

Rampion 2 Wind Farm Category 8: Examination Documents Applicant's Responses to Issues Raised at Procedural Deadline A

Date: February 2024

Application Reference: 8.32

Pursuant to: The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010, Rule 8(1)(c)(i)

Ecodoc number: 005074032-01



Document revisions

Revision	Date	Status/reason for issue	Author	Checked by	Approved by
A	28/02/2024	Issue for Deadline 1	WSP	RED	RED

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Project Overview	1
1.2	Purpose of this document	1
2.	Applicant's Response to Issues Raised at Deadline A	2

Tables

Table 2-1:	Applicant's Response to John Robert Hughes	2
Table 2-2:	Applicant's Response to Shuna Le Moine	4
Table 2-3:	Applicant's Response to CowfoldvRampion (Cowfold resident's Action Group)	5
Table 2-4:	Applicant's Response to Grahame Kittle	7
Table 2-5:	Applicant's Response to Susan Davies	10
Table 2-6:	Applicant's Response to Middleton on Sea Coastal Alliance	12
Table 2-7:	Applicant's Response to Ancleggan Limited	15
Table 2-8:	Applicant's Response to Elizabeth Leanne Marogna	16
Table 2-9:	Applicant's Response to Susie Clare Fischel	18
Table 2-10:	Applicant's Response to Jeremy Smethurst	19
Table 2-11:	Applicant's Response to Protect Coastal Sussex	21
Table 2-12:	Applicant's Response to Paul Lightburn	26
Table 2-13:	Applicant's Response to Janine Creaye	28
Table 2-14:	Applicant's Response to Meera Smethurst	30
Table 2-15:	Applicant's Response to the Maritime and Coastguard Agency	31

1. Introduction

1.1 Project Overview

- 1.1.1 “Rampion Extension Development Limited (hereafter referred to as ‘RED’) (the ‘Applicant’) is developing the Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm Project (‘Rampion 2’) located adjacent to the existing Rampion Offshore Wind Farm Project (‘Rampion 1’) in the English Channel.
- 1.1.2 Rampion 2 will be located between 13km and 26km from the Sussex Coast in the English Channel and the offshore array area will occupy an area of approximately 160km. A detailed description of the Proposed Development is set out in Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES), submitted with the DCO Application **[APP-045]**.

1.2 Purpose of this document

- 1.2.1 Submissions were invited to Procedural Deadline A to respond to a number of specific matters set out in the Rule 6 letter dated 14th December 2023 **[PD-006]**. Some Interested Parties (IPs) made additional representations at Procedural Deadline A. This document is intended to address those additional matters.

2. Applicant's Response to Issues Raised at Deadline A

Table 2-1: Applicant's Response to John Robert Hughes

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about the planned location of the huge transformer on the Oakendean Site and the associated cable route. 	<p>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-044] details how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved and demonstrates that all aspects of site selection, site access and future access requirements have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development to minimise and mitigate adverse impacts. The chapter explains the reasonable alternatives considered for the substation and onshore cable corridor and the reasons for selection of the preferred option. At this stage, the description of the Proposed Development is indicative and a 'design envelope' approach has been adopted which takes into account the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope (Planning Inspectorate, 2018).</p> <p>The provision of a design envelope is intended to identify key design assumptions to enable the environmental assessment to be carried out whilst retaining enough flexibility to accommodate further refinement during detailed design. Further details on the use of the Rochdale Envelope for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects is provided by the National Policy Statement (NPS) for Renewable Energy (EN-3) (Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), 2011 and the Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), 2023).</p> <p>Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-045] provides a detailed description of the substation and the onshore cable corridor. Section 4.5 details the onshore cable corridor from landfall at Climping through to the proposed new onshore substation and then onto the existing National Grid Bolney substation. A description of specific locations along the route that optionality has been retained is also provided.</p> <p>Further detail about the selection of the onshore substation has been provided in response to the ExA's Action Point 4 arising from the first issue specific hearings, submitted to the examination as Document 8.25.</p>
2.1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The very large number of HGVs required during the construction phase would cause an enormous amount of disruption and disturbance on the very busy A272. Rampion 2 also plan to use Kent Street as an access to their cable workings. Kent Street is a narrow single track country lane, totally unsuitable for HGV traffic. 	<p>The impact of the Proposed Development on the transportation infrastructure, including the strategic and local road network, Public Right of Ways, Sustrans national cycle network, has been undertaken in Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-064]. Environmental measures will be implemented to manage the potential effects from construction traffic. These are detailed in the Commitments Register [APP-254] which has been updated at the Deadline 1 submission and are secured through the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [PEPD-035a], Outline Construction Workforce Travel Plan [APP-229], Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [APP-230].</p> <p>The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [PEPD-035a] which has been updated at the Deadline 1 submission includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Commitment C-157: The proposed heavy goods vehicle (HGV) routing during the construction period to individual accesses will be developed to avoid major settlements of Storrington, Cowfold, Steyning, Wineham, Henfield, Woodmancote and other smaller settlements where possible; and</i> <i>Commitment C-158: The proposed heavy goods vehicle (HGV) routing during the construction period to individual accesses will avoid the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in Cowfold where possible.</i> <p>These commitments are also reflected in Table 5-1 of the Outline CTMP [PEPD-035a] which has been updated at the Deadline 1 submission and confirms prescribed local Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) access routes for all sections of the onshore cable corridor and Table 5-2 which details specific local constraints and proposed management of construction traffic routes.</p>

REF Procedural Deadline A Comment
APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

These commitments ensure that HGV construction traffic will route along the A27 and A23 to gain access to the A272 east of Cowfold wherever possible, thereby avoiding the village centre. Therefore, only accesses A-52, A-56 and A-57 will require construction traffic to route through Cowfold Village centre. As calculated by using data included in Table 5-3 of the **Outline CTMP [PEPD-035a]** which has been updated at the Deadline 1 submission, the impact of this commitment is the removal of up to 22,000 two-way HGV trips (11,000 HGVs) from Cowfold Village centre over the construction phase.

Commitment C-157 and C-158 (**Commitments Register [APP-254]** which has been updated at the Deadline 1 submission) discourages traffic from routing through the Cowfold AQMA. The transport of abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) has been subject to assessment within the **Appendix 23.1: Abnormal Indivisible Loads assessment, Volume 4** of the ES **[APP-196]** and is not based on a route for AILs that does not run through the village of Cowfold.

