*TKE*) is examined across the entire domain. Tests were undertaken using several combinations of pile diameter ($D = 0.1$ and 0.2 m) and mean flow velocity ($\bar{u}_0 = 0.08$ to 0.24 m/s), representing typical prototype conditions at a scale of 1:50. It is shown that turbulence can be predicted using the distance downstream (x) and off axis (y), the pile diameter, and the mean flow velocity. Two new parameters are introduced to simplify assessment of proposed structures. Relative Excess Turbulence (*RET*) is the extra turbulence generated by the pile, normalised by the ambient turbulence. Turbulence Recovery Lengthscale (*TRL*) is the distance downstream (normalised by D) required for *RET* to fall below a given threshold. Results show that *RET* decays exponentially with distance downstream. Across the wake, *RET* fitted a Gaussian function with peak values at the wake centre-line. *TRL* is estimated at 40 for an *RET* threshold of 1.0 and 400 for an *RET* threshold of 0.1.

Keywords: monopile, turbulence, windfarm, monopile array, windfarm environmental impact, current

*Principle corresponding author. Tel.: +44 7749 545477

**Corresponding author. Tel.: +44 1752 584737; Fax: +44 1752 586101

Email addresses: charlie.rogan@plymouth.ac.uk (C.Rogan),
j.r.miles@plymouth.ac.uk (J.Miles), d.simmonds@plymouth.ac.uk (D.Simmonds),
gregorio.iglesias@plymouth.ac.uk (G.Iglesias)

1. Introduction

Monopile foundations are by far the most common design for offshore wind turbines, comprising 91% of all European installations completed in 2014 (EWEA, 2015). They are well suited to shallow and transitional water depths, due to their simplicity of installation. At existing installations, piles are typically around 5 m in diameter. The UK is currently the world leader in terms of offshore wind installed capacity, with further growth in the sector forming a key component of the government's renewables 2020 strategy (DECC, 2013, Esteban et al., 2011).

As installations move into deeper water and turbine diameters increase, the greater horizontal loads and bending moments will necessitate the use of ever larger piles (Byrne and Houlby, 2003). There are plans for turbines of 6 MW capacity, in as much as 30 m of water depth. Such installations will require monopiles of up to 7.5 m diameter (Achmus et al., 2008). With a greater number of ever larger monopiles anticipated in the coming years, it is important that we understand their impact.

The flow structure close to the base of a monopile has already been extensively studied (Dargahi, 1989, García-Hermosa et al., 2014, Sumer et al., 1997, Unger and Hager, 2006). Three distinct flow structures can be identified close to the base of the pile. A horseshoe vortex forms at the upstream face, contraction of streamlines occurs as the flow accelerates around the sides of the pile, and lee wake vortices are formed immediately downstream of the pile.

These flow structures lead to enhanced bed scour and the formation of a scour hole around the pile. This is of great concern to the structural integrity of the foundation. Much work has been done to quantify the depth of the scour hole (Roulund et al., 2005, Sumer et al., 2001, Whitehouse et al., 2011), and its rate of development (McGovern et al., 2014).

In addition to the flow structures described above, the monopile's presence will cause increased turbulence in the flow downstream. Elevated turbulence enhances the carrying capacity of the flow, leading to increased sediment transport (Butt et al., 2004, Gyr and Hoyer, 2006). This increases the distance that scoured sediments can be transported downstream of the pile.

The environmental impacts of suspended sediments are numerous. Increased turbidity can affect the productivity of plankton (Kocum et al., 2002), as well as influencing the behaviour of predatory fish (Abrahams and Kattenfeld, 1997) and marine mammals (Weiffen et al., 2006). These

are related to economic concerns, as any changes could impact on fisheries. Sediment transport regimes also govern sedimentation processes downstream (Yin et al., 2014).

Techniques exist for estimating the turbidity downstream of existing monopiles, by analysing satellite images (Gerace et al., 2013). Turbid wakes have been observed transporting sediment for hundreds of metres downstream of monopiles (Vanhellemont and Ruddick, 2014).

Ideally, numerical modelling would be used to predict the likely impact of a proposed wind farm on sediment transport during the planning phase. However, the flow structures governing the increased turbulence are typically on the same scale as the monopile. These cannot be resolved by existing sediment transport models, which typically have cell sizes on the order of hundreds of meters in order to cope with the large regions of interest (Magar et al., 2013).

