Rampion 2 WIND FARM

Rampion 2 Wind Farm
Category 6: Environmental Statement

Volume 4, Appendix 4.2: Statutory consultation feedback

Date: August 2023
Revision A

Document Reference: 6.4.4.2
Pursuant to: APFP Regulation 5 (2) (a)
Ecodoc number: 004866459-01

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Document revisions

Revision	Date	Status/reason for issue	Author	Checked by	Approved by
A	04/08/2023	Final for DCO Application	WSP	RED	RED

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Contents

1. Statutory consultation feedback 3

1.1 Introduction 3
Responses to the Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion 3
Third Statutory Consultation exercise (PEIR FSIR) (24 February to 27 March 2023) feedback 21

1.2 Glossary of terms and abbreviations 25

1.3 References 27

List of Tables

Table 1-1 The Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion (2020) responses relevant to the description of the Proposed Development 5
Table 1-2 First Statutory Consultation exercise (PEIR) (14 July to 16 September 2021) feedback 16
Table 1-3 Second Statutory Consultation exercise (PEIR SIR) (18 October 2022 to 29 November 2022) feedback 20
Table 1-4 Fourth Statutory Consultation exercise (PEI) (28 April to 30 May 2023) feedback 23

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Page intentionally blank

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

1. Statutory consultation feedback

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This Appendix provides responses to the Scoping Opinion (Planning Inspectorate, 2020), and the key themes from Statutory Consultation exercises (first: Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) (RED, 2021), second: Preliminary Environmental Information Report Supplementary Information Report (PEIR SIR) (RED, 2022), third: Preliminary Environmental Information Report Further Supplementary Information Report (PEIR FSIR) (RED, 2023a), and fourth: Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) – Bolney Substation Extension Works (RED, 2023b)) associated with **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** (Document Reference: 6.2.4) and how these are addressed in the ES.

1.1.2 This Appendix should be read in conjunction with Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2 (Document Reference: 6.2.4).

Responses to the Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion

1.1.3 Table 1-1 sets out the comments received in Section 2.3 of the Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion relevant to the Proposed Development and how these have been addressed in this ES. Full details of the Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion (Planning Inspectorate, 2020) comments and responses are provided in **Appendix 5.2: Response to the Scoping Opinion** of the ES (Document Reference 6.4.5.2). Regard has also been given to other stakeholder comments that were received in relation to the Scoping Report (RED, 2020).

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Page intentionally blank

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Table 1-1 The Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion (2020) responses relevant to the description of the Proposed Development

Reference	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
Para 2.3.1	*Description of the Proposed Development* *The ES should include the following:* *- A description of the Proposed Development comprising at least the information on the site, design, size and other relevant features of the development; and* *- A description of the location of the development and description of the physical characteristics of the whole development, including any requisite demolition works and the land-use requirements during construction and operation phases.*	An explanation of the Proposed Development is presented in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4). This includes information on the site design, size, location, physical characteristics, relevant features, and demolition works and the land-use requirements during the construction and operation phases of Rampion 2.
Para 2.3.2	*Paragraphs 2.3.50 – 2.3.56 of the Scoping Report provides some detail on operation and maintenance activities. The ES should provide a full description of the nature and scope of these activities, including the types of activity, their frequency, and how works will be carried out for both the onshore and offshore elements of the Proposed Development. This should include consideration for the potential overlapping of activities with those required for the continuing operation of Rampion 1.*	**Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) provides a description of the nature and scope of operation and maintenance activities, including the types of activity, their frequency, and how works will be carried out for both the onshore and offshore elements of the Proposed Development.
Para 2.3.3	*Paragraph 2.3.56 and subsequent aspect sections of the Scoping Report address decommissioning in respect of the Proposed Development. The ES should include the rationale in support of the assessment of potential significant effects during the decommissioning phase, including a description of anticipated decommissioning activities (e.g. where the magnitude of impact is similar to that during construction).*	**Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) provides a description of anticipated decommissioning activities. The effects arising during the decommissioning phase are assessed by aspect **Chapters 6: Coastal processes** to **29: Climate**