The likely significant transport effects associated with the construction phase of the Proposed Development have been assessed in **Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2** of the Environmental Statement (ES) **[APP-064]**, ES Addendum (submitted at Deadline 1) and **Appendix 23.2: Traffic Generation Technical Note, Volume 4** of the ES **[APP-197]** which has been updated at the Deadline 1 submission. At peak construction, taking account of the construction traffic routing contained within the **Outline CTMP [PEPD-035a]** which has been updated at the Deadline 1 submission, the following effects have been identified for Cowfold:

- At A281 south of Cowfold (Receptor 23):
 - An HGV peak week increase of 12 HGVs per day, equivalent to an increase of 7.5% and approximately one HGV per hour; and
 - A total construction traffic peak week increase of one HGV per day and 71 light goods vehicles (LGVs) per day (5-6 per hour), equivalent to a 1.1% increase in total traffic flow.
- The A281 / A272 in the centre of Cowfold (Receptor 24):
 - An HGV peak week increase of 39 HGVs, equivalent to an increase of 3.5% and 2-3 HGVs per hour; and
 - A total construction traffic peak week increase of 19 HGVs and 154 LGVs (11 per hour), equivalent to a 0.7% increase in total traffic flow.
- The A272 Station Road west of Cowfold Village centre (Receptor 25):
 - An HGV peak week increase of 39 HGVs, equivalent to an increase of 4.6% and 2-3 HGVs per hour; and
 - A total construction traffic peak week increase of 19 HGVs and 154 LGVs (11 per hour), equivalent to a 0.9% increase in total traffic flow.
- The A272 Bolney Road east of Cowfold Village centre (Receptor E):
 - An HGV peak week increase of 39 HGVs, equivalent to an increase of 5.5% and 2-3 HGVs per hour; and
 - A total construction traffic peak week increase of 19 HGVs and 147 LGVs (10-11 per hour), equivalent to a 0.8% increase in total traffic flow.

As noted within Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) 1993 publication *Guidelines for the Environment Assessment of Road Traffic* (IEMA, 1993) an increase of less than 10% is not discernible environmental effect as is within day-to-day fluctuations in traffic flow. Therefore, no significant effects are predicted to occur within Cowfold.

Paragraph 23.3.46 within **Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2** of the ES **[APP-064]** describes that following consultation responses the construction access and permanent access to the onshore substation site will be from the A272 only (not via Kent Street) details of which are set out in the **Outline CTMP [PEPD-035a]** **Outline CTMP [PEPD-035a]** which has been updated at the Deadline 1 submission. Kent Street remains proposed for use as a temporary construction access (A-61 and A-64) for onshore cable corridor works only. Environmental measures will be implemented to manage the potential effects from construction traffic. These are detailed in the **Outline CTMP [PEPD-035a]**.

Table 2-2: Applicant's Response to Shuna Le Moine

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.2.1	Consider the relentless pounding into the seabed necessary to install each gigantic turbine. Would that be what we'd expect the wildlife and local population to endure?	<p>The Applicant has undertaken an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the Proposed Development to consider and assess the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The Development Consent Order (DCO) Application includes a series of documents that address the potential effects of noise on human receptors. These include the following aspect chapters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-049]; • Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-050]; • Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-051]; and • Chapter 12: Offshore and intertidal ornithology, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-052]. <p>The assessment concluded that the magnitude of impact on all marine species in the chapters outlined above (fish, shellfish, benthic, marine mammals, ornithology) from potential changes to noise and vibration exposure as a result of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development following the implantation of embedded environmental measures is negligible to minor adverse, which is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>A number of plans and protocols that outline the management measures and mitigation proposed throughout the offshore construction stage to reduce the effects of noise and vibration on marine ecology receptors, including commitments C-52, C-54, C-102, C-265, C-274, C-280, and C-281. These measures are all secured through condition 11 of the deemed marine licences at Schedules 11 and 12 of the draft DCO [PEPD-009] and will restrict the offshore construction works programme around sensitive breeding seasons, use of low noise technology, sequencing approach, soft start and ramp up procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Piling Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol [APP-236]; • Draft Unexploded Ordnance Clearance Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol [APP-237]; and • In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [APP-239].
2.2.2	Individually and with the sun illuminating its construction, a wind turbine can indeed be perceived as graceful, beautiful even – BUT, as an endless haphazard collection, and so huge, and with the sun behind them, which it mostly will be, they would each appear black and inevitably create an inescapable industrial vista. An ugly invasion on our shores.	<p>The likely significant seascape, landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development have been assessed in the Environmental Statement within Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-056] and Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-059]. Wherever practicable, likely adverse effects have been avoided or minimised through embedded environmental measures in the design of the Proposed Development, taking into account the findings of the Environmental Statement, consultation with stakeholders and national and local policy requirements. Full details of the embedded environmental measures for visual effects can be found in Section 15.7 of Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-056] and Section 18.7 of Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-059].</p> <p>Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-056] identifies significant seascape, landscape and visual effects for areas of the South Downs National Park (SDNP), West Sussex, East Sussex, and the City of Brighton & Hove. A number of environmental measures are embedded (C-37, C-40, C-61, and C-62 in table 18-25) as part of the Proposed Development design to avoid, minimise or reduce any significant environmental effects on seascape, landscape and visual receptors, as far as possible. Although there are some significant effects on views and perceived special quality of the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (CHAONB) designation, no effects are of such magnitude or significant enough, on their own or cumulatively to compromise the statutory purposes of the designation.</p> <p>The wider benefits of the Proposed Development and the need for offshore wind energy must be weighed against the adverse effects that have been identified as well as any local issues and concerns. This balancing should also take into account national and international policies and obligations that seek to tackle climate change and achieve net zero carbon emissions in 2050.</p>

Table 2-3: Applicant's Response to CowfoldvRampion (Cowfold resident's Action Group)

