

AUDIO_RAMPION2_OFH1_SESSION1_0602 24

Tue, Feb 06, 2024 4:15PM • 1:22:32

00:06

Good afternoon.

00:09

Can all those present hear me okay

00:14

and can I confirm that the live streaming of the event has commenced?

00:22

It is now 2:30pm Welcome to the open floor hearing in relation to the application made by rampion. Extension limited for the proposed rampion to offshore wind farm which is now open. My name is Steven Rani. I am a chartered town planner. I am an examining inspector and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of the panel of inspectors to examine this application. We are employed by the planning Inspectorate. Can I ask my colleagues to introduce themselves pleased button with Miss below.

00:55

My name is Claire below. I'm a chartered scientist and chartered environmentalist and a member of Siam, the Chartered Institute of Water and Environmental Management. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the examining authority for this application.

01:10

Good afternoon, everybody. I'm Richard Allen. I'm a charter town planner and examining inspector and appointed by the Secretary State to be the lead member of the panel of inspectors examining this application.

01:26

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Joe Sullivan. I'm a chartered town planner. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the examining authority for this application.

01:41

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Richard Morgan. I'm a chartered engineer and fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the examining authority for this application.

01:55

Thank you. Together we constitute the examining authority or exa for this application. For those joining online in the arrangement conference and those who are present in this room, you may have already spoken to Lily Robins who is our case manager for this project. She is supported by colleagues from the case team and the planning Inspectorate. Before we consider the items in the agenda, we just need to deal with a few housekeeping matters and general observations. I will try to get through these as quickly as possible. Firstly, can everyone either switch off their mobile phones or other notification devices or switch phones to Silent

02:30

there are toilets here, but they are back towards reception. So it's a fair walk. They're the closest ones that we have, unfortunately,

02:39

for fire exits, these are straight out to the doors, and then I believe it's a right and a left. There was no fire alarm test expected the day as far as we understand the alarm does go off. It's like to be genuine.

02:53

Can I also just check to see if anyone has had difficulties in accessing the room today, given the steps to get your from reception?

03:02

Or does anyone know of anyone who has a difficulty to get into this room?

03:07

Okay.

03:10

If you intend in online or on Microsoft Teams, please get your camera off and microphone muted unless you're speaking with us. If you wish to speak and one to our attention, then please use the raise hand function in teams. Thank you.

03:26

Just a little bit about open floor hearings. Normally Open floor hearings are held at the request of interested parties. This open for here and has been called by the XOR because we wish to hear from interested parties who desire to be heard as early as possible in the examination. It is an opportunity for the AXA to hear firsthand your thoughts about the application.

03:49

It will also allow us to discuss in more detail any of the points raised today at the issue specific hearing, which begins tomorrow and on Thursday and possibly Friday. This week.

04:01

I would like to reassure you that we are familiar with the documents that you have sent in. So when speaking or answering questions, please, you do not need to repeat at length something that's already been submitted. If you wish to refer to information already submitted, I would be grateful if you could provide the appropriate planning Inspectorate examination Library Reference. Could I also please ask that the first time you use an abbreviation or acronym that you give it as full title, as there will be people here today or listening on the audio who may not be as familiar with the application or document as you are?

04:37

It is the access intention to hear from interested parties in the first instance. And then from those who have pre registered to speak an interested party as identified by those persons set out under Section 102 of the Planning Act of 2008. Specifically and in relevance to this afternoon's hearing, it means persons who have made relevant representations alongside some local authorities and

05:00

To the parties, after which any interested party who has not pre registered, but wishes to speak will be invited to do so, afterwards. The open floor human will run until all interested parties have made their own representations and have had the response and have responded to the examining authorities. Exploration of all the matters arising from them should time permit the examiner authority will then consider asking for any contributions from other persons who may be present for the planning purposes or the person so those persons who are not interested parties, but have made representations after the close of relevant representation period. But before this morning's preliminary meeting. Finally, again should time permit the examiner authority will then hear from any non interested party who wishes to speak. The examining authority reminds those persons present that non interested parties can speak only today at the discretion of the examining authority

05:59

to make best use of time and whilst not wishing to prevent persons from wishing to speak, it will be in great assistance. If points were not repeated, you can rest assured that the examiner authority will have understood the point made at the first time

06:14

the examining authority will offer the applicant the right to respond following the discussions. Although we acknowledge the applicant may not wish to respond at this meeting, it may be necessary to impose the same time restriction on the applicant as we have for all our participants. Following any response from the applicant, that meeting will close.

06:34

We have conducted this meeting in accordance with section 9394 The plan act 2008. And the infrastructure planning rules 2010. Specifically rule 14 relating to the procedure at hearings. I would like to remind you that section 94 Eight of the 2008 Planning Act gives the examining authority power to disallow representations to be made at the hearing if the examining authority considers that that the representations are irrelevant, vexatious or frivolous, relate to the merits or policy set out in a national

policy statement repeats to other representations already made in any form or by any person or related to compensation for compulsory acquisition of land or the interest in rights in or right over that land.

07:21

As the hearing today has been recorded, the only official record of the proceedings is the recording, which will be uploaded onto the inspectors website as soon as practicable after the hearing, social media comments or messages, blogs or similar forms of communication arising out the meeting will not be accepted as evidence in the examination of this application. For the purposes of the recording, and for reference, when you do speak, please can I ask you to state your name and your interest in the case?

07:51

To ensure everyone can have their say, Please can I ask that each individual speaker keep to a limit of five minutes, unless you are speaking on behalf of a community or larger group, in which case you can have eight minutes to speak. I shall let you know when you are approaching that time limit.

08:08

Can I just check and ask if there's anyone from the press here or anyone here who intends to record this hearing?

08:18

That okay.

08:20

We have a list of persons who are registered to speak today. And we will invite you intern to come and sit at the table with a microphone to make your speech or we can bring the microphone to you. Unless of course you're joining online.

08:37

So I just want to go through this list. These are those who I've got down as specifically requested to speak. But first of all, it's Mr. Andrew Griffis MP, which I believe who I believe is online.

08:53

Yeah.

08:54

Okay. Thank you. We'll come back to you shortly. And I've also got Miss Mosley from Brighton and city council, buttonhole City Council. Sorry.

09:05

Okay, thank you. And Miss Smethurst on behalf of Cofield and rampion, but also on behalf of yourself, is that correct?

09:19

Just cold and rampion today. Okay, thank you.

09:23

I've got a list of other people who have registered to attend. So what I would like to do is just go through that list. If you'd like to let me know you're here and also if you are actually intended to speak okay. First of all, I got Mr. Elkington from West Sussex County Council

09:42

are here at the moment.

09:45

Okay.

09:49

I also got down from Horsham District Council, Councillor Lambert and Mr. Porter.

09:56

So

09:58

now

09:59

we

10:00

tend to tend to speak just in attendance. Okay, that's fine. Thank you so much.