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Reference	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
	Where there is uncertainty of impacts during decommissioning this should be clearly explained along with the implications for the assessment of significant effects (including assumptions and mitigation on which reliance is placed). For example, there is reference to a "decommissioning plan" but production of such a document does not appear in the Applicant's scoping commitments register (Scoping Report appendix 2).	**change, Volume 2** (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29).
Para 2.3.4	*Offshore* *Inter-array cabling and offshore export cables are described as having a "Target depth" for burial of 1m (dependant on cable burial risk assessment). The cable burial risk assessment is recorded as commitment C-45 in appendix A of the Scoping Report, although it is not immediately clear whether this would take place prior to or post any DCO consent. The ES should be clear on the range of burial depths that have been considered as part of the assessment(s). Where reliance is placed on a subsequent risk assessment as mitigation, the ES should also explain the effectiveness and degree of confidence that can be placed on this measure.*	**Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) describes the target burial depth, which will be dependent on the cable burial assessment to be carried out when the cable route is finalised. This will be undertaken post-consent and will be secured through deemed Marine Licence (dML) conditions.
Para 2.3.5	*The Scoping Report does not explain whether HVAC or Direct Current (HVDC) technologies are proposed, and the ES should describe the technology proposed or options sought in this regard. The Scoping Report also explains that array cables will be 33kV or 66kV but not the circumstances in which either 33kV or 66kV options would be chosen, or whether it might be a combination of both. The ES should*	High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) technologies are proposed as described in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4). **Section 3.5** of **Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) describes

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Reference	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
	describe these options, any differences in the physical infrastructure requirements and provide an assessment of environmental effects that may result between one or the other (or combined) option	the selection process between High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) and High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC). **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) describes that the array cables will be up to 132kV, dependent on the latest technology under development.
Para 2.3.6	*The Inspectorate understands that preliminary engineering investigations indicate "several" design options for the WTG foundations could be considered including monopiles and multi-leg foundations, and that "other solutions such as suction buckets may be used". The ES should include a full and detailed description of all the foundation options for which development consent is being sought, including maximum diameter of piles should they be used. The Inspectorate makes further comments on flexibility in design in the following paragraphs.*	**Section 4.3** of **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.4) describes all options under consideration for the WTG foundations and the maximum assessment assumptions.
Para 2.3.7	*The Scoping Report identifies the potential need for seabed preparation for foundations and inter array cabling, which may include boulder and/or sandwave clearance. Any requisite seabed preparation for the export cable route should also be described and any resultant likely significant effects assessed within the ES. Should seabed preparation involve dredging, the ES should identify the quantities of dredged material and identify the likely location for disposal. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the scoping consultation response of the MMO relating information required as part of the ES in*	**Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) describes the seabed preparation activities, assessment assumptions for foundations and inter-array cabling. The effects arising from seabed preparation activities for foundations and inter-array cabling are assessed in relevant **Chapters 6: Coastal processes** to **16: Marine archaeology, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.16).

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Reference	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
	supporting characterisation of new or existing disposal sites if they are to be included as part of the Proposed Development.	Site characterisation of new or existing disposal sites has been undertaken in support of the application for development consent, see **Site Characterisation Report** (Document Reference: 5.2), and identifies any requirements for a disposal site, in line with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) scoping consultation response.
Para 2.3.8	*The ES should identify the worst-case footprint of seabed disturbance that would arise from all offshore construction activities, for example seabed clearance/preparation, and vessel jack up and anchoring. The maximum footprints of all permanent components should also be identified.*	**Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.4) identifies the worst-case footprint of seabed disturbance that will arise from all offshore construction activities.
Para 2.3.9	*The Scoping Report states that the construction of the landfall is "anticipated" to be via a trenchless technique "such as" HDD. The Inspectorate notes that commitment C-4 of Scoping Report Appendix A states that a HDD technique "will" be used at the landfall location. No other trenchless or trenched techniques are presented. The ES should describe and assess the options considered in this regard and the assessment of alternatives should explain the reasons for the selected option(s).*	**Section 4.4 of Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) describes the construction of the landfall and techniques to be adopted. **Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) provides a description and assessment of the techniques considered for landfall. The reasons for the selected landfall technique are provided in **paragraphs 3.9.14** to **3.9.18** in **Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3).
Para 2.3.10	*Onshore* *Paragraph 2.3.38 of the Scoping Report explains that, in addition to buried cabling, onshore cable installation methods such as HDD will be also be used as required to avoid or*	**Appendix 4.1: Crossings schedule, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.4.1) identifies the locations and types of all trenchless crossings and is cross-referenced in the ES where appropriate.