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.3.1	<p>National Grid raises several concerns and objections regarding the Rampion proposals. However, we cannot see any mentioned of the 132kV cable which passes under the land on which the new substation is proposed at Oakendene, and which was mentioned to Rampion by several residents in the 2022 consultation responses and at meetings after that.</p> <p>This high voltage cable goes under the northern half of the site, from north west to south east, under the access road and construction compound and almost certainly under the proposed attenuation basin and swale and probably under the northern part of the permanent substation location. It is also crossed at least twice by the proposed cable route from Oakendene to Wineham.</p> <p>Nowhere in the DCO documents is there a discussion about it, certainly not in the Design and Access Document, nor is it mentioned in the Relevant Representation from the National Grid. It supplies power to much of the Horsham District. Perhaps, as it is an export cable, it is the property of UKPN instead? In any case, there is no evidence that either National Grid or UKPN have been consulted on this.</p> <p>The cable, like the Rampion cable from the coast to Oakendene, also the same voltage, cannot be built on or planted over. The implications of this not being under consideration during the examination are serious: once consent is granted, the 'discovered' cable would significantly affect the design, mitigations and screening capabilities at the site or the applicant would need to seek permission for the cable to be re-sited involving the highly disruptive digging up of the A272 and Kent Street. Furthermore, if it were to be hit during excavations, the consequences would be devastating both to the workman concerned and the power supply to a large area.</p> <p>Anything can be worked around, but would be costly, disruptive and not in the consultation.</p>	<p>The Applicant is in discussions to agree the diversion of the cable located underneath land at the proposed Oakendene substation site. The cable is owned and operated by UK Power Networks (UKPN). The cable is a dual circuit 132kV electrical cable and dates from the 1960s. The Applicant is seeking an engineered solution with UKPN and both parties are working to conclude the design, which is anticipated before the end of the Examination period.</p> <p>The Applicant is seeking sufficient rights in the Order to enable Statutory Undertaker Diversions.</p> <p>Standard reasonable avoidance measures including the review of mapping, consulting with Utilities and ground scanning surveys will be undertaken before breaking ground.</p>
2.3.2	<p>In the now archived DCO documents for Rampion 1, the UK Health Security Agency (or Public Health England as they were then known) Relevant Representation notes that when considering the assessment of the EMFs produced by the new onshore cables and substation, as described in Section 2b of the Environmental Statement – Onshore Project Description, "Public Health England advises that comparison with local area substations is not strictly appropriate as these operate at lower voltages than the newly proposed substation for stepping up to the National Grid. Further consideration should also be given as to whether case by case compliance assessments are required for new cables operating at voltages above 132 kV i.e. 150 kV, 220 kV and up to 400 kV in the cables connecting the two substations, and for substations containing air-cored reactors."</p>	<p>Chapter 28: Population and human health, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-069] and Appendix 28.2: Electro Magnetic Field Health Evidence Base, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-220] addresses the potential impacts as a result of electric and magnetic fields.</p> <p>The assessment concluded that the magnitude of impact on human health from potential exposure electro and magnetic fields for both the 275 kilovolt (kV) cable system along the onshore cable route from landfall (Climping) to the new onshore substation (Oakendene) and 400kV cable system between the new onshore substation (Oakendene) and the National Grid connection point (National Grid Bolney substation) is negligible, which is not significant in EIA terms. Therefore, the Rampion 2 electricity transmission infrastructure is well below the public health exposure guidelines and can be considered safe for human receptors.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes the confirmation of the UK Health Security Agency, confirmed within their Relevant Representation [RR-407] that following review of the submitted documentation: <i>'we are satisfied that the proposed</i></p>

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>We would like to ask whether the assessment criteria, as suggested by PHE have been applied in this case, specifically for the proposed new substation at Oakendene and the 400kV cable which will connect Oakendene to the main substation at Wineham, please. Both are much larger than the cable and substation under consideration for Rampion 1 at Wineham Lane.</p>	<p><i>development should not result in any significant adverse impact on public health' and that 'On that basis, we have no additional comments to make at this stage.'</i></p>
2.3.4	<p>i) The Royal Mail raises concerns about the need to keep key routes flowing smoothly and that changes in road capacity can have a major effect on their ability to meet their Universal Service Obligations.</p> <p>ii) The A27 and A23 are mentioned, but are they aware of the many concerns raised by residents and businesses about the impact on businesses and transport caused by the construction traffic on the A272 and surrounding lanes? The A272 is a major east west route through the northern part of the county and Rampion's traffic assessments of that route do not reflect the everyday experience of users, including our excellent post men and women.</p>	<p>i) The Applicant is aware that Royal Mail has sought to secure mitigation to protect its road-based operations due to regulatory conditions imposed by Ofcom in order to discharge Royal Mail's duties under the <i>Postal Services Act 2011</i> (the Act) during the Project's construction stage. The Applicant also acknowledges that Royal Mail is regulated by Ofcom to meet minimum standards under the Act.</p> <p>Wording has been included within section 8.4 of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [PEPD-035a] (updated at Deadline 1), which provides Royal Mail with satisfactory advance notification, liaison and information on works that affect the highway network.</p> <p>ii) Please refer to the Applicant's response to Issues Raised at Procedural Deadline A 2.1.2 above.</p>

Table 2-4: Applicant's Response to Grahame Kittle

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.4.1	We have been continually frustrated by the vagueness of plans, the lack of clarity and open-endedness of numerous lengthy communications which makes it difficult to plan from a farming and business perspective.	<p>Context</p> <p>The Applicant has been in regular correspondence with Grahame Kittle (The Land Interest) and his agent (Rowan Allan) since February 2021.</p> <p>Details of the onshore cable route as it passes through the Land Interest's land holding are shown on Sheets 15, 18, 19 and 20 of the Onshore Works Plans [PEPD-005].</p> <p>Grahame Kittle owns Sullington Manor Farm, a farm located to the south of the A283 and extending down to Sullington Hill. The Land Interest owns pasture and arable land affected by the proposed Rampion 2 cable route (Works No.9 - Cable Installation works (including construction and operational access)), for which a package of Cable Rights and a Cable Restrictive Covenant are sought. The areas affected are detailed on Sheet 15,19 and 20 of the Onshore Works Plans [PEPD-005] with the areas of the farm affected by Works No.9 comprising Plots 15/2, 19/2, shown coloured blue on the Onshore Land Plans [APP-007]. A package of Cable Rights and a Cable Restrictive Covenant are sought in relation to this land. The Order Limits in this location are wider than other sections of the cable installation area as Horizontal Directional Drilling is the proposed methodology for installing the cable across Sullington Hill. The Environmental Statement Volume 4, Appendix 4.1 Crossing schedule [APP-122].(sheet 12) shows the location and limits of deviation for the proposed HDD construction compound options and the affiliated indicative HDD underground cable pathways at Sullington Hill.</p> <p>There is a proposed operational access within the Order Limits (Works No.15), for which operational access rights are sought. The access affects a northern section of the Land Interest's land holding, beginning at the southern end of Sullington Lane (the boundary of the adopted highway), before following an existing track on the farm going southwards, as well as a boundary of a field, to reach the proposed cable route (located to the south). The area affected comprises Plots 20/11, 20/12, 20/013, 20/14 and 20/15 as shown coloured blue on the Onshore Land Plans [APP-007].</p> <p>There is another operational access (Works No.15) proposed which affects a track on the south-western boundary of the land holding. Chantry Lane is a road (privately owned but adopted highway) leading from Washington Road (A283) to Chantry Point which has been included as a proposed operational access. At Chantry Point, there is a track (which follows the South Downs Way) that heads eastwards. Part of this track is within the Land Interest's title and has been included as proposed operational access to reach the cable route. The area affected comprises Plots 19/3, 19/4 as shown coloured blue on the Onshore Land Plans [APP-007].</p> <p>In addition, the Land Interest's land is affected by a proposed construction and operational access (Works No.14), for which Construction and Operational access rights are sought. The area affected by Works No.14 is located on the southern boundary of the land holding. This access follows an existing track which runs parallel to the Title's southern boundary and connects with Long Furlong to the south. The Land Interest also has rights of access along the full length of this track to the south. The area affected by Works No.14 comprises Plots 18/1 as shown coloured blue on the Onshore Land Plans [APP-007].</p> <p>Route Amendments</p> <p>There were three cable route amendments considered further to the south of Sullington Hill. As a result, there were three different consultations (and site meetings), routes and accompanying sets of plans, which were sent to the landowner over several years.</p> <p>An initial site meeting was held in August 2021 to present the original cable routing proposals. Following consultation and feedback, a route amendment, LACR 1C was consulted upon in October 2022. Further feedback and consultation was undertaken which resulted in an additional amendment, LACR 1D being consulted upon in February 2023. LACR 1D was taken forwards within the final Order Limits.</p>