10:05

I've got

10:07

MS Cray

10:11

Okay, that's fine. Thank you very much.

10:14

Resident Ms. Susan Davis.

10:18

Okay, what do you intend to speak today or just you want to speak to okay

10:27

and Mr. Etherton

10:33

Are you looking to speak today as well?

10:38

Okay.

10:40

I've got Miss Lemoine.

10:44

There Hello. Yes

10:52

Then there's Mr. Dixon. Thomas Dixon

11:00

like thank you

11:02

I've got I think online Miss patch

11:11

Yes, I'm here. I'm just attending to listen. Not speak. Okay. Thank you very much. And Mr. Fishel

11:23

let's say you intend to speak

11:30

and I'm not sure if the attendance Mr. Brookside

11:37

representing the

11:41

problem okay. Thank you

11:45

Mr. Reaves.

11:49

Might be online

11:52

oh no Yeah. Okay. And the last one I got down here is Mr. Profit Clark

12:04

he's not

12:05

I'm here online just not intending to speak. Okay. Thank you.

12:12

Is there anyone else I might have missed out who wishes to speak today?

12:17

Yes sir.

12:29

Ask you registered as an interested party.

12:39

Okay, thank you.

12:41

Just Firstly, I would just want to have a few words about the general data protection regulation or GDPR. You will note from the exes letter dated 14 to December 2023, which we will going forward referred to as the real six letter that this event has been recorded as well as being live streamed to interested parties who request this, the digital recordings have obtained and published, they form a public record that can contain your personal information, and to which the GDPR applies the planning Inspectorate practice is to obtain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the sector states decision of the application. Consequently, if you participate in today's hearing, it is important that you understand you will be recorded, and that you will therefore consent to the retention and publication of this digital recording. We will only ever ask you for information to be placed on the public record that is important and relevant to this planet decision. It will, it will only be in the rarest of circumstances that we might ask you to provide personal information of the type that most of us would prefer to keep private or confidential. Therefore to avoid the need to edit or the digital recordings. What we would ask is that you try your best not to add any information to the public record that you would wish to be kept private. All that is confidential. Does anybody have any questions on the matter of GDPR?

14:11

I shall then call those who are representing a group or community first then individuals to speak afterwards. Can I firstly ask if Mr. Andrographis MP would like to speak for his minutes please?

14:26

Thank you very much. And

14:30

can you hear me Mr. Chairman?

14:33

Okay, can we hear Can you see me but thank you very much indeed for the panel for allowing me to speak. I am as you say the Member of Parliament for Arundel and Southdowns and I represent 88,000 residents who are impacted particularly by the proposed onshore cable motorway. I am supported with renewable energy, but in my view, this is the wrong project in the wrong place, and the majority of the 40 kilometre cable motorway

15:00

runs through parishes in my constituency from Livingston in the south, all the way through to the substation bolney and the proposed new substation or kaufhold, it will be hugely damaging to communities and wildlife habitats within the very special landscape of the South Downs National Park, particularly during its construction phase, but it will disrupt households and businesses in West Sussex for many years. John Gurdon, a Western based farmer and landowner made the critical point that this project falls way short at the standards that should reasonably be expected. And that parish councils who are the representative voices for 1000s of residents feel and have simply not been listened to alternative routes, which would have carried greater support have been dismissed for what appears to be simply a quicker and least expensive option. So I've got five key points to make to you, panel members today. First of all, I would just note in passing that this hearing is in Brighton, and yet most of the impacts are not felt in Brighton, but within a vast swathe of the South Downs, nowhere near Brighton at all.

16:10

The second is that consideration of the alternatives is a clear policy requirement in the examination of nationally important infrastructure projects that disrupt designated landscapes, their functions and National Protection objectives. That's the requirement here that I'm sure familiar that forgive me, but I know you'll be familiar with that. In this case, I refer to the South Downs National Park. And I put it to the project team as I have throughout every stage of the consultation, that their project would have much greater support, and less environmental and human impact if they use the existing cable route for rampion. One or something that was very close to that, and I have never received a satisfactory explanation as to why that couldn't be the case and why it shouldn't and couldn't be an alternative to these disruptive DCO plans. You will hear from many residents I believe over the course of this process and will have received many letters, including from myself on the 23rd of September about clear failures in how the consultation was conducted. And that's particularly the case for those living in California near the proposed new substation, but also been shared with you by the lemon stir and Washington parish councils. And I'm surprised that this application has got so far without considering some of the deficiencies in the consultation and representation. I believe there's been a comprehensive failure to engage properly with landowners, businesses and residents. As an example that maps provided part prior to the DCO. The only ones that were available to be consulted on lacked the detail that was needed for most residents to make their informed assessment. Livingston Parish council told you that members of the community have previously responded to the consultation exercise, yet very few of the views submitted or roots traversing high quality farmland have been considered. In California

residents have been able to demonstrate that they were not informed of the proposal to locate the rampion substation opened Dean farm until the second consultation when they had just weeks to collate the ecological and geographical information needed to evidence their objections. I believe you'll hear more from that from Mrs. Smith first, Washington parish council responded to the second consultation, but expressed their dissatisfaction with the process and the engagement. They stated that route and access plans in particular have been produced in such a way that it's difficult to identify the underlying map information. In summary, the consultation has been very poor, and a part of an informed consultation and informed consent is providing the necessary information. My next point is disruption to local communities. The whole idea of this project has already caused considerable blight and put a real pressure on landowners and parish councils with the additional costs to employ professionals to make their own responses and feedback. I have yet to see any information of the impact that rampion construction works will have on traffic especially on the A 24 and the a 272. And I hope there will be the ability for the panel to go and see these roads for themselves and the difficulties that are already on there. That's on top of the industrial compounds related to construction of each section of cabling. Of note is the fact that both kaufhold and Storrington are air quality management areas, the latter with vehicle weight restrictions in place. So this route is going to impact very significantly on traffic congestion, pollution and invite

20:00

Mental sensitivity. My focal point is lack of mitigation to harm environments.

20:07

The the even even the more technically literate readers struggled to evaluate the full ecological and environmental impacts of given the information that was provided. But what we do know is that vast swathes of precious Greenland will be carved up and scarred, the green and chalk soil disrupted and the surface disturbed for many, many years. Even today, you can see evidence of where the first cable route runs and the soil simply has not recovered to its natural biome. Sherman re parish council have made the points that roads and verges are still showing damage from the first cable route. Loss of precious amenities is also a major factor worthy of your consideration, such as the Washington recreation ground, which is a protected green space, a registered community asset that would be impacted, and small villages don't have alternatives. Unlike in big urban areas, the South Downs National Park Authority have given their clear objection to the plans and this should in my opinion, carry the greatest weight and be a stark warning about the damage the onshore cable route will inflict on this precious National Park landscape. They state the significant adverse harm the proposal would cause and the wholly inadequate mitigation and compensation as to why they cannot support a rumbleon to wind farm I joined my voice to this. I also asked that you give consideration to the points made by those residents who've taken time to prepare and deliver reports to evidence the impact on people and natural habitats, including those prepared by protect coastal West Sussex, which incorporates the kaufhold action group, and those submitted to you by the many farmers and landowners along the entire route. Thank you very much for your time, you can tell that this is a topic that raises extreme passion and concern amongst those who I seek to do my duty and represent both at today's inquiry throughout this process and in Westminster.

