

James Smethurst Written Representation for Feb 28th Deadline

Onshore Work Plans/Compulsory Acquisition

Rampion seem to be asking for rights over land to an excessive extent, and adequate explanation for this is hard to get from them. For example:

- Why do they need a right over the whole of the A272 north of Oakendene for 'construction and operational access (plot number 33/19, works number 14) as opposed to just the verge on the south side. Why is the rest of the road any different to any other road they will travel on? [REDACTED]. No satisfactory explanation has been given to them despite emails and meetings, nor to any of their neighbours.
- Why do they need the whole of the verges and road at the northern end of Kent Street for 'temporary construction access? (plot 33/4-8, works number 13) as opposed to just the verges they will need to cross to gain access to the cable routes? How is this part of the road any different from any other road they will be using?
- Why do they need such a wide piece of land for the cable route before it enters the substation area? (plot number 33/1, works number 9). There does not seem to be any adequate explanation of this in the DCO.
- Why do they need such a wide piece of land to the west of the cable route for continued operational access at plot number 31/2-3, works number 14? Will it be permanently affected? This is prime quality meadowland.
- Why do they need such a wide splay of land to the north of Cratemans Farm for operational access? (plot number 31/5-6, works number 15). No adequate explanation for this was given at the ISH

In addition, at the onshore substation, plot number 33/9 is listed for **both** environmental mitigation and the substation construction (works numbers 16 and 17). How can the whole plot possibly be used for environmental mitigation? Has the entire plot been included in the environmental mitigation calculations (i.e. overestimating), and has the extensive destruction of habitats on the site also been included? (i.e. ensuring the negative balance is correct-similarly for any other mitigation site)

Action Points Arising from ISH 1

Having listened to the recordings of the February hearings, there appear to be a number of action points missing:

- The applicant was warned that compulsory acquisition must be seen as a last resort and that progress must be made before the next hearing
- The applicant was asked to provide a convincing explanation of why the Rampion 1 cable route had not been reused (followed from Andrew Griffith's OFH speech)
- Action point 10 was also to include the southern end of Kent Street, which also has conflicting maps
- The applicant was to produce a plan to ensure access to Kings Lane /Moatfield Lane at all times, including for emergency access
- Traffic survey for Kent Street
- Peak weeks were to be made more specific to the road/ site under consideration
- The need for a holding bay as for Rampion 1 was to be considered

- The pollution effects of traffic were to be more extensively considered, including noise
- Traffic management/safety on A272 if no traffic lights
- More convincing drainage plans for the substation site

ExA Questions to Natural England

Agenda Item 4-Effects of the Proposed Substation at Cowfold/Oakendene:

Q4-1:

- The whole area from the Oakendene substation site and down the cable route to Gratwicke is of ecological importance. It is undesignated but does contain priority habitats-see Written Representations from Janine Creaye, including photographic and video evidence, and CowfoldvRampion for deadline 1. Residents strongly believe this area **should** be designated; it has had no reason to be surveyed until now, meaning that desk top surveys seriously underrepresent the true picture.
- Sussex Biodiversity records office do not currently have a mechanism for designating new Local Wildlife Site in Sussex, due to lack of resources. However, they have said that they are willing to consider the site for assessment in the future on the basis of the evidence we have presented, should funding become available. However, by the time the funding is available, the site may no longer exist as a result of the DCO proposals

Q4-2:

- Rampion have relied too heavily on desk top surveys to inform their wildlife surveys and have not listened to evidence from local people, despite being warned about the fact that desk top surveys may not reflect the reality if there has been no reason to survey a place before. Many of the ecological surveys were not done before the site was chosen, and when they have been done, there has been an overreliance on desk top studies and the use of designated sites to inform where surveys were undertaken. This has meant that not all studies were attempted on this site. Even when they were, there were incomplete surveys due to equipment failure, or the carrying out of surveys outside of correct seasons. Even more incomprehensible is the claim that they were incomplete due to 'lack of access'. Yet despite all this, this so called undesignated 'industrialised' location and the northern end of the cable route contain such a high proportion of all positive findings-great crested newts, important hedges and veteran trees, water voles, dormice, otter, badgers and nightingales. It is far more biodiverse than the alternative locations at Wineham, sadly already depleted by the earlier substations and the more open nature of the field systems.

Submission ID: 26378

I have both contributed to and fully agree with, the content of the document 'Cowfold Residents' Impact Statement on Rampion2'. This was submitted by CowfoldvRampion for deadline 1 on 28 February 2024.
Please add this to my original WR submitted for this deadline.