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.4.2	<p>The maps indicate vastly wider areas of work than are actually required and it is difficult to see where the work will actually take place. In addition, the planning application also covers an unnecessarily wide area which is of concern. In particular, the planning permission application for DCO includes farming infrastructure such as livestock troughs and barns which are far from the proposed route of the cable. Plus, a 99 year lease for the access way seems excessive to inspect infrastructure which will be out of date well before that.</p>	<p>Sullington Hill proposed Cable Installation Methodology</p> <p>The planned crossing of the escarpment feature will be undertaken using trenchless methods at Sullington Hill to protect the Local Wildlife Site and calcareous grassland (a Habitat of Principle Importance) as detailed in C-114 in the Commitments Register [APP-254]. Environmental considerations at Sullington Hill are presented in full in Chapter 22: Terrestrial Ecology, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-063]. Due to the nature of the obstacle, a wider corridor had to be included in the Application to provide the necessary flexibility before site investigation data is available and an appropriate construction design can be finalised. See sheet 12 in the Environmental Statement Volume 4, Appendix 4.1 Crossing schedule [APP-122].</p> <p>The Applicant would point out that there is a distinction between Works No 9 ('Onshore Cable Connection Works'), for which rights and a restrictive covenant equivalent to an easement are being sought, and Works No 15 ('Operational Access'), for which the rights sought are expressly limited to rights of access for operational purposes only. Land for Operational Access A31 as shown in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan Outline CTMP [PEPD-035a] will provide access to the onshore elements of the Proposed Development for maintenance during the operational phase and as such will not be used during the construction phase of the project. Operational access rights are defined in Schedule 7 of the Draft DCO [PEPD-009] and in summary comprise rights of access with or without vehicles and equipment: "<i>for the purposes of operation, maintenance and commissioning of the authorised development</i>".</p> <p>Order Limits</p> <p>Land owned by the Land Interest is required for construction and operation of the permanent cable easement. The land is required to be included in the Applicant's DCO at this stage to ensure that all required rights for construction and operation are secured. If a voluntary land agreement is secured within the Land Interest compulsory acquisition may not be required.</p> <p>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-044] details how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved and demonstrates that all aspects of site selection, site access and future access requirements have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development to minimise and mitigate adverse impacts. The chapter explains the reasonable alternatives considered for the onshore cable corridor and the reasons for selection of the preferred option. At this stage, the description of the Proposed Development is indicative and a 'design envelope' approach has been adopted which takes into account the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope (Planning Inspectorate, 2018).</p> <p>The provision of a design envelope is intended to identify key design assumptions to enable the environmental assessment to be carried out whilst retaining enough flexibility to accommodate further refinement during detailed design. Further details on the use of the Rochdale Envelope for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects is provided by the National Policy Statement (NPS) for Renewable Energy (EN-3) (Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), 2011 and the Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), 2023).</p> <p>The Applicant does not agree with the Land Interest's comment that the powers sought are disproportionate to the actual area of land required for construction. As explained by the Applicant in the Statement of Reasons (SoR) (Para 9.11.7-9.11.9) [APP-021], not all of the land within the DCO boundary will need to be permanently acquired. Flexibility is sought to enable the construction of works anywhere within the area identified for those works on the works plans [PEPD-005], within which area there will be a circa 40m construction corridor and 20m permanent easement rights corridor (HDD). Further to pre-construction surveys and ground investigations, the final cable routing will be refined and provided in the stage specific Construction Method Statement (CMS). Outline Construction Method Statement [Doc ref APP-255] states that Stage specific CMSs will be produced by the appointed Contractor(s) following the grant of the Development Consent Order (DCO) and prior to the relevant stage of construction. This will provide further information from detailed design and will be in accordance with this Outline CMS for approval of the relevant planning authority, prior to the commencement of that stage of works pursuant to DCO Requirement 23. The Applicant will seek to minimise the extent of permanent rights required by taking temporary possession first of the wider construction corridor and then permanently acquiring the rights required over the narrower easement area when the location is known. The Applicant will seek to avoid impacts on farm buildings and will discuss the avoidance or protection of farming infrastructure that</p>

REF Procedural Deadline A Comment
APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

may be impacted at the construction stage. Water pipes will be marked and appropriate construction methods used to protect existing services in accordance with the Outline Construction Method Statement [Doc ref APP-255]. Utilities which states that the location of existing services will be accurately identified on the ground prior to construction or intrusive ground investigations. 2.9.2 states that the position, depth and condition of exposed services shall be recorded. All agreed measures for protection will be implemented before any works associated with the utility crossings commence.

Easement Documentation

The Applicant seeks to negotiate rights for a cable easement and for an operational access t, both of which are for a 99 year term, which is for a term that is consistent with other offshore wind projects such as Triton Knoll, and is acceptable to the Offshore Transmission Operator who will ultimately operate the project. The easement will be finalised taking no greater area than required.

The equivalent rights sought within the DCO are the Cable Rights, Cable Restrictive Covenant and Operational Access Rights, all of which are defined in Schedule 7 to the Draft DCO [PEPD-009].

The Applicant welcomes the Land Interest's willingness to discuss matters further and confirms that it will engage further with the Land Interest regarding the refinement of the final land area and appropriate and reasonable mitigation measures during construction of the project to minimise disturbance to the Land Interest.

2.4.3 The farm is at the end of a single track lane which is used for the church, holiday cottage guests, walkers and other users including residents. Vague references and sloppy marks on the plans are not distinct enough for us to be able to assess the impact of the project access on other residents, our customers and ourselves.