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Reference	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
	minimise potential effects where constraints are identified, including environmentally sensitive water course crossings, major roadways and railways. The ES should identify the locations and type of all such crossings. Where reliance is placed in the ES on the use of a specific method as mitigation, the Applicant should ensure that such commitments are appropriately defined and secured. The Inspectorate notes that commitment C – 18 of the Scoping Report Appendix A refers to a "Crossing Schedule" being produced, and this should be cross-referenced throughout the aspect chapters where special crossing types are relevant.	Where reliance is placed in the ES on the use of a specific method as mitigation (such as HDD), the ES ensures that such commitments are appropriately defined and secured. **Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) provides a description and assessment of the techniques considered for trenchless crossings in **paragraphs 3.9.19** to **3.9.25** in **Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3). **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) identifies the locations and types of all trenchless crossings. Where reliance is placed in the ES on the use of a specific method as mitigation, this will be secured through the DCO.
Para 2.3.11	*Paragraph 2.3.45 of the Scoping Report explains that onshore cable construction may be phased and there is a possibility that the installation of all onshore cables may not occur in a single operation. It is also explained that haul roads, and any construction compounds will be removed, and reinstatement will take place on completion of the installation. The construction programme should be defined in the ES on the basis of a worst case in respect of phasing periods. The ES should identify where new access routes, either temporary or permanent, are required to access the onshore cable corridor and compounds, as well as the duration for which*	The construction programme is defined in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) and is based on a worst case. **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) identifies where new access routes, either temporary or permanent, are required to access the onshore cable corridor and construction compounds, as well as the duration for which they will be required in light of phasing (e.g.,

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Reference	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
	they will be required in light of phasing (eg how long they will need to be retained for in light of cable installation in multiple operations).	how long they will need to be retained for in light of cable installation in multiple operations).
Para 2.3.12	*The Scoping Report identifies the need for joint bays and link boxes "at regular intervals along the route" to enable the cable installation and connection process. Regular intervals are defined as 600 – 1,000m in C-19, Appendix A of the Scoping Report, although it does define whether their locations will be determined by the time the application is made. The Inspectorate anticipates this may not be the case. If uncertainty persists, the ES should identify a worst-case scenario for the number of jointing pits and link boxes that may be required, and their impact during both construction and operation. Where commitments are made at specific locations to mitigate any potential effects, these should be secured through the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (or equivalent) as referred to at paragraph 4.4.27 of the Scoping Report.*	Joint Bays (JBs), Fibre Optic Cables (FOC) JBs, and Link Boxes (LBs) are required at regular intervals along the onshore cable route; this is dependent on onshore substation, onshore cable route and length, as described in Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) (Paragraph 4.5.18). Any impacts associated with JBs, FOC JBs and LBs during construction and, operation and maintenance are identified and assessed in aspect Chapters 17: Socio-economics to 29: Climate change, Volume 2 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.17 to 6.2.29). Where commitments are made at specific locations these are detailed through the Outline CoCP (Document Reference: 7.2).
Para 2.3.13	*For the avoidance of doubt, the Inspectorate understands that the connection of the new substation to the existing National Grid Bolney substation would be via underground cabling (as is implied but not expressly stated at paragraphs 2.3.34 - 2.3.48 of the Scoping Report). The Inspectorate expects the ES to provide greater clarity as to the necessary connection works between the new substation and the Bolney substation (up to 5km away). This is particularly important if / where construction and operation of the connection may be of a different form or type (e.g. overhead line) to the connection of*	The connection of the new onshore substation to the existing National Grid Bolney substation will be via underground cabling included as part of the Proposed Development. **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) outlines the necessary extension works to the existing National Grid Bolney substation and works for the cable between the onshore substation and National Grid Bolney substation.