22:22

Thank you very much, sir.

22:24

Thank you.

22:41

Mr. GRIFFIS, I hope you haven't gone. I just got one question for you. In your, your representation, you talked about rampion one effects and the scoring of the soil. Is that something you can provide some more written information in at the next deadline? I would I would like to see some further evidence on that if you're if you're able to provide that. Yes, look, I'll do my very best. That was something that the South Downs National Park commissioned a visual drone survey, an aerial survey, and I saw that video so that's where that's coming from, and I will do my best to help the panel have access to that. Thank you very much.

23:30

Okay,

23:32

I'm looking now to move on to the next speaker. We've got

23:41

Miss Mosley from Brighton Hove City Council.

23:45

Do you want to you can come forward or use the microphone there.

23:52

Good afternoon.

24:04

Okay, if you just want to turn the microphone on, if it's not ready. It's great. Okay, go ahead.

24:12

Thank you. Yes, I'm Jane Mosley. I'm a planning manager at Brighton and Hove City Council are going to be relatively brief as we've provided a relevant representation and I'll set out more detail on our local impact report. I want to first note that Brighton and Hove City Council supports the principle of the scheme and the provision of renewable energy to help address climate change targets including our own. But I would note, I'd also note how central the city of Brighton and Hove is to the rampion projects. The Visitor Centre is here just across the road ramp project used to be staffed from here. Both examinations including this one have been held here.

24:49

However, what we do want to get across is our frustration at the way the applicant has failed to engage with the council during the process. Despite the project submission clearly showing that Brighton and Hove would be

25:00

subjected subjected to significant long term adverse impacts along our coastline.

25:06

We appreciate the applicant is focused on the impacts of the cable route given the numerous complicated constraints and land ownership issues. However, as the applicant has been at pains to say that impact will be for four years during the construction process, we also appreciate the need to minimise the impacts of the offshore works on the South Downs National Park. However, as with the previous scheme, Brighton and Hove will be significantly affected by the offshore works, both during the construction and the operation for a period of at least 34 years. As you would see from looking across the road here on a clear day,

25:40

the existing turbines are clearly visible along much of the horizon, the turbines proposed and Rankin to, will be even more so having an impact described in the SLV IA as moderate, sorry major, significant major moderate. Despite this Brighton host city council has been peripheral to the process of bringing the scheme forward. Again, we understand why the applicant has been focused on minimising the impacts on the national park, but this should not be to the exclusion of the largest population centre along the coast. Brighton and Hove has 11 kilometres of coastline, all of which would be affected as it is now. Views from the coast as central to daily life and Brighton and Hove, many of the 250,000 residents live here precisely because of its coastal location. Literally 10s of millions of people visit here each year because of its low coastal location. Open views over the sea towards the horizon are exactly what brings many people to Brighton and Hove, specifically to the area's beaches and promenade. As noted in the SLV EIA, the expanded wind farm will be a prominent element as an addition to the east and west of the existing rampion one wind farm. So it will have a significant impact on a significant number of people.

26:55

The coastline is urban but it's sensitive. Being home to numerous heritage features seven coastal conservation areas and numerous listed buildings including the two piers, railings, shelters, grand residences, such as the Royal crescent and Sussex square and the Madeira Tierra terrace, which extends 865 metres along the coast, much of the way from the palace pier to the marina. It's cited as being a very as being very rare being the only known land based monumentally scaled on Promenade in England, and possibly worldwide. And it directly faces the coast and out towards rampion. It's been concluded in relation to all of these historic features along Brighton and host coastline. But because of the distance and the visual separation from the wind farm, there'd be a low magnitude of change with the impact on these historic features not significant. It's difficult to reconcile this with the change in view that's apparent from the viewpoints provided, but also with the conclusion in relation to visual impact that the harm would be major moderate,

27:56

as highlighted in our relevant representation are our own four seven, we consider this in part to be the result of the understatement and misunderstanding of the deliberate design relationship. The historic features along the coast have with the sea. Given the close relationship between the conservation areas and listed buildings along the Brighton and Hove seafront, we consider the magnitude of change resulting from rampion to to be high, and the resulting significance of the effect to be major adverse, we did not consider as this has been properly assessed in the EIA, and consequently, the impact on the many historic features along the seafront of Brighton and Hove has been under assessed.

28:35

In terms of socio economic impact, we note that despite our requesting it at the pier stage, so in September 2021, rampion, has not undertaken surveys of attitudes to wind farms since rampion. One was built, saying this would only provide more ex ex ante evidence, ie before the before impianto has been built. However, the surveys would have provide ex post evidence of attitudes to wind farm, and even better a wind farm in this location, namely rampion. One, it's difficult to understand why this work wasn't undertaken, but instead limited evidence was extrapolated from other projects. Further, the evidence the applicant has provided indicates that where they've been where there have been negative impacts on tourism, this would be what by way of displacing the tourism, diverting them to neighbourhood neighbouring areas, which could clearly have a significant impact on the Brighton and Hove economy, in which more than 13% of local jobs are dependent on the tourism sector.

29:30

We note reference in the West Sussex County Council response to socio

29:34

economic issues to expecting further discussions with the applicant. And I would again the highlight that until July 2023, we have had no discussions at all with rampion and the applicant only came to us in July 2023 regarding a potential skills and employment strategy, despite us asking all the way through, even if it is accepted that the scheme would have a detrimental impact on the city's economy as we said from the start

30:00

That would not have a sorry would not have a detrimental impact on the city's economy, there would be very little social economic benefit. Any jobs during the construction stage will be centred along the cable corridor or at the ports of New Haven as they are now or Shoreham, where the maintenance facilities are also located located. Put simply, Brighton and Hove has 34 years of significant visual impact resulting from rampion to, in addition to that already experienced from rampion, one without any benefit to the city.

30:30

So what is it that we want from the process what the Brighton and Hove City Council want from this, we accept the wider benefits of renewable energy, as I've said, we know you can't hide the turbines.

30:42

We want what we want their forest offset the impact with with mitigation and compensation along the coastline contributions from rampion that will secure improvements to the city's coastline, particularly as heritage features. We want the applicant to engage with us properly to secure that, as we've requested throughout the process. From our response in writing in September 2021. The applicant acknowledges the impact on the city, Brighton and Hove is clearly central to the project, but the benefit to the city and the people as Nick as negligible, negligible. Nothing at all was secured from rampion. One. So we're asking that, with this much more substantial scheme, Brighton and Hove actually benefits in a real way that does something to mitigate the very real impacts. Thank you.