This paper presents the results of a series of laboratory experiments, performed at a scale of 1:50, examining the wake structure downstream of a monopile foundation. In particular, the influence on turbulence of flow velocity, pile diameter and location relative to the pile were measured. Two new parameters are introduced to simplify turbulence assessment of planned monopile structures in terms the relative position and flow velocity.

Empirical relationships are presented predicting the turbulent characteristics of the wake. These have been validated to show that turbulence in the wake of a monopile can be described by a small number of parameters. These parameterisations will allow the monopile’s influence on turbulence to be implemented in regional sediment transport models.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Experimental Design

The experimental programme was carried out in the Coastal basin at Plymouth University. The basin measures 10 m long by 7.2 m wide, with a water depth of 0.5 m. The pile was fixed to the floor of the basin, centred 4.5 m from the downstream tank wall and 3.5 m from the side (Figure 1). The floor of the tank is fibre reinforced plastic, with a roughness lengthscale of < 0.0001 m.

Prototype values of water depth, pile diameter and flow velocity were chosen based on typical values at existing wind farm sites. Matutano et al. (2013)

Figure 1: Plan view of the Coastal basin. Not to scale. All dimensions in metres.

provide information from several existing wind farms. Average monopile diameter is just below 5 m, with the largest quoted at 6 m. Pile diameters are expected to increase in the future as development moves into deeper water. Peak current velocities range between 0.6 and 2.0 m/s, although the higher values in this range correspond to particularly shallow sites. The experimental programme was designed to examine turbulence in the free stream flow, and so an intermediate depth prototype was considered more appropriate. This was confirmed by examination of proposed sites in the channel region, using the ANEMOC offshore windfarm database (Benoit et al., 2008).

Prototype values were converted to model scale by applying Froude similitude at a scale of 1:50 to derive appropriate scale factors (λ). Measurements were made at four model velocities ($\bar{u}_0 = 0.08, 0.14, 0.18$ and 0.24 m/s), and two model pile diameters ($D = 0.1$ and 0.2 m), in water depth d of 0.5 m (Table 1). Froude similitude is achieved between the model and prototype, with Froude numbers ranging between 8×10^{-2} and 2×10^{-1} .

Table 1: Prototype vs Model parameters

Parameter	λ	Prototype	Model
d	50	25 m	0.5 m
D	50	5-10 m	0.1-0.2 m
$\bar{u}_0$	$\sqrt{50}$	0.6-1.6 m/s	0.08-0.24 m/s
Re	-	2×10^6 to 2×10^7	8×10^3 to 5×10^4

Measured water temperatures were around 20 °C throughout the experimental program, with a corresponding kinematic viscosity of approximately 10^{-6} m²/s. For the current experimental program, model Reynolds numbers range from 8×10^3 to 5×10^4 ; flow is fully turbulent.

To allow comparison of results with different prototype scales, x and y positions were normalised by the pile diameter to yield x^* and y^* :

$$x^* = \frac{x}{D} \quad (1) \quad y^* = \frac{y}{D} \quad (2)$$

2.2. Data

Three components of velocity were measured using a Nortek Vectrino profiler Acoustic Doppler Velocimeter (ADV), referred to here as ‘ADV1’. ADVs are very suitable for experimental measurements of this kind and are widely used, (Graf and Istiarto, 2002, Qi et al., 2012). Nikora and Goring (1998) provide a summary of their operation.

Detailed velocity measurements were made downstream of the model pile under steady flow conditions, with the goal of parameterising the wake structure. Velocity time series data were recorded using ADV1 positioned along transverse and longitudinal wake profiles (Figure 2). At each location, 500 seconds of velocity time series data were recorded at a sample frequency of 64 Hz, for each flow condition. The instrument was positioned vertically to record point velocity within the free stream, 35 cm from the tank floor.

The longitudinal profile extended 2.7 m downstream of the pile centre, with nine measurement positions spaced logarithmically along its length. Table 2 summarises the eight transverse profiles, aligned perpendicular to the mean flow. Values of x and D were chosen so that the eight profiles converged to four in the x^* domain. Each profile extended 50 cm either side of the wake centreline.