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Reference	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
	the new substation to the landfall. In addition, paragraph 2.3.35 states that the existing National Grid Bolney substation would require "underground cables and minor upgrades", and it is unclear whether these works would be part of the Proposed Development (as associated development) or subject to separate consent by National Grid or another party. These matters should be clearly set out in the ES and likely significant effects should be assessed.	
Para 2.3.17	*Flexibility* *The Inspectorate notes the Applicant's desire to incorporate flexibility into their draft DCO (dDCO) and its intention to apply a 'Rochdale Envelope' approach for this purpose. Where the details of the Proposed Development cannot be defined precisely, the Applicant will apply a worst-case scenario, as set out in section 2.2 of the Scoping Report. The Inspectorate welcomes the reference to Planning Inspectorate Advice Note nine 'Using the 'Rochdale Envelope' in this regard.*	The Rochdale Envelope approach has been applied where appropriate. Where applied, a maximum design scenario will be adopted. Assessment assumptions associated with the maximum design scenario are provided throughout **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.4), and **Chapters 6: Coastal processes** to **29: Climate change, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29). The Planning Inspectorate *Advice Note Nine 'Using the Rochdale Envelope'* (Planning Inspectorate, 2018) has been adhered to.
Para 2.3.18	*The Applicant should make every attempt to narrow the range of options and explain clearly in the ES which elements of the Proposed Development have yet to be finalised and provide the reasons. At the time of application, any Proposed Development parameters should not be so wide-ranging as to represent effectively different developments. The development parameters will need to be clearly defined in the DCO and in the accompanying ES. It is a matter for the*	**Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.3) provides a narrative on how options considered for the Proposed Development have been refined and narrowed during the iterative design process. A summary of the refinement of the design of the Proposed Development between PEIR and ES is provided in **Section 4.1** of **Chapter 4: The Proposed**

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Reference	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
	Applicant, in preparing an ES, to consider whether it is possible to robustly assess a range of impacts resulting from a large number of undecided parameters. The description of the Proposed Development in the ES must not be so wide that it is insufficiently certain to comply with the requirements of Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations. In this regard, the Inspectorate expects that the component parameters presented in tables 2.2 and 2.3 of the Scoping Report will be refined and further detailed as part of the ES.	**Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.4). Assessment assumptions are provided in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.4).
Para 3.3.11	*The Inspectorate understands that the maximum height to blade tip of the Proposed Development's WTGs is 325m, whereas those installed as part of Rampion 1 are 140m to blade tip. This is likely to be a key consideration across the aspect chapters of the ES (particularly landscape and visual, cultural heritage and socio-economics), and the ES should be clear as how the magnitudes of effects of the Proposed Development (within the design envelope) account for the relationship with the Rampion 1 project*	Details of the maximum assessment assumptions are set out in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4) and within each aspect **Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29). The full assessment of effects of the Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs) in relation to seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, landscape and visual impact assessment historic environment and socio-economics, is provided in **Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Chapter 17: Socio-economics, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact**, and **Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.15, 6.2.17, 6.2.18 and 6.2.25).
Para 3.3.13	*As set out in paragraph 2.3.11 of this Scoping Opinion, the ES should be clear as to the potential construction*	An outline construction programme is presented and described in this chapter (**Section 4.7** of **Chapter 4:**

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Reference	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
	programme options where the installation of all onshore cables may not occur in a single operation. Paragraph 4.4.26 and Figure 2.7 of the Scoping Report states that the construction of the Proposed Development will have a duration of approximately 5 years although it does not clearly state how this accounts for flexibility in the onshore construction programme and whether this accounts one or more cable installation operations.	**The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.4)).
Para 3.3.14	*Residues and Emissions* *The EIA Regulations require an estimate, by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions. Specific reference should be made to water, air, soil and subsoil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation and quantities and types of waste produced during the construction and operation phases, where relevant. This information should be provided in a clear and consistent fashion and may be integrated into the relevant aspect assessments.*	Information on anticipated emissions from the Proposed Development is provided in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4). and relevant aspect **Chapters 6: Coastal processes to 29: Climate change, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29). An **Outline Site Waste Management Plan** (Document Reference: 7.3) has been prepared and submitted as part of the DCO Application.
Para 4.4.5	*It is not yet confirmed which method of cable protection will be adopted for the proposed development, though it is noted that cable burial is the preferred option. The ES should explain the types of cable protection which could be used, and the associated impacts upon benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology.*	The exact form of offshore cable protection to be used will depend upon local ground conditions, hydrodynamic regime/processes, and the selected cable protection contractor. However, the final choice will include one or more of the following: 1. concrete ‘mattresses’; 2. rock placement; 3. geotextile bags filled with stone, rock or gravel;

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Reference	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
		4. polyethylene or steel pipe half shells, or sheathes; and 5. bags of grout, concrete, or another substance that cures hard over time. The impacts of introduced artificial substrates have been addressed in **Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Section 9.10** (Document Reference 6.2.9) using available literature and a worst-case scenario to undertake a precautionary assessment.
Para 5.1.11	*The Scoping Report states that up to 4 trenches will be required for the installation of the onshore corridor. The ES should report the number of trenches to be used and also dimensions of each and how long they would remain open for. The intention is to use trenchless techniques where possible; the ES should assess the landscape effects which may be created by open trenches.*	**Table 18-24, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18). provides a summary of the assessment assumptions of the onshore elements of the Proposed Development with a full description provided in **Section 4.4 within Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4). Effects on landscape character/ elements as a result of the installation of the onshore cable corridor are assessed in **Appendix 18.3: Landscape assessment, Volume 4** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.4.18.3) and summarised in **Section 18.11, Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.18).