31:25

Sorry, I realise I went over the notes. But Perfect, thank you.

31:30

Any questions from?

31:37

Just Just one quick question. It's mostly will you be expanding on either in your local impact report on your written representations, the

31:49

mitigation compensation that you're looking for? You've talked about that you you're looking for, for benefits from it and you wish to engage the applicant, but I'm not clear what exactly you would need.

32:01

What you're actually seeking from that. Now, if that's something you're going to expand upon in your local impact report or your written representations are wait for that. But But if not, is that something you could just let me know specifically, this slide what what you would be looking the applicants of either do or fund.

32:21

I think it would be something we can expand on in the local impact report. And to be honest, it was something we anticipated having discussed with the applicant, up to this point to kind of lay out what we think would be appropriate but appropriate for them to, to look at working on but there's there's so many projects along the front, there's the Madera terraces, which I mentioned, need upgrading. And that's a key viewpoint at a high level out across to the, to the rampion wind farm. It's things like the visitors centre, which is lovely, but it's not secure through section 106. And there's very little benefit in terms of that to the city. But as you'll be aware, of course, if you are to request that and we are to recommend that to the Secretary of State, we will like the tests and the framework we need to to respond to those tests. And so, of course, you'll need to justify what you're looking for and to what project and how it's how they're directly related. So I look forward to receiving that from you. Thank you.

33:23

Okay, thank you very much. Thank you.

33:30

And now we're Mr. Smethurst. For representing careful Caufield versus rampion. You can stay there and you can bring a microphone to you if you'd like or forward here.

33:41

You come here. That's fine. Thank you.

33:47

It's the mother lilles. Yeah, the right hand button, little face on it. That's it. That's it. Okay, when you're ready, my name is Mira Smethurst. I'm here to represent California V. rampion. The California residents Action Group.

34:02

There is no point in having a wind farm to help us combat combat climate change. If in doing so we have destroyed the very wildlife we were seeking to protect. We have felt we feel that rampion have taken the view that they didn't really need to prove their case because they were green and we'll be nodded through. We aim to show with respect to the northern cable route and substation area, at least just how wrong it would be to do this. We have mainly looked at just this area, but we sense from the relevant representations. That the same is true across the whole DCA GCo affected area, including the fee. There is a better solution regarding the whole project as others will argue. But at least for the substation sites and associated cable route. The view across the county seems to be that the consultation has been at best tokenistic. For us. It has been much worse than that for kaufhold. There has been no meaningful consultation before October 2022 I after the substation site was announced.

35:00

Most of us had never heard of rampion even many of those in the immediate vicinity as we received our first ever section 42 letters in October 22. We have a document signed by 52 householders in our adequacy of consultation document, which confirms this until the site was chosen. It wasn't referred to buy rampion as oakdene leaflets were not delivered here. And even if they had been, they referred only to a site near the existing substation at Bondi, which gave people no real clue as to where it might have been. And for the hard to reach group of very small, often startup businesses at the Oakland Dean industrial estate, who will face certain closure. If this goes ahead. If they genuinely did contact them as they say they did. Surely the absolute radio silence from them in the first consultation must have rung alarm bells in any properly conducted consultation. proper consideration of the responses must surely include a lack of response from an area so significantly impacted. senior people on the rampion team were aware of this failure to consult it was brought to their attention in 22 by Carter Jonas, resulting in us receiving the section 42 letters that October, but they chose to ignore it, hoping it would stay hidden. Not unlike those senior post office officials who covered up the post office scandal, believing that small people couldn't fight them. But it doesn't matter how late in the day you uncover a feeling it needs to be put right. Instead, they found ways to explain it. Everyone who needed to had at least one section 42 letter at some stage during the process, we're not at a point when it might have made a difference. I was only arrived after all material decisions had been made about the substation site, and mouthfeel Lane only had theirs in April 2023. Last year, I asked Chris Tomlinson for the postcodes of all the people they had received responses from in the first round of consultation as I wanted to make a map

of where they'd come from. He refused, saying that it would all be available when the DCO was submitted, but it is not there. There is no sign of it.

36:59

We must consider how likely Grampians claims about output are to be justified, including looking at what the reality of rampion one actually was.

37:08

And the damage that they say they will do and their medications mitigations weighed against our evidence. In the coming days, we will provide evidence to show how the inflammation in the DCO significantly downplays for baseline facts about ecology and the current status of traffic economy and the social aspects of cleat people's lives and how they underestimate the negative impacts, providing an assessment of sustainability significantly biased in their favour failure to favour there is a direct result of failure to consult properly, which means they fail to understand the key constraints of the site at a time when they should have put themselves in a position to do so. They have then doggedly persisted with the decision. Even though they had to devise ever more complicated ways of dealing with the constraints that we have become apparent to them. They didn't make any attempt to seek an understanding of the site from local people. Quite the opposite. We will show tomorrow that there is no evidence they have made any attempt to try to understand why there were almost no comments coming from California. And those comments they did get they ignored. This led to an undue lack of understanding of local geography, how the 87 two works and the capacity of the road. The fact that there are no farm tracks the significant ecology at this site, the fact that the site floods and so on, there is no evidence they put themselves in a position to properly compare the two sites or the implication of choosing the OIC undines site. They did not contact the businesses on the OIC Indian industrial estate at an early stage. There is no evidence that they took into account the fact that had been no reason to survey this area. Whereas the wine area had been reasonably well surveyed for the rampion one project so that on paper, the two areas looked similar ecologically. They knew Janine crane Cray had provided them with really good evidence about the habitats and wildlife in this area, including an extraordinarily detailed visual record. But instead of trying to find out more, and make sure they were doing the right thing, they ignored her. Perhaps hoping like the post office, she would not be able to fight alone and would give up. What's more, most of the ecology field surveys were not done, or were completed after the substation site was announced so could not have been taken into account.

39:19

At the first meeting held in California, which was not until November 22, it was clear they really didn't understand the traffic on the 272 at this point, and why it was so different from the situation that the wine and Lane turn off. They had made an assumption when choosing open DNS that traffic on the at 70 wouldn't be a problem. Because it wasn't with rampion. One, they had no understanding either of how unsuitable chemistry was for HGVs. They had clearly not engaged with local people before this time. This lack of consultation is so significant because by the time they did start to get an understanding of the problem with this choice they didn't want to hear. As a result they have chosen the most damaging site on all sustainability from

40:03

From coast to California, it seems that the relevant representations from the relevant representations that there are major concerns about the environmental damage. Others will talk about the energy efficiency and the wisdom of or otherwise of the turbine turbine location. And if the damaging to Klimkin beach, the South Downs, National Park and other places, we want to focus only on the northern end of the cable route from the A to 8120. Can Dean and the substation site itself but it is clear that many of the issues we raised are repeated across the county.

40:36

Thank you very much. Has anyone got any questions from the panel?

