

Bolney PC, RR-042; Use of single track lanes:

Bolney Parish Council make the following, very reasonable, request about the use of minor lanes, which I hope you would agree with.

"The use of the Broxmead Lane/A23 and Hickstead/A23 junctions must be prohibited for all vehicles. There must be no use by any vehicle of the roads in the centre of the village of Bolney or any of the narrow, rural minor roads in any circumstances including London Road, Bolney Chapel Road, Foxhole Lane, Jeremys Lane, Spronketts Lane and Cross Colwood Lane; "

However, how then can it be reasonable to use the totally unsuitable single track Kent Street for HGVs and LGVs to both access the cable route and to avoid the Cowfold AQMA, or to use Dragons Lane and Moatfield/Kings Lane, which are smaller still?

I agree with their request that "The permitted construction route through the Parish for all construction vehicles - that is HGVs, large and small vans, construction workers and private vehicles – must be on the A23, A272 and Wineham Lane only." But it highlights the view, I believe held by most reasonable people who understand this location, that the plan to use the Oakendene site, and the ill thought out consequences of choosing this site, has resulted in the use of far more problematic lanes to bring the cable route there than would be the case at Wineham Lane North or South.

RR-158; Flooding at the Oakendene substation site:

I would like to support the views in this Relevant Representation that the flood risk at Oakendene is downplayed by Rampion, and will be providing video evidence of the flooding at this site later in the examination.

I would also like to point out, having read the Flood risk assessment (document 6.4.26.2) that there is an error in the information provided by the applicant, which prevents proper assessment of the evidence.

Firstly, in the Sources of Information and Consultation section on Page 9, it is clear that HDC were not involved in the meetings about this topic until June 2022, when the substation site had virtually been chosen. Indeed, the June minutes say that the announcement about the substation is imminent. The action summary from the April 2022 meeting, which included Mid Sussex DC and WSCC, but not HDC, includes the following:

"Wood agreed to check and communicate which districts the substation option sites are in (MSDC or Horsham Council)."
GD actioned -"Bolney Rd/ Kent Street Substation Option lies within
HDC and the Wineham Lane North Option lies within MSDC"

In other words, up to that point they did not know that Oakendene was in Horsham district and had not been engaging with HDC about the site options, only Mid Sussex, thus skewing the decision-making process. They may have been engaging with Horsham about the cable route and flood risk assessment, however.

Also, apart from the list of attendees and the Action Summaries, the minutes of the two meetings are identical. I assume they relate to the June meeting, as MB from Horsham was not listed in the April meeting, but can't be certain. Obviously, we have no indication of what was discussed in April. This is another example of the poor attention to detail in the DCO submission.

This lack of realisation by Rampion that Oakendene fell within Horsham district may also explain why HDC do not appear to have been involved in substation related discussions about noise and vibration, or soils and agriculture, until 2022, whilst they may have been taking part in cable route discussions before that. The skewed comparative input from the two councils about the substation sites may have helped sway Rampion 's 'marginal' decision to choose Oakendene; of course, Mid Sussex were likely to have favoured Oakendene as it is not on their patch, and they were far more able to provide relevant data about the Wineham sites than about Oakendene.