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Reference	Scoping Opinion comment	How this is addressed in this ES
Para 5.6.3	*The Scoping Report has scoped out potential impact on local roads, PRoW and the users of these routes during decommissioning works on the basis that the effects of decommissioning will be lower than construction. The Inspectorate is unable to agree that this can be scoped out at this stage as the effects and subsequent mitigation have not been quantified for the construction phase. Although the transport impacts during decommissioning works would be similar or potentially lower than during construction, the ES should assess these matters where significant effects are likely to occur.*	Acknowledged. It is anticipated that all onshore and offshore subsurface cable infrastructure will be left *in situ* as part of the decommissioning phase (outlined in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4). Decommissioning effects will relate only to the removal of the onshore substation and traffic generation will therefore be lower than during construction. An assessment of the decommissioning effects in relation to the decommissioning of the onshore substation is included in **Section 23.12 of Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.23)

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Table 1-2 First Statutory Consultation exercise (PEIR) (14 July to 16 September 2021) feedback

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
Arun District Council	Working hours should be Monday to Friday 08:00 – 18:00. HDD activities should aim to be between 07:00 – 23:00 and avoid 24-hour working where possible.	Working hours are detailed in the **Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)** (Document Reference: 7.2). When undertaking trenchless crossing techniques (such as HDD) 24-hour working will be required.
Multiple stakeholders including (but not restricted to) East Sussex County Council, West Sussex County Council and The National Trust	When deciding on the use of the smaller proposed WTGs (210m) or the larger WTGs (325m) landscape and visual impacts should be thoroughly considered.	A worst-case scenario approach for seascape, landscape and visual effects is considered thoroughly in **Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.15) and **Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.18).
Kingston Parish Council, Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	The Proposed Development (WTGs) are too close to the shoreline.	The spatial extent of the Rampion 2 Offshore Array Area has been reduced and designed according to a set of SLVIA specific design principles to reduce its field of view. Seascape, landscape and visual effects are assessed in **Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.15).
MMO	Clarification is required as to whether the duct extensions included within paragraph 4.3.65 of the PEIR (RED, 2021) are included in the total dredge figures and worst case scenario.	The potential impact of the duct extension works are not included in the dredge figures but are included in the seabed disturbance figures. The duct extension will be formed of sections of what is likely to be plastic duct with concrete collars to enable them to be placed below water. A trench will be dug following the cable route and the duct placed within it, with the excavated material used to infill the trench as soon as possible. For areas assumed to dredged,

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
		it is not intended for the material to be placed back where it was initially dredged from.
Natural England	The Proposed Development allows for up to four cables, as was proposed for Rampion 1. All four cables are now required for Rampion 1 due to issues with the cables already installed. The Applicant should justify confidence in up to four cables following lessons learned from Rampion 1.	It has been subsequently established that damage to the original two Rampion export cables was caused during the transfer of the cables from their delivery vessel to their installation vessel. The loading of cable to the cable installation vessel will be carefully designed and monitored to ensure that no damage is caused by this operation during the construction of Rampion 2. This activity is outside the scope the ES so it is not specifically addressed.
Natural England	Justification should be provided on the use of two offshore interconnect export cables and whether this is realistic given the issues experienced with the Rampion 1 export cable.	The project is proposed with up to three offshore substations and up to four offshore export circuits, as described in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4). Using all of this infrastructure will mean that two of the offshore substations will be served by only one offshore export circuit. It is generally desirable to avoid single points of failure on an export system, which is this case could be the single circuits serving the two of the offshore substations. Interconnecting these single circuit substations using additional export cable provides a means of being able to maintain a connection to a single circuit substation in the event that the export circuit serving it develops a fault.
Natural England	The Applicant should refine the Rochdale Envelope as far as possible by the submission of the application for development consent.	A Rochdale Envelope approach to the Proposed Development is used to allow flexibility within the design to accommodate further refinement during detailed design. The assessments in **Chapters 6: Coastal processes** to **29:**