40:46

Only I'm think matters. We will do it tomorrow. I'll I'll take misma has questions to the outcome tomorrow. So I think nothing further to ask now.

40:57

Thank you very much.

41:06

Just carrying on then looking to ask if Mr. Rainey would like to come forward.

41:31

Like look at when he already

41:34

says

41:36

speaking to you with our ongoing specific concerns regarding the rampion extension. There has proposed a temporary access road pipeline or combination of both on the field directly north of our property at brookside holiday camp limited. In Leominster bn 17 Seven QE. We had a consultation meeting with our web and cast Jonas Littlehampton in July 2021. Subsequent plans were made for consultation showing a pipeline through the middle of the field to the north of the part which to my eyes were preferable to the access road. And the latest plans show a sort of combination of both previous ones. I've also had a meeting with Nigel iBot on the 27th of October 2023, where those multi layered plans had been described as to give the project optionality.

42:28

The scope of our business and concerns were long established since the 1930s and Andhra family ownership since 1962 family holiday caravan park we own purely the one site which extends over 8.25 acres and comprises of 120 static holiday caravans and one holiday bungalow. Some of our owners have been with us since shortly after the date we took over and all are extremely valued as we are to them it's their choice of location for their holiday home from home. Whilst we are in favour of the new project in principle, and wind power as a sustainable power for the future in the quest to become carbon neutral by 2050. We believe the location of the proposed access road is entirely unsuitable for the

following reasons. We have 25 caravans that back onto the field and one holiday bungalow. The boundary is a hedge and a ditch. The construction of the caravans is a thin metal and the proposed proximity and construction noise would be extremely detrimental to our holidaymakers enjoyment of this special place. Lots of our owners come from London and the surrounding areas and live in flats. Their caravan is their garden, their space away from the hustle and bustle of everyday life. And I'm told that their mental health benefits from being here and stress levels are as result a much lower a holiday bungalows rented out on a weekly basis as a not inconsiderable cost and I cannot see many people making bookings if a busy access road is constructed only yards away from the rear garden. We have read that legal operational construction times these types of road is 7am to 7pm, Monday to Friday, and 8am to 1pm on a Saturday. This would be totally disruptive to caravan owners and holiday makers and possibly negate any reason that they have to actually have a holiday caravan here. There's not a lot of holiday accommodation in the local area and poor little Hampton area of this type either. Many owners might decide to sell up if the proposed construction road were to go ahead. This could prove financially disastrous for us especially following 16 months of COVID 19 restrictions already impacting sales and bookings. We're concerned about the noise every time anything goes over the proposed access road and the dust pollution that it would cause the document rampion to volume to chapter 20 To 22 point 9.43 states the predicted noise levels would be 85 decibels at the nearest points. Our level appears to be amongst the highest indicating our proximity and putting predicted noise

45:00

Is levels on a par with a diesel truck at 40 miles per hour at 50 feet at four decibels. Mr. Nigel Alberta Carter Jonas said on the 27th of October 2023 At a meeting with myself that he would recommend that works to the field north of us would be preferred to take place during the winter months, 1 October to the end of March in order that disruption and noise etc to our caravan owners would be kept to a minimum. He also said that noise reduction or bunding measures would still be something that can be used by rampion to to mitigate noise and dust and the timescale of that particular part of the project should be achievable in a six month timeframe. Nevertheless, we are concerned about the potential weight of vehicles that would use the proposed access road bearing in mind the bungalow at brookside has been underpinned several times. Its latest remedial work completed in June 2001 and is prone to cracking static caravan bases are not especially thick. We estimate an excavator to weigh 30 tonnes and a low loader to weigh 15 tonnes. So there's the potential for 45 tonne weights going up the access road, causing structural damages to both caravan bases and the bungalow. According to the plan at present, the proposed access road will be very close to our heads and thus to certain caravan owners bedroom windows, many of which open out onto the field north of us which has no public access along the edge of the field, but rather diagonally through Southeast to Northwest at present. This could potentially cause privacy issues in the most intimate of settings, and also potential security issues with unknown persons using the access road right by privately owned caravans. The fire drainage ditch between Brookside and the field north of us would also be vulnerable to collapse due to soil vibration. We believe that the access from the public road the A to eight four as it is at the moment at the proposed location is too narrow for lorries to turn or reverse into

46:55

into your spokesman, the rampion to spokesperson at the 2021 meeting Ellery wells mentioned that the proposed plans were initially scoped by Google Maps Earth as site visits were not viable during the

COVID 19 lockdown, but following our concerns a site visit was something she would definitely plan to ascertain why we think it is totally unsuitable to put an access road in the proposed location. We still believe in more suitable location for an access road could be found further north towards erendorn. However, if the field to the northwest wants to be used, then there is a more suitable location for an access route at the far north of the field, where residential house owners have long gardens providing better distances screening with regard to noise pollution, apart from lunch cottage at the front and of course bricks and mortar soundproofing. Again Mr. Abbott suggested the entrance to the field might be made more centrally or to the northern parts of the field rather than the southern part where there is currently a style on the farm gate. We're also concerned about disturbance of the local wildlife which includes, which includes water voles in the reed bed and ditch between the park and the field north of us destruction of habitat which is normally soft, undisturbed Earth we'd like him burrow into easily amongst tall grasses, and reed beds, where trees have been coppiced. We now see buzzards, kingfishers and casseroles and hawks occasionally, we already see the a two a four is an extremely busy road at certain times of the day with vehicles queuing, especially when the level crossing wick limits the crossing gates down often during the day and even more so with the level of road and housing construction in the area and for the foreseeable future causes huge tailbacks to the north well past that entrance. This proposed access road could seriously impact on already overloaded stretch of road. Originally, we were told the proposed access road would be temporary, but don't know the predicted timeframe for an access road being constructed or being in place. We were later told it would take about six months to construct in a consultation at Littlehampton in 2022. At the town hall chamber, Mr. Abbott said an accessory will be kept after the project was completed and were possibly used once a month or so for a Jeep or a four by four to go down to the plant area by the errand check on operations etc. He also said at this point an access road would prevent any future potential development in the field, ie farmers building houses from being built to close to our boundary. There's lots of discussion discussing ifs and buts but obviously not his purview beyond the scope of this project. Thank you for permitting me to put forward our representation.

49:36

Thank you, sir. Then we're getting questions.

49:43

Hello, Mr. Reddy.

49:45

You've probably seen that in tomorrow's issue specific three port hearing. We intend to actually explore with the applicant. The decision around locating the access road where he is proposed at the moment.

49:59

I don't know if you're aware

50:01

At the pre examination deadline,

50:04

the applicant submitted a revised code of construction practice, which is documented p p d dash 033 That is actually proposing a enhanced acoustic barrier instal life along with boundary of your caravan site and the access road. I haven't seen that one yet.

