



24 August 2023
Our Ref: DNB739/HC

Telephone: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@batchellermonkhouse.com

FAO Mr M Porter
Horsham District Council
Parkside
Chart Way
Horsham
East Sussex
RH12 1RL

Sent by email only: [REDACTED]@horsham.gov.uk

Dear Sirs,

**Rampion 2 Project
Adequacy of Consultation Representation**

We write, as Agent, on behalf of the below parties, all of whom farm and reside within this District, to raise the shared concerns regarding the consultation process, with Rampion 2, to date:

Mr G Talbot, [REDACTED]

Mr and Mrs T Chapman, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

R G Nash & Sons, [REDACTED]

Mrs N Crichton- Brown, [REDACTED]

Mr M and Mrs K Cleaver, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Mr R Heath, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Mr C How, [REDACTED]



The above include both freehold and leasehold interests and are representative of the different uses encountered along the route; to include residential, agricultural, commercial, and

equestrian. The impact the scheme will have on each, will inevitably vary. However, opinion towards the unsatisfactory consultation process is unanimous.

A summary of these concerns are outlined below. It is proposed to raise these in more depth with the Planning Inspectorate directly, but we wanted to bring them to your attention, ahead of you submitting your response on the 25th August.

1) **Route selection process**

The process in determining the route lacked early engagement. It is considered that engagement of engineers should have been sought from the outset, in order to select the best route, far earlier on in the consultation process. Instead, it appeared the majority of the route was decided remotely, and the impact and suitability has been addressed, if it has been addressed at all, as a secondary matter.

2) **Consideration of businesses**

It is considered that there has been an insufficient platform to voice concerns as to the serious impact the route is going to have on the business interests of parties. Numerous requests have been made, to have the opportunity to explain and discuss in person, in detail, the considerable economic effect on the businesses the route will have, to no avail. We emphasise that these attempts have not been to resist the route, but instead, to try and work with the project, to help address these concerns early on, to help mitigate the damage. This is considered a significant shortfall of the project, at the expense of all stakeholders involved.

3) **Representation response**

The level of response provided to the representations submitted at Public Consultation level has been inconsistent. Following the Public Consultation, there has been very little attempt to engage further, which has given the impression that the Project is relying largely on its' compulsory purchase powers, and that individual concerns, and moreover, attempts to mitigate these ahead of the DCO submission, have been unsatisfactory.

4) **Heads of Terms**

The Heads of Terms have proposed that our clients sign away very extensive and vague rights over their farms and property which have, especially during the construction phase, the possibility of seriously disrupting their businesses. We ask that Rampion 2 engage at a farm by farm and business by business level to work through solutions' that will work and alleviate our clients very real worries.

We emphasise that the underlying cause for concern stems from the frustration as to the lack of engagement, the inconsistent approach, and unwillingness to take on board constructive feedback that would, in the longer term, be of benefit to both Rampion and landowners alike.

We urge that this response is taken into account when composing your response to the Planning Inspectorate.

Should you wish to discuss this further, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Yours faithfully



Batcheller Monkhouse