Grahame Kittle owns pasture and arable land (located at Sullington Hill) affected by the proposed Rampion 2 cable route. Details of the onshore cable route as it passes through the Land Interest's land holding are shown on Sheets 15, 18, 19 and 20 of the Onshore Works Plans [PEPD-005].

Sullington Manor Farm, the church and associated buildings are accessed from and located at the southern end of Sullington Lane. Sullington Lane is located to the north of the proposed cable route. There is a proposed operational access that connects the end of Sullington Lane (the boundary of the adopted highway) with the proposed cable route indicated as Works No.15 - Operational Access, on Sheet 20 of the Onshore Works plans.

As explained above, the Applicant has applied for rights over this area for operational access only for the onshore cable route. Paragraphs 23.4.21 and 23.4.22 within **Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2** of the ES [APP-064] describe the expected operational and maintenance phase activities which includes periodic testing of the cable through attendance by up to three light vehicles such as vans in a day at any one location. Unscheduled maintenance or emergency repair visits for the onshore cable will typically involve a very small number of vehicles, typically light vans. Infrequently, equipment may be required to be replaced, then the use of an occasional HGV may be utilised, depending on the nature of the repair. (Paragraph 23.4.22 within **Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2** of the ES [APP-064]). There will be no restriction of private means of access on Sullington Lane.

Table 2-5: Applicant's Response to Susan Davies

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.5.1	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that there was a thorough investigation of the two alternative sites, in terms of traffic impact, flooding/geology or environmental/ecology. Looking at the minutes of meetings, HDC only became aware that Oakendene had been proposed in June 2022, and Rampion announced their decision in July 2022. However, there was no environmental/ecological studies, geological or traffic surveys/modelling for this site. It was clear from a public meeting held with Rampion in Cowfold, one month before the end of the consultation process in November 2022, that Rampion were not aware that Oakendene had suffered from surface water flooding, nor that Kent St was a single-track lane, assessed as "inappropriate" in their Woods report, nor that a High voltage cable lay under the proposed site.</p> <p>Reading through the minutes of the meetings of 1.4.22 found in document 6.4.26.2, on p174, it's clear that there was an underlying assumption that Rampion 2 would be located on Wineham Lane, because participants were "trying to learn lessons from Rampion 1" and Oakendene had not been included in assessments. However, this assumption is not appropriate for Oakendene as there are significant differences between the two proposed substation sites. Rampion 2 is 30% bigger, with the entrance to the site directly off the fast moving, busy A272, which caters for over 18000 vehicles daily. Whereas Rampion 1 was located off the relatively quiet Wineham Lane, which is often used by HGV's because it is wider and has two lanes. Oakendene is also on a floodplain which has been designated as an area of "high flood risk" according to the Environmental Agency maps. Properties nearby have flooded badly and residents regularly ask the council to clear ditches and pipes in order to reduce their risk of flooding.</p> <p>The vast majority of Cowfold village knew nothing about the Rampion's plans to build a substation and storage facility at Oakendene, Cowfold until the month before the consultation closed. A few weeks before the end of the consultation period, there was a meeting organised by a concerned local resident where we learnt more about the proposal. It was clearly evident at this meeting in October 2022 that Rampion were not aware of the existing local traffic problems related to the Oakendene section of the A272, one of the most hazardous sections of road with the highest number of RTA's in the region. They didn't know about the prolonged congestion that occurs on this stretch of road regularly and consistently, with over 18,000 vehicles approaching Cowfold on a daily basis. They were also unaware that Kent St and Dragons Lane were single track lanes, described as "unsuitable" for their proposal. They didn't know that during times of heavy congestion, vehicles use the side lanes of Picts Lane and Bulls Lane as a cut-through, causing chaos for both drivers and residents alike.</p> <p>On numerous occasions we've asked Rampion to supply details of their "temporary traffic control measures" relating to Oakendene/Kent St. During a meeting at Bolney, on 15.5.23, they promised that this information would be disclosed at a meeting on 21.6.2023, but have failed to do so, instead saying</p>	<p>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-044] describes the alternatives studied by the Applicant and a comparison of their environmental effects across the project as a whole. This includes the alternatives considered and consulted on prior to the DCO Application.</p> <p>There is also a requirement to consider alternatives in the context of development in the national park in accordance with para 5.9.10 of NPS EN1 (2011) and in accordance with the EIA regulations.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-044], the Proposed Development has been developed through a multi-disciplinary design process including environment, engineering, landowner, and cost considerations. The Applicant has sought to avoid, reduce, or minimise the effects through the design process and also by identifying and securing embedded environmental measures. It is acknowledged that some residual effects remain across the site.</p> <p>Section 3.6 of Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-044] provides the information on the onshore substation site selection process. Section 3.6 describes the site selection process and the reasons for other sites being discounted based on the multi-disciplinary factors identified in the paragraph above. The selection of Oakendene is clearly stated as favourable for engineering, cost, and landowner considerations in paragraphs 3.6.23 to 3.6.25 of Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-044]. Significant weight was also given to the environmental constraints and related policy in the overall balance of the decision. This Applicant has also developed further embedded environmental measures that have been presented in the application including the design principles in the Design and Access Statement [AS-003], Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [APP-232] and Outline Operational Drainage Plan [APP-223]. These measures are secured via requirements 8, 12 and 17 of the draft DCO [PEPD-009].</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken an EIA which considers and assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on social, economic, and environmental well-being. The ES Volume 2 [APP-042 to APP-072], and Volume 4 [APP-120 to APP-222], reports the findings of the EIA. The ES also provides information about the Proposed Development including its context, a full description of the Proposed Development and its construction, the main alternatives considered, the consultation process that was part of the EIA, and any relevant technical information that has been used to assess the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The ES and includes a series of chapters that consider and assess the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development in relation to each relevant environmental aspect.</p> <p>The Consultation Report [APP-026], sets out the numerous rounds of statutory and non-statutory consultation including notices, advertisements, and leaflets around the proposed cable route, including the village of Cowfold. Additionally, the Applicant attended a public Q&A session organised by the Parish Council in November 2022, and hosted a public information event in June 2023. Issues pertaining to Cowfold are drawn together from page 35 of the Consultation Report [APP-026].</p> <p>In regard to the transport concerns raised, please refer to the Applicant's response to Issues Raised at Procedural Deadline A under reference 2.1.2 (above).</p>

REF Procedural Deadline A Comment

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

that it was a "highways problem". We are concerned how they are going to safely manage the movement of thousands of HGV's across two lanes of fast-moving, busy A272 traffic. Some 18,000 vehicles use this hazardous stretch of the A272 on a daily basis. We've also asked them to clarify the confusing and contradictory data relating to the numbers of HGV's, LGF's and construction workers vehicles that will make the two- way journeys to/from Oakendene. Local residents are extremely concerned about the safety aspect of these proposals, and the sustained congestion that will result from temporary traffic lights. Furthermore, the chaos that will result as drivers divert across the narrow country lanes of Picts Lane and Bulls lane, which are accessed from both directions along the A272 and A281.