Table 2: Summary of transverse profiles

D	x	x^*	$\bar{u}_0$
(m)	(m)	-	(m/s)
0.1	0.25	2.5	0.08-0.18
0.1	0.50	5.0	
0.1	0.75	7.5	
0.1	1.00	10.0	
0.2	0.50	2.5	0.08-0.24
0.2	1.00	5.0	
0.2	1.50	7.5	
0.2	2.00	10.0	

Velocity time series data from ADV1 was used to calculate Turbulent Kinetic Energy per unit volume (TKE), using equation 3.

$$TKE = \frac{1}{2}\rho(\bar{u}^2 + \bar{v}^2 + \bar{w}^2) \quad (3)$$

Where u , v and w are the components of velocity in the x , y and z directions, respectively, and the apostrophe indicates the fluctuating component. ρ is the density of water. For these experiments, x is defined as the mean flow direction, y is the other horizontal dimension perpendicular to this, and z is the vertical direction.

Figure 2: Experimental setup: plan view showing longitudinal and transverse measurement profiles. All dimensions in cm.

122 A point measurement ADV (Nortek Vectrino+) was used to measure the
 123 undisturbed mean flow velocity upstream of the pile ($\bar{u}_0$). This instrument,
 124 referred to as ‘ADV2’, was positioned 100 cm upstream of the pile centre
 125 and +65 cm off axis. The two instruments had the same sample frequency,
 126 and were electronically synchronised to record over the same time period.
 127 Both instruments were positioned vertically so as to measure within the free
 128 stream, 35 cm from the tank floor.

129 *2.3. Control Measurements*

130 A series of control measurements were also made with the pile removed
 131 from the tank. These covered the same range of pump settings as used in
 132 the wake measurements. Control TKE values (TKE_0) were calculated from
 133 the velocity time series data according to equation 3.

134 *2.4. Flow Conditioning*

135 Flow entering the tank passed through a flow straightener structure to
 136 minimise pump turbulence. Design of this structure was informed by the
 137 findings of Markus et al. (2015). Flow is impounded near the inlet, before
 138 passing through a bank of honeycomb blocks to enter the basin. Each block
 139 measures 0.5 m tall by 0.3 m thick by 1.25 m wide, with a bank of four
 140 blocks extending across 5.0 m of the inlet grills. The blocks are made from
 141 polycarbonate with a cell size of 12 mm diameter. Whilst Markus et al. used
 142 tubes aligned both parallel and perpendicular to the main flow direction,
 143 all of the cells in the current work were aligned parallel to the flow. Visual
 144 examination of the flow with fine seeding particles confirmed that turbulence
 145 is not significant once the flow has passed through the honeycomb.

146 *2.5. Data Pre-Processing*

147 In order to reduce the potential problems of instrument noise and en-
 148 sure that genuine turbulent fluctuations were identified, raw measurements
 149 were subjected to rigorous processing to ensure high quality data. Data
 150 were assessed manually to check for low correlation, low signal to noise ratio,
 151 reflections from the bed, or phase wrapping - all indications of poor measure-
 152 ment accuracy. Acceptable data were then filtered using a 3D phase space
 153 algorithm to remove noise. This technique was originally proposed by Goring
 154 and Nikora (2002), and modified by Wahl (2003). A concise description of
 155 the algorithm can be found in Mori et al. (2007).

156 2.6. New Parameters

157 In assessing the environmental impact of a proposed monopile founda-
 158 tion, a fundamental consideration is the increase in turbulence relative to
 159 the ambient level in the undisturbed flow (TKE_0). To this end, a new pa-
 160 rameter is introduced to express the increased turbulence in the pile wake -
 161 the Relative Excess Turbulence (RET):

$$162 \quad RET = \frac{TKE - TKE_0}{TKE_0} \quad (4)$$

163 Another useful parameter for impact assessment is the spatial extent of
 164 the pile's region of influence. A second new parameter is introduced to sim-
 165 plify comparisons between proposed installations. The Turbulence Recov-
 166 ery Lengthscale (TRL) is defined as the normalised distance required down-
 167 stream, along the wake centreline, for turbulence to recover. Recovery can
 168 be considered to have taken place when RET falls below a threshold (Δ).

$$169 \quad TRL = x^* \quad (5)$$

170 when

$$171 \quad y^* = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad RET = \Delta$$

172 3. Results

173 Data from the experimental programme were analysed, with the aim of
 174 quantifying a surface that defines RET in the domain downstream of a pile
 175 in terms of x^* and y^* .

176 3.1. Control Measurements

177 The data from the control measurements is presented in Table 3. These
 178 values are the mean of three measurements made using ADV1 at each of
 179 four pump settings. As expected, pump power correlates with both $\bar{u}_0$ and
 180 TKE_0 . Following the quadratic relationship between velocity and kinetic
 181 energy, TKE_0 was normalised by $\rho\bar{u}_0^2$. Values of $TKE_0/\rho\bar{u}_0^2$ show close
 182 agreement across the range of flow conditions tested, supporting this method
 183 of normalising TKE .