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
		Climate change, Volume 2 of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.6 to 6.2.29) consider a maximum design scenario which allows flexibility to make design decisions in the future that cannot be finalised at the time of submission.
Natural England	Floatation pits increase the temporary habitat disturbance and increase suspended sediment and sediment deposition from spoil from temporary floatation pits.	Floatation pits have been removed from consideration due to engagement with stakeholders and the proposal of alternative measures (see **paragraph 8.3.30** of **Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.8)).
Shoreham Port Authority	Concerns regarding shipping and navigation and collision risk resulting from the Proposed Development.	The proposed DCO Order Limits have been reduced at the eastern extent to reduce the effect on port access to Shoreham.
The National Trust	The ES should provide justification behind the intrusion on the Birling Gap when this was a structure exclusion zone for Rampion 1.	The Exclusion Zone of the Rampion 1 Deemed Marine Licence (dML) is located entirely outside the Rampion 2 array area boundary, thereby adhering to the requirement for a Structures Exclusion Zone as set out in the Rampion 1 dML. The spatial extent of the Rampion 2 array area has been reduced and designed according to a set of seascape, landscape and visual impact specific design principles that provide embedded environmental measures by reducing the magnitude of effects and minimising harm on the perceived qualities and views of the Heritage Coast area of the South Downs National Park. The eastern extent of Rampion 2 has been reduced, avoiding the area to the east of Rampion 1 in favour of the area to the south of Rampion 1, which is further offshore at greater distance from Birling Gap (28.8km), while also reducing its field of view (lateral

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
		spread) and providing separation from Rampion 1, as described in full in **Chapter 15: Seascape, Landscape and Visual impact assessment, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.15).
WSCC	Concerns regarding a 50m working width for the construction cable corridor.	As per C-20 (see **Commitments Register** (Document Reference 7.22)), the typical construction working corridor will be 40m along the onshore cable corridor to minimise the construction footprint. At other discrete locations this may be expanded to accommodate working area for example for Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). The working corridor will be narrowed in sensitive locations where possible (for examples see C-204 and C-255, **Commitments Register** (Document Reference 7.22)) (see **Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)** (Document Reference 7.2)).

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Table 1-3 Second Statutory Consultation exercise (PEIR SIR) (18 October 2022 to 29 November 2022) feedback

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
Twineham Parish Council	Working hours should be 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 - 13:00 on Saturdays with no working at weekends, Bank Holidays or in the evenings.	Working hours are detailed in the **Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)** (Document Reference: 7.2). When undertaking trenchless crossing techniques (such as HDD) 24-hour working will be required.
WSCC	Concerns regarding large construction compounds proposed to be in place for up to three years and six months.	Mitigation on effects arising from the presence of large construction compounds are detailed within the **Outline Code of Construction Practice** (Document Reference 7.2). The likely significant effects resulting from construction compounds are assessed within the relevant chapters (see **Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.18); **Chapter 19: Air quality, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.19); **Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.21) and **Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.23)).
Natural England	Concerns regarding the viability of HDD/Trenchless Crossing through underlying geology.	Further ground investigation will be undertaken prior to the commencement of construction. Information on TC methodologies is available in the **Construction Method Statement** (Document Reference: 7.24).

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Third Statutory Consultation exercise (PEIR FSIR) (24 February to 27 March 2023) feedback

1.1.4 The third statutory Consultation exercise was undertaken from 24 February 2023 to 27 March 2023. This was a targeted consultation which focused on a further single onshore cable route alternative being considered following feedback from consultation and further engineering and environmental works. As part of this third Statutory Consultation exercise, RED sought feedback on the potential changes to the onshore cable route proposals to inform the onshore design taken forward to DCO application.

1.1.5 There were no key themes emerging from Rampion 2's third Statutory Consultation exercise specifically associated with **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** (Document Reference: 6.2.4) and how these are addressed in the ES.