Table 2-6: Applicant's Response to Middleton on Sea Coastal Alliance

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.6.1	<p>Significantly, No visual aids have been provided to the community from the developer that could have given a fair representation of real life animation or static representation of the large-scale construction – 2 ½ times the height and differing diameters than Rampion 1. As a result, no reasonable discussion has taken place, and understanding of the actual impact on the visual amenity cannot have been realistically understood by the community to enable engagement with the project. Consequently, no alternative placement of the turbines or a possible rethink in height, or clear horizon space, has been part of the consideration of the project. The critical socio-environmental impact to the area would be felt by both current and generations to come of residents, visitors and as well as the perception of the South Coast and mental health benefits not least in the economics of opportunity costs. All this without reasonable or adequate visual consultation to explain the extent to which the actual impact will be seen.</p>	<p>Photomontage visualisations depicting the predicted views of the Proposed Development are provided in Figure 15.26 to Figure 15.79, Volume 3 of the ES [APP-091 to APP-095] from a range of 54 representative viewpoints along the West Sussex coastline and wider area. These provide an accurate 'real life' indication of the appearance of the Proposed Development in photographic views, including from the coast and wider landscape. They have been produced in accordance with relevant standards for visualisations of development proposals, published by the Landscape Institute. These photomontage visualisations were made available for public viewing during the first Statutory Consultation in July to September 2021.</p> <p>As set out in the Consultation Report [APP-027], the Applicant undertook a range of Statutory and non-statutory consultations including both in-person events and online consultations in which it engaged with the wider public, which included visualisations of the Proposed Development, in order to allow the public to understand its appearance and visual impacts from the initial early design and throughout the design evolution.</p> <p>The consultation procedure undertaken by the Applicant for Rampion 2 has met the requirements for consultation that are specified in the Planning Act 2008 as confirmed by acceptance of the Application. Further information on the consultation undertaken by the Applicant can be found in the Consultation Report [APP-027].</p> <p>Chapter 28: Population and human health, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-069] and Appendix 28.1: Human health baseline, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-219] assess the potential effects for population and human health. The assessment concluded that the magnitude of impact on human health from potential changes to air quality, noise and vibration exposure, transport nature and flow rate, visual amenity, access to opportunities for physical activity, and socio-economic factors, as a result of the Proposed Development is negligible, which is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>The assessment within Chapter 17: Socio-economics, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-058] explores the impact on tourism and finds that overall, when all influencing factors are considered, the effect of the Proposed Development on the volume and value of tourism across Sussex is expected to be negligible across employment, gross value added, volume and value of the tourism economy, access to and enjoyment of onshore recreation activity, which is considered not significant in EIA terms.</p>
2.6.2	<p>We request a within project discussion of alternative siting/placement and number of the turbines within the array in effect to break down and mitigate the extensive 'fencing in' that is proposed to take in the entirety of the line of the horizon (left, front and right). We believe the evidence clearly indicates construction and operation of Rampion 2 will debase the natural beauty of the Sussex Coast both inward and outward facing and put pressure on projects started for re-invigorating the marine environment, including kelp restoration after the ban on inshore trawling and biodiversity improvement efforts on land such as interrupting biodiversity corridors</p>	<p>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-044] details how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved and demonstrates that all aspects of site selection, site access and future access requirements have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development to minimise and mitigate adverse impacts. The chapter explains the reasonable alternatives considered for the onshore cable corridor and the reasons for selection of the preferred option. At this stage, the description of the Proposed Development is indicative and a 'design envelope' approach has been adopted which takes into account the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope (Planning Inspectorate, 2018).</p>

REF Procedural Deadline A Comment**APPLICANT'S RESPONSE**

The provision of a design envelope is intended to identify key design assumptions to enable the environmental assessment to be carried out whilst retaining enough flexibility to accommodate further refinement during detailed design. Further details on the use of the Rochdale Envelope for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects is provided by the National Policy Statement (NPS) for Renewable Energy (EN-3) (Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), 2011 and the Draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), 2023).

Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-056] identifies significant seascape, landscape and visual effects for areas of the South Downs National Park (SDNP), West Sussex, East Sussex, and the City of Brighton & Hove. A number of environmental measures are embedded (C-37, C-40, C-61, and C-62 in table 18-25) as part of the Proposed Development design to avoid, minimise or reduce any significant environmental effects on seascape, landscape and visual receptors, as far as possible. Although there are some significant effects on views and perceived special quality of the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (CHAONB) designation, no effects are of such magnitude or significant enough, on their own or cumulatively to compromise the statutory purposes of the designation.

The likely significant onshore landscape and visual impacts (see **Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2** of the ES [APP-059]) linked to the Proposed Development are limited to the construction phase, and early in the operational phase, and impacts will be temporary. Embedded environmental measures (C-1, C-33, C-9, C-113, and C-199 in table 18-25) aim to minimise effects on the special qualities of the SDNP through careful design consideration and planning in respect of the construction process and activity, taking account of relevant policy and guidance. The ES assessment presented in **Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2** of the ES [APP-059] has found some significant effects on the setting of designated assets in the construction phase along the onshore cable corridor. These effects will be temporary.

The wider benefits of the Proposed Development and the need for offshore wind energy must be weighed against the adverse effects that have been identified as well as any local issues and concerns. This balancing should also take into account national and international policies and obligations that seek to tackle climate change and achieve net zero carbon emissions in 2050.

The Applicant has committed to undertaking targeted pre-construction surveys of priority habitats as referenced in the **Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan [APP-240]**. The Applicant will ensure the extent of these features are mapped as part of these surveys. Proposals for micro-siting around priority habitats are presented within the **In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [APP-239]**. The final Plan is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Marine Management Organisation, as secured in Condition 11(1)(k) of the draft Marine Licence (dML) (Schedules 11 and 12 of the **Draft DCO [PEPD-009]**).