50:24

That's what I was gonna ask basically, is what your reaction to that is. Have you had any discussion with the applicant on that? Not over the acoustic barrier with options were being taught, but nothing had been

50:38

mentioned further. I hadn't seen that document, I'm afraid. Okay. That's great. Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

50:52

Okay, thank you. Just coming on to some of the individuals look at speak here. I've got Miss as Susan Davis, is it? Do you want to speak there, you can come forward if you'd like.

51:08

Okay, thank you. So, five minutes. Thank you.

51:12

Good afternoon. I think it's quite important to understand the potential implications of locating the proposed substation and oh contiene in comparison to wind and Lane, and this alternative site hasn't really is me being explored properly.

51:30

As those Can I just ask you to bring the microphone a bit closer to you so that we are so close to this that

51:36

you see all just try and speak up a bit if you can, okay.

51:40

Thank you.

51:42

As open Dean and Kent street during rush hours, the traffic extends about one two and a half miles from the edge of the village right up until two can Street. This is due to the couple of roundabouts, the pedestrian crossing, and the junctions within the village.

51:57

We understand that with this proposal, there should be two visibility splays on the 272.

52:05

right alongside Oh contine. These will be within about a half mile of each other, each about 215 metres long. So this obviously is a very hazardous section of the 272. In fact, at this point, there's

52:24

the highest number of road accidents and certainly double that of the wind and Lane junction, none of that was taken into consideration. We've asked on several occasions for rampion to provide us information about the road traffic scheme that they propose, such as traffic lights are what how they're going to manage this road.

52:46

And we haven't received anything from them.

52:51

Just to put this into context on the 87 to on average, this 18 and a half 1000 vehicles that don't get along this road at about 60 miles an hour.

53:00

And the thought of 1000s of HGVs. cutting across two lanes of traffic is quite horrendous and is likely to cause even more accidents and complete mayhem.

53:15

If you compare this against wind and Lane, where it's already has the visibility splay and it's located two and a half miles outside California village, they don't have the traffic backing up to that point. So when rampion one was built, they didn't have need for traffic lights, unlike the fact that we will, if it goes ahead at Oak and Dean,

53:40

the road traffic accidents, this analysis and this problem has been highlighted to rampion but they seem to ignore it. And were at a meeting in the summer where they said that

53:55

they would give us more information about their proposals and how they were going to deal with the traffic. But again, no proposals going forward. And I can't see anything in the documentation. But this is a significant problem.

54:08

The other problem is that when there's any sort of issue traffic lights incident along the 272 around California or towards Kent Street, traffic immediately backs up and the drivers be the delivery drivers or anyone they cut through picks lane, which has a connection from the 87 two and the 281 is a single track lane with grass verges and having

54:38

to two sets of traffic in different direction just causes absolutely mayhem. There's horse boxes that have turned over cars that have been pulled out of ditches. But none of this was none of this was mentioned or even

54:54

considered in the in the proposals and it's nowhere in the report.

55:00

rampion wants to

55:02

use Kent Street for the HGVs. Again, Kent Street is a single track lane, which is about three metres wide, and has widths restrictions and lorries just simply don't go down there are very seldomly.

55:20

Whereas one lane is a five metre road, it was built in the 1960s for the construction of the national grid, and does have leuser down this comparison, again, there was no mention of it whatsoever.

55:34

In the documents that I've read, I've found at least 20, for instance, where rampion, direct the reader to other

55:45

other chapters, and

55:50

other sections and other documents to find traffic modelling, that doesn't exist. And there's no

55:58

no data on the construction management plan. There's no detailed traffic calculations that had been disclosed, there haven't given any sort of traffic predictions.

56:11

And the road traffic accident data has been taken as a whole along the 272 not split between the two areas. So again, it's quite misleading.

56:22

I mean, I've got several examples that I won't go into everything. But the other thing that hasn't come across in the documentation at all, is that the massive disruption that all this traffic and the queuing will cause to not only the 70 businesses on the country in the state, but there's another 60 or so additional businesses in California in the village. So many people are concerned that their livelihoods would just be decimated and ruined, mainly because

56:50

many of the people on the industrial estate rely on just in time deliveries. And we found that even when there have been some roadworks on the 272 delivery drivers don't want to come down and be set in queues. So that will cause them problems. Also, say for instance, with the hospitality business in the village, they're concerned that

57:11

workers won't want to sit in traffic queues, though there's profit problems with staff retention. The driving school is concerned that he's going to be sat in the cube for 40 odd minutes, part of his two hour lesson. So the complete livelihoods and none of this has been assessed. The only thing that came out of the rampion mentioned about the economic impact was to footpaths that will be closed and that they they just seriously haven't considered it. And if say for instance, you look at the macroeconomic impact of people sitting in traffic, you've got 18,000 drivers is sitting in traffic about 15 minutes, that's 20 million pounds a year lost in lost productivity just sitting in queues. And and also there's no consideration about the impact of the traffic going off to being diverted to the other villages, apportioning political parties screen. Again, nothing has been considered at all.

58:07

The other point that we were quite concerned about and again, it looks like quite misleading, is that the information on the way was gonna say if you look to finish up the next few minutes, okay.

58:22

So the flooding

58:26

the canteen

58:28

seems to basically be a floodplain.

58:31

And although they've been given information

58:36

to this effect, the analysis seems to have been quite limited.

58:42

Although there are sections in the documents such as in six point 4.26, where the underlying topography shows that the modelling predates the development and does not provide up to date overview of surface water flooding and the increased risk other documents state that the development has the potential to increase the overall flooding and

59:07

this could also lead to increase peak runoffs and increase the risk of flooding in Downstream receptors.

59:15

All of this is in the documents and yet

59:19

at the final analysis these are negligible. So, I really think that there needs to be further studies done further surveys and

59:31

and this analysis has to be you know, full traffic surveys, proper traffic modelling.

59:38

Okay, thank you very much. Thank you. Any questions for anyone on the panel

59:47

agree much them

59:51

Can I call up? Mr. Etherton?

1:00:07

Thank you, sir. Okay,

1:00:09

so here on behalf Mr. Dixon, I'm tolerating a solicitor at Leicester Aldridge mistakes is also represented by that jokes of Lester Aldridge, so mould of onesky, Evans and Annabel grey and pool of promises television chambers, I'm not going to repeat the submissions will be made in respect to the relevant representations. And we will see address days extensively during the submission of evidence.

1:00:35

I would like to say the mystics has raised strong objection to the pros cable route, which completely extinguish his inability to continue farming.

1:00:48

Mr. Dixon is also protected under the Equality Act, and is therefore entitled to reasonable adjustments which the applicant has failed to consider.

1:00:59

He has made extensive attempts to negotiate and come to a settlement with the applicant, however, they have failed to engage with him. I'd also like to raise that they've made several inaccuracies on their land tracker in respect to the position of notice of negotiations with sticks in.

1:01:19

For example, more recently, in the updated land tracker submitted as part of the procedural deadline one applicant has stated that they have been in correspondence with Mr. Dixon in January 2024. To our knowledge that hasn't taken place.