Table 3: Summary of control data

<i>Pump Power</i> (%)	$\bar{u}_0$ (m/s)	TKE_0 (kg m ⁻¹ s ⁻²)	$TKE_0/\rho\bar{u}_0^2$ -
20	0.0963	0.1289	0.0139
32	0.1531	0.3694	0.0158
40	0.1886	0.5459	0.0153
50	0.2357	0.8471	0.0153

3.2. Longitudinal Characteristics

Figure 3a shows measured TKE values along the centreline of the wake downstream of the 10 cm pile, at each of the three current velocities tested. Turbulence decays exponentially with distance downstream of the pile in all three datasets. As expected, higher mean flow velocity correlates with higher values of TKE . These trends were also observed downstream of the 20 cm pile. Figure 3b shows trends with similar gradients, this time for four different velocities tested. For a given value of x at or beyond 0.5 m, TKE values associated with the larger pile are greater by a factor of approximately two.

TKE and x can be normalised by $\rho\bar{u}_0^2$ and D respectively. When this was applied, data for both pile diameters and all four mean flow velocities collapsed towards a common relationship, as shown in Figure 4. Data nor-

(a) 10 cm diameter pile.

(b) 20 cm diameter pile.

Figure 3: Centreline TKE Profiles

Figure 4: Normalised TKE : longitudinal profiles.
 $\bar{u}_0 = 0.08$ to 0.18 m/s

Figure 5: RET : longitudinal profiles. $\bar{u}_0 = 0.08$ to 0.24 m/s

malised in this way were analysed using linear regression to yield equation 6, which fits the data with an R^2 of 0.945. The high R^2 value indicates that the equation is very representative of the process. This shows that turbulence characteristics downstream of the pile centreline can be estimated using only $\bar{u}_0$ and D , parameters that will be known at an early design stage.

$$\frac{TKE}{\rho \bar{u}_0^2} = 0.6x^{*-1.1} \quad (6)$$

The wake TKE data from ADV1 were combined with undisturbed velocity data from ADV2, to calculate RET (equation 4). When this was applied, data for both pile diameters and all four mean flow velocities collapsed to a single relationship (Figure 5). Equation 7 fits the measured data with an R^2 value of 0.944. Both equation 6 and equation 7 can be applied with confidence over the experimental range of $2.5 \leq x^* \leq 27$.

$$RET = 38.8x^{*-1.2} \quad (7)$$

3.3. Transverse Characteristics

Figure 6 shows a typical transverse profile of normalised TKE . Normalised TKE was greatest along the wake's centreline, and rapidly dropped to a constant background value on either side. Transverse TKE cross sections collapsed when normalised by mean $\rho \bar{u}_0^2$ and D , as was the case with the longitudinal profiles.

Figure 6: Normalised TKE cross section, $2.5 D$ downstream. Data for different velocities and pile diameters collapsed to a common relationship.

Figure 7: Transverse profiles fitted to normalised TKE data at four different values of x^* . Cross sections become lower and wider with x^* .

216 The distribution of TKE in the cross sections was found to fit a function
217 of the form:

$$218 \quad \frac{TKE}{\rho \bar{u}_0^2} = \alpha_1 e^{-\alpha_2 y^{*2}} + \alpha_3 \quad (8)$$

219 Where α_1 , α_2 and α_3 are regression constants. Non-linear regression was
220 used to determine the values of these constants for each of the four x^* profiles
221 (Table 4).

Table 4: Regression constants for normalised TKE cross sections.

x^*	α_1	α_2	α_3	R^2
2.5	0.2330	1.0512	0.0212	0.9387
5.0	0.0992	0.2555	0.0162	0.7892
7.5	0.0711	0.1748	0.0209	0.5396
10.0	0.0497	0.1015	0.0138	0.5826
<i>Mean</i>	-	-	0.0180	0.7125

222 For a given cross section, the peak value of TKE is governed by the
223 constant α_1 . Given the distance downstream and the pile diameter, the
224 value of α_1 might be estimated using equation 6. Likewise, the width of the
225 wake is governed by the constant α_2 . Both constants tend towards zero as x^*
226 increases and the wake profile becomes lower, wider and flatter (Figure 7).

Figure 8: Regression constants α_1 , α_2 and α_3 for normalised TKE cross sections.