A statement outlining the significant differences between the March 2023 draft NPSs and the November 2023 NPSs, which came into force in January 2024, has been submitted at Deadline 1, see **Statement on the Implications of the 2023 National Policy Statements** (Document Reference: 8.29). Paragraph 2.2.28 of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 (Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), 2011a), extant at the time of submission of the DCO Application and against which it will be tested, outlines that the NPS takes full account of the objective to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 2.6.3 of NPS

REF Procedural Deadline A Comment
APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

EN-1 (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), 2023a) (published in November 2023), which took effect in January 2024, and is a relevant consideration in the decision-making process, also states that the NPS takes full account of the objective to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, whilst paragraph 2.6.5 states that the UK Government believes that the NPSs provide policies that both respect the principle of sustainable development and can facilitate the consenting of energy infrastructure at the scale required.

The range of assessments in **Chapter 6: Coastal processes [APP-047]** to **Chapter 29: Climate change, Volume 2** of the ES **[APP-070]** demonstrate how the Applicant has taken into account how the Proposed Development would affect social, economic and environmental well-being. The Applicant considers that the Proposed Development represents sustainable development.

Section 104 of the Planning Act 2008 outlines that the DCO Application must be decided in accordance with the relevant NPS (in this case: NPS EN-1 (DECC, 2011a), NPS EN-3 (DECC, 2011b) and NPS EN-5 (DECC, 2011c) with NPS EN-1 (DESNZ, 2023a), NPS EN-3 (DESNZ, 2023b) and NPS EN-5 (DESNZ, 2023c), that came into force in 2024, relevant considerations in the decision-making process) unless (inter alia) the adverse impacts of a proposal would outweigh its benefits. Section 5.4 of the **Planning Statement [APP-036]** summarises the potential environmental, social and economic benefits and the adverse impacts of the Proposed Development drawing on relevant information in line with NPS EN-1. Section 5.5 of the **Planning Statement [APP-036]** sets out the planning balance where the potential benefits and impacts of the Proposed Development are weighed up. Although, inevitably, there are adverse impacts associated with the scale and type of infrastructure that forms the Proposed Development, the Applicant considers that the planning balance is firmly in favour of the Proposed Development and the benefits outweigh the adverse impacts.

2.6.3 The location inshore in the Sussex Bay does not respect the Government's strategic environmental advice on where the preferred location should be for such huge turbines such as Rampion 2 to avoid unjustifiable several social, environmental and economic detrimental impacts in coastal areas and undermine the protection of designated landscapes.

The proximity and scale of the proposal means there will a significant negative impact on almost the entire South Downs National Park and Seven Sisters Heritage Coast, both of which are due protection under National Parks and Levelling Up Legislation. Substantial weight should be given to fully applying existing OESEA visual buffers, specially the 25m (40km) distance of turbines over 225m tall from designated national landscapes and highly sensitive visual receptors (people).

South Downs National Park (SDNP) Visual Impact

Due regard to the statutory purpose of the SDNP has been had through the project design process, which has reduced adverse effects on the 'breathtaking views' and 'stunning, panoramic views to the sea' defined in Special Quality 1. The spatial extent of the Proposed Development array area has been reduced and designed according to a set of SLVIA specific design principles, which are set out in Section 15.7 of **Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2** of the ES **[APP-056]** and the '**Seascape, Landscape and Visual Design Principles Clarification Note**' (Document Reference: 8.25.11) submitted at Deadline 1, which provides further commentary on these SLVIA specific design principles.

In summary, the area to the east of Rampion 1 has been avoided with the Proposed Development wind turbine generators (WTGs) array focused to the south and west of Rampion 1 wind farm. These areas are further offshore at greater distance from the Sussex Heritage Coast of the SDNP, while also having a narrow additional lateral spread in the field of view. A clear line of sight between Rampion 1 and 2 arrays also ensures that it appears as a distinct array with less contrast and a degree of balance with Rampion 1. Although some significant effects on views from the SDNP have been identified in the assessment, effects of major significance in EIA terms have been avoided on the Sussex Heritage Coast area of the SDNP through a decision to reduce the Eastern extent of the offshore wind farm array from that proposed and assessed within the Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment (PEIR).

Table 2-7: Applicant's Response to Ancleggan Limited

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.7.1	<p>In a letter dated 21 April 2023 from the Applicant to the planning officer considering the Ancleggan Project, the Applicant stated that it “requires a 30m construction corridor, becoming a 20m permanent easement”. Accordingly Ancleggan considers that the 100 to 125 meter corridor applied for by the Applicant is disproportionately large and, if granted, will make the Ancleggan Development economically unviable or significantly more expensive and complex to develop.</p>	<p>The context and the specifics of the land take sought by the Applicant in relation to Ancleggan Limited is set out in Table LI15 Applicants Response to Ancleggan Limited [RR-012] in the Relevant Responses to Affected Parties (Submitted at Deadline 1).</p> <p>The Applicant will where possible work collaboratively with the Ancleggan Project (previously referred to as the ‘One Planet’ project in dialogue between the Parties) and try to agree a design that would result in a mutually acceptable arrangement and therefore the coexistence of the two projects. The Applicant understands from meetings that Ancleggan Project also agrees to try to minimise disruption to the Rampion 2 Project. It is anticipated by the Applicant that further to clarification on the connection and design from NGET, both the Applicant and Ancleggan will be able to consider whether there is potential to make further project refinements to minimise impacts on infrastructure for both Projects. A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) has been drafted and will continue to be developed for submission at Deadline 3.</p> <p>In regard to the Rampion 2 project parameters concerns raised, please refer to the Applicant's response to Issues Raised at Procedural Deadline A 2.1.1 above.</p>
2.7.2	<p>Further, Ancleggan believes that it is open to the Applicant and National Grid to agree a more direct cable route between Oakendene and Bolney substations which does not enter the Location at all. Accordingly, Ancleggan has requested that the development consent order application boundary granted by the ExA does not encroach on the Ancleggan land encompassing the Location.</p>	<p>The consideration of alternatives of specific interest to Ancleggan is responded to in Table LI15 Applicants Response to Ancleggan Limited [RR-012] in the Relevant Responses to Affected Parties (Submitted at Deadline 1).</p> <p>The Applicant has communicated with Ancleggan the content of the discussions with NGET, the requirement for the NGET design work in progress and the likely timescales for delivery.</p> <p>The Applicant has also communicated to Ancleggan that the land in the southwestern corner of the Ancleggan land is likely to be critical to the proposed route through to the Bolney NGET Extension on its location east of the main Bolney Substation due to the presence of existing operational Bolney substation infrastructure to the west of the Ancleggan land.</p>