1:01:37

Mr. Dixon is open to having comprehensive discussions with the events in respect of agreeing an alternative cable route that meets his farming needs. My past my contacts to Grampians legal team today, and awaits immediate discussions.

1:01:56

Thank you.

1:02:00

Thank you very much.

1:02:02

Any questions? Yes. Just one very quick question.

1:02:07

When you say that there's been an attempt, just to clarify when you say there's an attempt and an agreement between Mr. X and the applicant, is that to do with the actual location of the of cable roads? Or is it to do with compensation of, of land? So either deployment of horizontal directional drilling or a alternative cable route?

1:02:35

Right, so he's looking for a trenchless crossing all across his land or parts of his land, as I understand, and that will be evidence on submission on 28. February, lovely, thank you. I was just about to ask if you would, then if you could evidence that but that's that that would be very helpful. Thank you.

1:02:56

Thank you.

1:02:59

Like, call up, Miss Lemoyne.

1:03:06

I hope I'm pronouncing that correctly.

1:03:14

Okay, when you're ready, good afternoon panna.

1:03:18

I live in Littlehampton. I'm here to raise points which I did not cover in my written statement regarding Grampian to, which as it is no way attached to the comparatively diminutive rampion. One is surely not as claimed an extension.

1:03:34

You may know that a census in 2022 revealed that Littlehampton West and river area as the second most deprived neighbourhood in Aaron, Bognor Regis been described as the most deprived. I believe that this development should this development be consented, both areas will certainly become even more deprived and may not recover.

1:04:00

And as a district contains a large tourism sector, attracting many visitors to the SAS towns in the north and to our beaches in the South. Consequently, the district has a high number of seasonal employment.

1:04:14

The Office of National Statistics estimate that nearly 11% of the population is employed in the tourism sector compared to 8%. Nationally, both live Littlehampton and Bognor Regis are aware that their main asset and tourist attraction is the seaside. Littlehampton proudly boasts the prestigious Blue Flag award for the quality of the water and the beach.

1:04:38

Our industry counsellor so aware of the sea view as both an attraction and a therapeutic Leifert that they are investing in Moby chats, including wheelchair accessible hats, which are of course valued due to the seaview we may be a deprived area, but we are proud of our peaceful seaside Haven. Proud also of our grade two listed rustington

1:05:00

Lesson home, built facing the sea in 1897 by Sir Henry Harbin, one of the few remaining places in the UK which specialises in short term convalescent care, and also proud of the many architecturally protected buildings on the entire length of the south coast, which face the sea and are of course there because of this day.

1:05:22

A little further west of us along the coast is Selsey bill. Did you know that this is where Eric copes was inspired by the view. On a warm still summer evening, looking across the lagoon from the East Beach towards Bognor Regis to write Sleepy Lagoon, the theme music to Desert Island Discs, not quite so sleepy with a vista of giant wind type turbines.

1:05:49

As part of the levelling up fund initiative, our council has recently received 7.2 million pounds, but Littlehampton seafront regeneration to enhance the visitor experience and create a place where people can meet and spend time works for this are due to start this year 2024

1:06:09

inescapably during the four years of construction, possibly beginning in 2025 rampion to destroy our peaceful seaside Haven. What was the relentless noise of the piling for the up to 90 Giant turbines, the helicopters, and the inevitable traffic chaos is the necessity necessary materials and parts of what to site for at least four years, it will certainly deter any tourist. And then once completed, the serene seascape which was our greatest asset would be transformed into an ugly industrial Lister, which will persist for at least a whole generation so much for levelling up. What a waste of 7.2 million pounds. levelling up mission eight is wellbeing, meaning people feel happy and healthy in their body and mind levelling up mission nine pride of place, meaning people being proud of the area where they live,

1:07:10

to me should rampion to be permitted, we would certainly be robbed of those positive feelings. In fact, I for one, certainly move home as I would no longer feel either happy or proud to live there. Furthermore, this development would risk undermining the achievement of sustainable development. due to climate change, we are likely will likely be encouraged to spend more time and money visiting exploring and enjoying our natural coastal seascape instead of just jetting off elsewhere.

1:07:43

It would surely therefore be sensible and responsible not to despoil the degree and degrade our natural assets here for the enjoyment of current and future generations, especially when that landscape and seascape has been adjudged to be of high value and national importance. No amount of money could possibly compensate for this proposed theft in nature. This isn't just about us, I firmly believe that we have no right to tell them that the natural beauty which belongs to everyone today and to this future generations

1:08:20

sorry. As an active member and supporter of protect coastal statics group, we are deeply concerned that rampion to is actually in breach of the European Convention of landscapes, and all other forms of protections set up to protect value escapes.

1:08:38

Just before I go, I would like to mention the smallest but highly valuable casualties of this proposed development. Insects are pollinator and the bottom of the food chain. 3.5 trillion insects migrate across the south coast, including the Sussex Bay each year, 4 billion Hava fives the parade and consume 10 trillion aphids each year. None of the scoping report mentions insect migrations certainly worthy of consideration. And useful to know too that dead insects ducks the turbine blades slow down the electricity field. So surely they'd be better placed away from migrates food. Thank you.

1:09:21

Thank you very much. Can I just ask about the issue of the insects that you mentioned? Is there evidence or information along that those lines that can be submitted into the into the panel for us to look at I know for sure to be honest with you. That part was given to me by a fellow member of PCS is not well moment and I know she wanted it to be mentioned, but we can certainly get more evidence for

you. It has been mentioned and we will be putting out to the to the applicant as well on that on that point. Thank you.

1:09:52

Thank you.

1:09:54

Anything else from the panel?

1:09:58

Thank you very much.

1:10:05

I've got Mr. Fishel.

1:10:10

Thank you, sir.

1:10:16

Good afternoon. It's David physcial. On behalf of myself and my wife, Susie Fishel from Sweet Hill Farm in Ashurst. And we've we've put in relevant representations, we thought it would be useful to give the examining authority. An update on where things have got to, with the applicant

1:10:37

decide to sell with a little bit of background suito Farm is extends 232 acres. We ceased farming it intensively over 20 years ago, since when we have allowed it to rewild and it is effectively run as a nation reserve has been no significant has been no agricultural production on the land. And no fertilisers or pesticides have been applied.

1:11:00

No farm livestock has been on the land for several years and the pastures get graze down by wild deer which pass through

1:11:07

as recognised by the applicant. In its environmental statement. The farm is rich in biodiversity, and host a large variety of wildlife, including, for example, the most active that site of all the sites tested by the applicant along the route.

1:11:24

The Woodlands together with the three main watercourses passing through the form farm, and the many ponds dotted around provide key habitats for a variety of wildlife. These are further enhanced by the many wetland areas in the species rich pasture, together with a species rich headrow hedgerows and mature oaks

1:11:45

over 700 metres, which is approximately 2% of the route passes through the farm. And it's only a it's only 132 acres and serve as a portion of the southeastern part of the farm from the rest of the farm.