Figure 8 plots the values of α_1 , α_2 and α_3 against x^* , confirming the trend identified in Table 4. Although α_1 and α_2 are constant for a given cross section, these observations show that when considering the wake as a whole they are functions of x^* .

The constant α_3 defines the ambient level to which turbulence decays outside the wake. The fitted values were similar for all four cross sections. Furthermore, the range of α_3 encompasses the control range of $TKE_0/\rho\bar{u}_0^2$ presented in Table 3, with similar mean values.

Figure 9 plots RET against y^* , for each of the four values of x^* tested. Each plot represents two different pile diameters and four different flow velocities. As with the longitudinal profiles, the data collapse very well when normalised in this way. Peak RET occurs along the centreline. The shape of the wake becomes lower, flatter and wider as x^* increases.

Table 5: Regression constants for RET cross sections.

x^*	β_1	β_2	R^2
2.5	14.1747	0.9429	0.9309
5.0	6.7866	0.3028	0.8332
7.5	5.1888	0.1657	0.5292
10.0	2.8917	0.0928	0.4760
<i>Mean</i>	-	-	0.6923

Figure 9: RET - transverse cross sections at different values of x^* . Black lines indicate equation 9 fitted to the measured data. Profiles become lower, flatter and wider as x^* increases.

240 Average RET values recover to approximately zero at the boundaries of
 241 the wake. This allows equation 8 to be simplified to give equation 9:

$$242 \quad RET = \beta_1 e^{-\beta_2 y^{*2}} \quad (9)$$

243 Table 5 summarises the fitting of experimental data to this relationship.
 244 As with Table 4, the values of the constants tend towards zero as x^* increases.
 245 The general trend in both tables is for R^2 to reduce with increasing values
 246 of x^* . This might be attributed to the increasing influence of measurement
 247 error as the turbulence signal decreases. Figure 9 indicates that equation 9
 248 predicts the mean RET values at the crest of each profile.

249 3.4. Empirical model

250 Following the observations made in sections 3.2 and 3.3, a unifying rela-
 251 tionship was sought to describe the distribution of turbulence over the entire

domain. The validity of such a relationship follows from dimensional analysis of the parameters. As the peak RET in a given cross section occurs along the centreline, β_1 can be expressed by a term of the same form as equation 7; $\beta_1 = \gamma_1 x^{*- \gamma_2}$, where γ_1 and γ_2 are constants. Table 5 suggests an inverse relationship between x^* and β_2 , and so the term γ_3/x^* is substituted for β_2 , where γ_3 is a constant. RET can now be expressed in terms of both x^* and y^* :

$$RET = \gamma_1 x^{*- \gamma_2} e^{-\frac{\gamma_3 y^{*2}}{x^*}} \quad (10)$$

Using non-linear regression, equation 10 was fit to the measured data to yield the constants γ_1 , γ_2 and γ_3 . Equation 10 is valid with these constants for the range of experimental values, $2.5 \leq x^* \leq 27$ and $-5 \leq y^* \leq 5$.

$$\gamma_1 = 33.949$$

$$\gamma_2 = 0.9761$$

$$\gamma_3 = 1.9967$$

Along the centreline of the wake, γ_1 and γ_2 are analogous and similar in magnitude to the fitted constants in equation 7, which gives confidence in the result.

Figure 10 plots the measured data over the entire domain, against a surface defined by the empirical relationship. Measured RET agrees closely with calculated values. The function successfully explains both the exponential decay of RET along the wake centreline and the spreading of the wake with distance downstream.

Figure 11 plots the measured values of RET against those predicted using equation 10 and the fitted values of γ_1 , γ_2 and γ_3 . Predicted values were found to fit measured data with an R^2 of 0.874. 23% of predicted values are within $\pm 10\%$ of the measured data, with 70% falling within $\pm 50\%$.

3.5. Outputs

Equation 10 allows the calculation of TRL along the wake centreline. By setting y^* equal to zero and RET equal to Δ , γ_3 is eliminated and the equation simplifies:

$$\gamma_1 x^{*- \gamma_2} = \Delta \quad (11)$$

$$x^* = e^{\frac{\ln \frac{\gamma_1}{\Delta}}{\gamma_2}} = TRL \quad (12)$$

Figure 10: Distribution of Residual Excess Turbulence (RET), against normalised distance downstream (x^*) and off axis (y^*) from the pile centre. Measured values against a surface defined by equation 10.