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Page intentionally blank

© WSP Environment & Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd

Table 1-4 Fourth Statutory Consultation exercise (PEI) (28 April to 30 May 2023) feedback

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
Bolney Parish Council, Horsham District Council, WSCC.	The Air Insulated Switchgear (AIS) option will be less visible in the landscape from residential properties. However, while the Gas Insulated Switchgear (GIS) option has a smaller footprint it will involve the construction of a large building which will be more obvious in the landscape.	The proposal for the extension works to the existing National Grid Bolney substation did not identify significant effects as a result of the AIS or GIS option. Both AIS and GIS options are retained in the application and provided within **Appendix C: National Grid Bolney Substation Extension - Indicative Landscape Plan – GIS and AIS Option, Design and Access Statement** (Document Reference: 5.8).
Bolney Parish Council	The construction hours should be identical to those granted for the construction phase of Rampion 1.	Construction working hours are detailed in the **Outline CoCP** (Document Reference 7.2).
Horsham District Council	AIS will require a larger amount of construction traffic	The proposal for the extension works to the existing National Grid Bolney substation did not identify significant effects as a result of the AIS or GIS option. Both AIS and GIS options are retained in the application. Traffic impacts resulting from the proposed extension works at the existing National Grid Bolney substation are assessed in **Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference 6.2.23).
WSCC	The AIS extension option has a larger footprint than the GIS option, therefore may result in a larger degree of harm.	The proposal for the extension works to the existing National Grid Bolney substation did not identify significant

Stakeholder	Theme	How this is addressed in this ES
		effects as a result of the AIS or GIS option. Both AIS and GIS options are retained in the application.

1.2 Glossary of terms and abbreviations

Term (acronym)	Definition
DCO Application	An application for consent under the Planning Act 2008 to undertake a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project made to the Planning Inspectorate who will consider the application and make a recommendation to the Secretary of State, who will decide on whether development consent should be granted for the Proposed Development.
Environmental Statement (ES)	The written output presenting the full findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment.
Preliminary Environmental Information Report	The written output of the Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment undertaken for the Proposed Development. It was developed to support Statutory Consultation and presented the preliminary findings of the assessment to allow an informed view to be developed of the Proposed Development, the assessment approach that was undertaken, and the preliminary conclusions on the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development and environmental measures proposed.
Preliminary Environmental Information Report Supplementary Information Report	The PEIR Supplementary Information Report (SIR) identified and provided additional supporting preliminary environmental information associated with proposed alternatives and modifications to the onshore part of the original PEIR Assessment Boundary which have been identified since the publication of the original PEIR (RED, 2021) in July 2021.
Preliminary Environmental Information Report Further Supplementary Information Report	The PEIR Further Supplementary Information Report (FSIR) identified and provided further preliminary environmental information associated with the proposed alternative route option identified since the publication of the original PEIR and PEIR SIR in July 2021 and October 2022 respectively (RED, 2021; 2022).
Proposed Development	The development that is subject to the application for development consent, as described in **Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2** of the ES (Document Reference: 6.2.4).

Scoping Opinion	A Scoping Opinion is adopted by the Secretary of State for a Proposed Development.
RED	Rampion Extension Development Ltd (the Applicant)
WTG	Wind turbine generator

1.3 References

Planning Inspectorate. (2020). *Scoping Opinion: Proposed Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm, Case Reference: EN010117.* [Online] Available at: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010117/EN010117-000045-EN010117%20Scoping%20Opinion.pdf [Accessed 27 July 2023].

Rampion Extension Development (RED), (2020). *Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report.* [Online] Available at: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010117/EN010117-000006-EN010117%20-%20Scoping%20Report.pdf [Accessed 27 July 2023].

Rampion Extension Development Limited (RED), (2021). *Preliminary Environmental Information Report 2021.* [Online] Available at: https://rampion2.com/consultation-2022/documents/#documents2021 [Accessed 27 July 2023].

Rampion Extension Development Limited (RED), (2022). *Preliminary Environmental Information Report: Supplementary Information Report (PEIR SIR) 2022.* [Online] Available at: https://rampion2.com/consultation-2022/documents/ [Accessed 27 July 2023].

Rampion Extension Development Limited (RED), (2023a). *Preliminary Environmental Information Report: Supplementary Information Report (PEIR FSIR) 2023.* [Online] Available at: https://rampion2.com/consultation-2023/consultation-2023-documents/ [Accessed 27 July 2023].

Rampion Extension Development Limited (RED), (2023b). *Preliminary Environmental Information – Bolney Substation Extension Works.* [Online] Available at: https://rampion2.com/consultation-proposals-2023-bolney/ [Accessed 27 July 2023].

Rampion 2
WIND FARM