1:12:01

So our issues are twofold. Really they relate partly to the whole compulsorily compulsory acquisition process of the DCO, but also to the environmental effects. And I know we're dealing with the latter tomorrow, so and the specific hearing, so I won't go into any details on that now. But on the latter, as far as we're concerned, there are inconsistencies between what is included in the DCO. And the onshore route plans submitted by the applicant versus what the applicant commits to in the environmental statement and commitments register.

1:12:37

Just on process, I like to spend a little bit of time on, we initially work constructively with rampion to improve their route for them. That the DCO corridor through sweet Hill has significantly changed from the original proposal. And we welcome this this initial cooperation.

1:12:56

But over the last 18 months, they've essentially discontinued any constructive engagement. We've been informed by the applicant, for example, neither they nor their advisors would engage with us on issues we have with the DCO application. Unless we sign the standard heads of terms or an easement. Well, the applicant has made no response whatsoever to a number of issues raised about those heads of terms a long time ago. And that was raised by a whole group of agents on behalf of the whole group of landowners.

1:13:29

And I'd say there's been no serious response to those comments on the heads of terms, which I'm not a lawyer and I could see the problems in the heads of terms. So it's not surprising that no one's signed them. But there's been no offer of any

1:13:43

no sign of any interest in in changing those heads of terms.

1:13:48

So we appreciate compensation is not a matter for the examining authority. And I want to stress that for us. The key concern is not a matter of compensation is the extent of the powers afforded by the draft ECA and the environmental effects on sweet Hill Farm.

1:14:04

Our understanding is that the applicant should be using its time before and during this examination, to engage with interested parties, not to refuse to engage with them or make it difficult to do so.

1:14:17

We understand for example, that Landon is affected by the ramp in one project, I found that to be a very different experience with the applicant keen to engage throughout the process.

1:14:30

So we really would welcome a firm commitment from the applicant to start engagement with us on the matters we cover today. And tomorrow's issue specific hearing.

1:14:43

Thank you.

1:14:47

Thank you. Anyone questions from the panel?

1:14:52

Thank you very much.

1:14:59

The neck

1:15:00

So I've got down. Mr. Crawford Clark

1:15:05

is

1:15:12

on line at the moment

1:15:16

he wasn't going to speak anymore. That's fine. Thank you very much.

1:15:21

That's my list here is Mr. Daniel ball, was it? Yes. Thank you.

1:15:30

It's on. That's fine. Is it on? Yeah. Do I need to press that button? No, no, it's fine. Okay. I wasn't going to talk today. But I've been speaking to all the people in the room. I just wanted to reiterate the importance of the small person, or the individual householders. I live on Ken street. So my views are very much that of the local MP and also mirror in the kaufhold versus rampion group.

1:15:57

The stories and the representations you've had from residents in the cab fold and Kent Street area, I just wish you'd give them a lot of weight. We feel the applicant has not given adequate consultation at all on Ken's tweets, or around kaufhold. And the O container stage, which is going to be disastrous for

the older people who work there. I for one bought a plot of land three years ago, and intending to build my dream home. This has now been destroyed. For reasons family reasons I have to sell, so we'll have to sell at a lower price. We also have residents on Kent Street who were told by the rampion team that they couldn't object, because there's a national infrastructure project. They have not then put in any representations. We've also got a lot of elderly people along Ken Street. And these people may well have to sell in the next five to six years. And they are absolutely devastated what they're going to do. Because they've lost all these people, our largest asset is our home. And they will have to accept reduced prices on these homes and ever know they'll have enough money to go into care. So allowed to reiterate what the MP and Mira said the lack of consultation has been incredible. around California and Kent Street. And all the residents have been completely devastated.

1:17:28

Any questions?

1:17:33

No.

1:17:35

Questions? Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you.

1:17:41

Is there anyone else here that wishes to speak that hasn't spoken so far?

1:17:56

Yep, yeah, that's fine. Yes. And but just don't obviously repeat any of the points you've raised previously.

1:18:07

I'm nearest Methodist. Speaking as a private individual. I just want to ask rampion why, in their expert topic groups, regarding the substation, caution District Council don't appear to have been invited until almost when the site was chosen. I'm talking about the flood risk assessment, the noise and vibration and the soil and agriculture groups. Surely, when mid Sussex were there right from the very beginning, this lack of involvement of Horsham, even if they might have been involved in other ways, has skewed the consultation, it has affected

1:18:48

the information that that rampion were receiving at a time when they were trying to make judgments about which site to use, and that I believe, has helped to skip that and a whole host of other things, which I'm sure will come on to tomorrow, but has helped to skew the consultation process.

1:19:09

And the other thing was just to pick up on something that someone else said about the trail, they'll often put links in documents to or they'll say, Oh, there's more information in document 7.6 or whatever. And you look there. And that information is simply not there.

1:19:25

And there are also lots of examples of where they make claims, but they don't actually back them up with facts.

1:19:36

And too much in the use of tech terms, like we believe it probably will, and

1:19:43

we think it's likely that scoping things out and for

1:19:48

the decisions they make without any real evidence to back it up.

1:19:54

That's all I really wanted to say. Thank you.

1:19:58

Okay, thanks very much.

1:20:00

Any other questions?

1:20:03

Okay.

1:20:06

Is there anyone else that might mess with it? I know.

1:20:10

There's no raise hands online, within in the room.

1:20:15

So I just want to see if there's anyone from the applicant who wishes to come forward for comment

1:20:28

if you just like to introduce yourself your name and and you'll have eight minutes to respond. Thank you, sir. All day on behalf of the applicant. We just like to thank everybody for their representations today. We don't intend to reply to those representations in the meeting today, but we will make a response in writing where appropriate. Thank you, sir.

1:20:52

Okay, thank you. I mean, one thing, I think,

1:20:56

from our panel, we would want to say is there's obviously strong feeling about the level of engagement,

1:21:03

initial engagement, and I think the applicant might want to reflect on that going forward. And I'm sure we'll hear more about that as examination

1:21:13

progresses.

1:21:19

If there's no other relevant business,

1:21:22

I'll look to close the hearing. May I remind you that the timetable of this examination requires that parties provide a post Haven documentation documents honour before deadline one may also remind you that the recording of the hearing will be placed on the inspectorates website as soon as practicable after this meeting. And just to finish, just want to thank you all today, for attending and for your participation. Sorry, also for that, because that was going on for quite a while, as soon as to finish now. That was beyond our controller. There we go.

1:21:56

We all can say that all of your responses carefully and we will and they will inform the examiner authorities distribution, where the written questions and all through the round of hearings are necessary. The next event is tomorrow's issue specific hearing and that could go on till Friday. It will start tomorrow at 9:30am details and agendas can be found in the rule six letter and supplementary agendas. So once again, thank you. The time is now 352 and this open floor hearing is now closed. Thank you