282 The value of the threshold Δ is arbitrary in this definition, and differ-
 283 ent values may be specified according to the purpose of the analysis. Two
 284 examples serve to illustrate this point:

285 Given a receptor or process that is insensitive to variations in turbulence,
 286 Δ might be set equal to 1.0. This implies TKE is twice that of the ambi-
 287 ent conditions, and might signify that turbulence has returned to its original
 288 order of magnitude. Inputting these values into equation 12 yields a value
 289 of 37.01 for TRL , or approximately 40. Given a typical prototype diameter
 290 of 5 m, this corresponds to a distance of 200 m. From an engineering per-
 291 spective, 200 m is less than typical turbine spacing in existing and planned
 292 offshore windfarms; RET will decay below a value of 1.0 before reaching a
 293 neighbouring monopile.

294 If instead the process of interest is highly sensitive to changes in turbu-

Figure 11: RET downstream of the pile. Measured values vs values predicted using equation 10.

lence, a value of 0.1 might be specified for the threshold Δ . This implies that TKE has decayed to only 10% above the ambient conditions - a much tighter specification than above. Using this new threshold TRL is calculated at 391.6, or approximately 400. This corresponds to 2,000 m downstream for a typical 5 m diameter prototype, which is greater than typical pile spacing; RET will exceed 0.1 when the wake reaches the next pile downstream.

4. Discussion

Model velocities covered the range from 0.08 to 0.24 m/s. These model values represent prototype current velocities of 0.57 to 1.70 m/s, which are typical of peak velocities measured at existing wind farms (Matutano et al., 2013). The data may even be applicable to some less energetic tidal energy sites.

Two pile diameters were tested during the experimental programme. The 0.1 m model pile scales to a typical 5 m diameter prototype in a transitional water depth of 25 m. At the same scale, the 0.2 m pile represents a 10 m diameter prototype. This is significantly larger than the largest wind turbine monopiles currently being proposed, but may represent other types of offshore structure. In spite of this disparity in scale, *RET* values collapsed successfully (Figure 5, Figure 9, Figure 11). This suggests that the relationships identified hold true for the range of pile diameters scaled to represent existing and proposed offshore wind farms.

In general, the proposed equations were found to represent the data well. One group of *RET* values were found to lie above the main cluster of data in the cross section at $x^* = 7.5$ (Figure 9). Closer examination did not reveal any underlying cause for this group of points. Despite these anomalous data, the range of *RET* values at the centre of the cross section is approximately 8, which is similar to the range of *RET* values shown in the cross sections at $x^* = 2.5$ and $x^* = 5$.

The findings indicate that turbulence affects a substantial region downstream of the pile, showing that turbulence is a much larger scale problem than scour. Changes to the turbulent characteristics of the flow may be significant for mixing, and could affect primary productivity and marine biodiversity in the region of the pile (Kocum et al., 2002).

This is in good agreement with the findings of Vanhellemont and Ruddick (2014), who reported turbid plumes 30 to 150 m wide, extending for several kilometres downstream of wind farms. Translating *RET* values into quantities of suspended particulate matter would require data on the characteristics of the suspended material and the ambient conditions at a specific site, as proposed by Rivier et al. (2014). However, heightened *TKE* at this distance from the pile will enhance the carrying capacity of the flow, and contribute to the persistence of the observed plumes.

Prototype pile spacing within existing and planned wind farms is typically 500 to 1,000 m, with pile diameters of around 5 m. Given these dimensions, the *TRL* values estimated in section 3.5 imply that the *RET* reaching a monopile from its upstream neighbour will be somewhere between 1.0 and 0.1. This is small compared to the estimated *RET* of 33.9 at $x^* = 1.0$ downstream of an individual pile (equation 10). These observations suggest that monopile foundations will behave as individuals with respect to turbulence in the pile wake, and group effects are expected to be small.

344 5. Conclusion

345 A detailed experimental programme was carried out in a laboratory to
346 assess the levels of turbulence in the wake of a monopile foundation. TKE
347 measurements were made up to 27 diameters downstream of the pile. Tur-
348 bulence along the wake centreline was found to decay exponentially with
349 distance downstream.

350 In this work, two new parameters have been introduced for characterising
351 the turbulence downstream of a monopile foundation: the Relative Excess
352 Turbulence (*RET*) and the Turbulence Recovery Lengthscale (*TRL*). These
353 parameters will be useful for assessing the likely impact of monopile founda-
354 tions on local flow conditions. Experimental data were used to infer *TRL*
355 values of 40 pile diameters for an *RET* threshold of 1.0, or 400 pile diameters
356 for an *RET* threshold of 0.1.

357 Profiles of turbulence across the wake fitted a Gaussian function. The
358 lateral extent of the pile’s impact increased with distance downstream of the
359 pile. Measurements of TKE outside the wake were similar to ambient values.

360 6. Acknowledgements

361 This work was carried out as part of the OFELIA project (Offshore Foun-
362 dations Environmental Impact Assessment). This is a collaboration between
363 the universities of Plymouth, Le Havre and Caen, and the authors would like
364 to thank all project partners for their support and constructive comments.
365 The project was selected under the European cross-border cooperation pro-
366 gramme INTERREG IV A France (Channel) - England, co-funded by the
367 ERDF (European Regional Development Fund).

368 References

- 369 Abrahams, M. and Kattenfeld, M. (1997), ‘The role of turbidity as a
370 constraint on predatory-prey interactions in aquatic environments.’, *Be-
371 havioural Ecology and Sociobiology* **40**, 169 – 174.
- 372 Achmus, M., Abdel-Rahman, K. and Kuo, Y.-S. (2008), Design of Monopile
373 Foundations for Offshore Wind Energy Converters, *in* ‘11th Baltic Sea
374 Geotechnical Conference’, Gdansk.

- 375 Benoit, M., Lafon, F. and Goasguen, G. (2008), ‘Constitution et exploita-
376 tion d’une base de données d’états de mer le long des côtes françaises par
377 simulation numérique sur 23 ans’, *European Journal of Environmental and*
378 *Civil Engineering* **12**(February 2015), 35–50.
- 379 Butt, T., Russell, P., Puleo, J., Miles, J. and Masselink, G. (2004), ‘The
380 influence of bore turbulence on sediment transport in the swash and inner
381 surf zones’, *Continental Shelf Research* **24**, 757–771.
- 382 Byrne, B. W. and Houlby, G. T. (2003), ‘Foundations for offshore wind
383 turbines’, *Philosophical Transactions of The Royal Society* **361**, 2909–2930.
- 384 Dargahi, B. (1989), ‘The turbulent flow field around a circular cylinder’,
385 *Experiments in Fluids* **12**, 1–12.
- 386 DECC (2013), UK Renewable Energy Roadmap, Technical Report Novem-
387 ber, Department of Energy and Climate Change.
- 388 Esteban, M. D., Diez, J. J., López, J. S. and Negro, V. (2011), ‘Why offshore
389 wind energy?’, *Renewable Energy* **36**(2), 444–450.
- 390 EWEA (2015), The European offshore wind industry - key trends and statis-
391 tics 2014, Technical Report January, European Wind Energy Association.
- 392 García-Hermosa, I., Brossard, J., Cohen, Z., Perret, G., Pinon, G., Abcha,
393 N., Bennis, A. C., Ezersky, A., Mouazé, D., Rivier, A., Iglesias, G., Miles,
394 J., Rogan, C., Simmonds, D., Gross, M. and Magar, V. (2014), Experi-
395 mental characterisation of wave induced flow fields due to an offshore wind
396 farm mast, in ‘Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Renew-
397 able Energies Offshore’, Lisbon.
- 398 Gerace, A. D., Schott, J. R. and Nevins, R. (2013), ‘Increased potential to
399 monitor water quality in the near-shore environment with Landsat’s next-
400 generation satellite’, *Journal of Applied Remote Sensing* **7**, 073558–1 –
401 073558–18.
- 402 Goring, D. G. and Nikora, V. I. (2002), ‘Despiking acoustic doppler velocime-
403 ter data’, *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* **128**(1), 117–126.
- 404 Graf, W. H. and Istiarto, I. (2002), ‘Flow pattern in the scour hole around
405 a cylinder Écoulement dans une fosse autour d’un cylindre’, *Hydraulic*
406 *Research* **40**(1), 13–20.

- 407 Gyr, A. and Hoyer, K. (2006), *Sediment Transport*, Springer.
- 408 Kocum, E., Underwood, G. J. C. and Nedwell, D. B. (2002), ‘Simultaneous
409 measurement of phytoplanktonic primary production, nutrient and light
410 availability along a turbid, eutrophic UK east coast estuary (the Colne
411 Estuary)’, *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **231**, 1–12.
- 412 Magar, V., Abcha, N., Bennis, A., Brossard, J., Conley, D., Ellis, E., Ezer-
413 sky, A., Greaves, D., Gross, M. S., Iglesias, G., Littlewood, K., Miles,
414 J., Mouazé, D., Perret, G., Pinon, G. and Simmonds, D. J. (2013),
415 Laboratory-Scale Environmental Impact Assessment of a Monopile Founda-
416 tion under Different Wave Conditions, *in* ‘EWEA Offshore 2013’, pp. 1–
417 9.
- 418 Markus, D., Jakobsen, M., Bletzinger, K.-U. and Frigaard, P. (2015), ‘Damp-
419 ing of unwanted turbulence in wave-current experiments’, *Coastal Engi-
420 neering* **96**, 38–48.
- 421 Matutano, C., Negro, V., López-Gutiérrez, J.-S., Esteban, M. D. and del
422 Campo, J. M. (2013), ‘Dimensionless wave height parameter for prelimi-
423 nary design of scour protection in offshore wind farms’, *Journal of Coastal
424 Research* **29**(65), 1633–1638.
- 425 McGovern, D. J., Ilic, S., Folkard, A. M., McLelland, S. J. and Murphy, B. J.
426 (2014), ‘Time development of scour around a cylinder in simulated tidal
427 currents’, *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* **140**(6).
- 428 Mori, N., Suzuki, T. and Kakuno, S. (2007), ‘Noise of acoustic doppler
429 velocimeter data in bubbly flows’, *Journal of engineering mechanics*
430 **133**(1), 122–125.
- 431 Nikora, V. and Goring, D. (1998), ‘ADV measurements of turbulence: Can
432 we improve their interpretation?’, *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* .
- 433 Qi, W., Gao, F., Han, X. and Gong, Q. (2012), Local scour and pore-water
434 pressure around a monopile foundation under combined waves and cur-
435 rents, *in* ‘Proceedings of the Twenty-second International Offshore and
436 Polar Engineering Conference’, Rhodes, pp. 159–165.

- 437 Rivier, A., Bennis, A. C., Pinon, G., Gross, M. and Magar, V.
 438 (2014), ‘Modelisation numerique regionale de l’impact des eoliennes off-
 439 shore sur l’hydrodynamique et le transport sedimentaire’, *Journées de*
 440 *l’hydrodynamique* **14**.
- 441 Roulund, A., Sumer, B. M., Fredsøe, J. and Michelsen, J. (2005), ‘Numerical
 442 and experimental investigation of flow and scour around a circular pile’,
 443 *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **534**, 351–401.
- 444 Sumer, B., Christiansen, N. and Fredsøe, J. (1997), ‘The horseshoe vortex
 445 and vortex shedding around a vertical wall-mounted cylinder exposed to
 446 waves’, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **332**, 41–70.
- 447 Sumer, B., Whitehouse, R. J. and Tørum, A. (2001), ‘Scour around coastal
 448 structures: a summary of recent research’, *Coastal Engineering* **44**(2), 153–
 449 190.
- 450 Unger, J. and Hager, W. H. (2006), ‘Down-flow and horseshoe vortex char-
 451 acteristics of sediment embedded bridge piers’, *Experiments in Fluids*
 452 **42**(1), 1–19.
- 453 Vanhellemont, Q. and Ruddick, K. (2014), ‘Turbid wakes associated with
 454 offshore wind turbines observed with Landsat 8’, *Remote Sensing of Envi-*
 455 *ronment* **145**, 105–115.
- 456 Wahl, T. (2003), ‘Discussion of Despiking acoustic doppler velocimeter data
 457 by Derek G. Goring and Vladimir I. Nikora’, *Journal of Hydraulic Engi-*
 458 *neering* **128**(1), 484–488.
- 459 Weiffen, M., Möller, B., Mauck, B. and Dehnhardt, G. (2006), ‘Effect of water
 460 turbidity on the visual acuity of harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*)’, *Vision*
 461 *Research* **46**, 1777–1783.
- 462 Whitehouse, R. J. S., Harris, J. M., Sutherland, J. and Rees, J. (2011), ‘The
 463 nature of scour development and scour protection at offshore windfarm
 464 foundations.’, *Marine pollution bulletin* **62**(1), 73–88.
- 465 Yin, Y., Christie, E., Li, M., Moulinec, C. and Emerson, D. (2014), ‘3d
 466 morphological impact modelling of offshore wind farms using les and hpc’,
 467 *Coastal Engineering Proceedings* **1**(34), sediment–48.