Table 2-8: Applicant's Response to Elizabeth Leanne Marogna

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.8.1	<p>Regarding environmental impacts and the developer's lack of detail in their Environmental Statement and Impact Reports. Some of these details lacking include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Marine biodiversity net gain was not considered. 2. Habitat suitability assessments, including pre- and post-construction surveys and impacts on special marine protection areas have not been suitably carried out. 3. Sedimentation from construction and decommissioning will set back the Kelp Regeneration scheme being carried out in the Sussex Bay by many years, due to smothering and lack of sunlight. 4. Release of toxic sequestered chemicals are at risk of being released during construction (pyridine from anti-fouling paint on boats: English Channel is busiest shipping lane in the world) as well as sequestered carbon from the benthic layer. 5. Lack of regard on the impact on marine mammals, including many rare and protected species that are in the proposed zone out to the 12 nautical mile limit. This includes how noise will affect the health, mortality and behaviour of cetaceans 50km from source of noise. 6. Lack of regard on the impact of fish in the Sussex Bay. The noise from installation, operation and decommissioning will raise the Sound Exposure Levels (SEL) to potentially deadly levels for many species. 7. Insect migration is not able to be mitigated. Lack of consideration of emerging research of the adverse impact on flying insects impacting on biodiversity as well as pollination services on both sides of the Channel. Research concluded that 3.5 trillion arthropods fly or windsurf over the southern UK each year within the range of the proposed turbine rotors. 	<p>1) Whilst Marine Net Gain is not currently mandated in the same way as onshore (terrestrial) biodiversity net gain (BNG), in recognition of the principles set out in the NPS EN-1 (DESNZ, 2023a) that came into force in 2024, the Applicant is currently exploring opportunities to partner with organisations who are able to deliver marine benefits in the region.</p> <p>2) The Applicant has undertaken an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) which considers and assesses the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 2 of the ES [APP-042 to APP-072], and Volume 4 of the ES [APP-120 to APP-222], reports the findings of the EIA. The ES also provides information about the Proposed Development including its context, a full description of the Proposed Development and its construction, the main alternatives considered, the consultation process that was part of the EIA, and any relevant technical information that has been used to assess the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The ES and includes a series of chapters that consider and assess the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development in relation to each relevant environmental aspect.</p> <p>Further to the Environmental Statement chapters, a number of additional documents have been submitted that are focused on offshore ecology and habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment [APP-038]; • Habitats Regulations Assessment (Without Prejudice) Derogation Case [APP-039]; • Draft Marine Conservation Zone Assessment [APP-040]; • Outline Project Environmental Management Plan [APP-233]; • Draft Unexploded Ordnance Clearance Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol [APP-237]; and • In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [APP-239]. <p>3) The environmental effects to the seabed are assessed in Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-050], specifically including the area of the proposed export cable corridor which passes through the no-trawling zone assigned to protect kelp beds. Due to the short-term and localised nature of this impact and the tolerance and recoverability of the majority of the benthic receptors, the significance of the residual effect is deemed Minor Adverse, Not Significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>4) A detailed assessment of direct and indirect seabed disturbances leading to the release of sediment contaminants is presented within Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-050], paragraph 9.9.52 et seq., which revealed that adverse eco-toxicological effects are not expected, based on the detailed deliberation of contaminant data against industry standards.</p> <p>It is understood that sequestered blue carbon can be lost from sediments through disturbance during the construction of a windfarm, however it should also be noted that new evidence suggest that increased organic enrichment results in greater carbon sequestration in the seabed of an offshore wind farm ((De Borger et al, 2021)). At this present time the research suggests that the benefits from an offshore wind farm would have far greater benefits to the environment than any release of carbon from the sediments, given the footprint of the development. For example, this carbon would be offset by the much larger amount of carbon (CO₂) not emitted by using a renewable rather than a fossil energy source. For comparison, in Belgium, CO₂ emissions</p>

REF Procedural Deadline A Comment
APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

would be reduced between 1.04 and 2.86 million tons by using wind-generated energy instead of a gas turbine (based on 2018 data) (De Borger et al, 2021¹).

5) **Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2** of the ES [APP-051] concluded that the magnitude of impact on marine mammals from potential changes to noise and vibration exposure as a result of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development following the implantation of embedded environmental measures is negligible to minor adverse, which is not significant in EIA terms.

A number of plans and protocols that outline the management measures and mitigation proposed throughout the offshore construction stage to reduce the effects of noise and vibration on marine ecology receptors, including commitments C-52, C-54, C-102, C-265, C-274, C-280, and C-281. These measures restrict the offshore construction works programme around sensitive breeding seasons, use of low noise technology, sequencing approach, soft start and ramp up procedures:

- **Draft Piling Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol [APP-236];**
- **Draft Unexploded Ordnance Clearance Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol [APP-237];** and
- **In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [APP-239].**

6) The environmental effects to fish and shellfish assessed in **Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2** of the ES [APP-049] and no significant effects are predicted to occur. Further to this, the Applicant confirms that the inclusion of **Draft Piling Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol [APP-236]** (as secured in Condition 11(1)(f) of the dMLs (Schedules 11 and 12 of the **draft DCO [PEPD-009]**) in Table 8-13 of **Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2** of the ES [APP-049] which is an embedded environmental measure related to the use of soft start procedures for piling to deter mobile marine life, therefore reducing the noise exposure to fish and shellfish receptors. With regards to mitigating against the potential for impacts to sensitive stationary receptors such as black seabream and seahorse, further mitigation measures have been proposed. These are detailed in **In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [APP-239]** (as secured in Condition 11(1)(k) of the dMLs (Schedules 11 and 12 of the **draft DCO [PEPD-009]**), and include noise abatement measures, and the development of a spatial and temporal zoning plan for piling.

7) The Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion (see **Appendix 5.1 Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion, Volume 2** of the ES [APP-125]) does not raise any concern with regards to insects colliding with offshore wind turbines and the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), 2023b) makes no reference to insect collision, although it specifically mentions collision risks associated with birds and marine mammals. Further recent reviews of potential ecological effects of offshore wind farms have not identified insect collision as a risk. These include a 2021 study completed on behalf of the IUCN (Bennun et al., 2021) and one published in the journal Nature in 2022 (Galparsoro et al., 2022). Although the Applicant acknowledges that invertebrates may occur around the wind turbines, either due to prevailing winds blowing insects out to sea or through migration the potential effect can remain scoped out. It is, however, noted that there is a small number of publications that consider the risk posed to insects from onshore wind turbines.

¹ De Borger Emil, Ivanov Evgeny, Capet Arthur, Braeckman Ulrike, Vanaverbeke Jan, Grégoire Marilaure, Soetaert Karlina. (2021) Offshore Windfarm Footprint of Sediment Organic Matter Mineralization Processes. Frontiers in Marine Science, Vol 8.

Table 2-9: Applicant's Response to Susie Clare Fischel

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.9.1	Failure of Rampion 2 to provide sufficient detail and explanation to interested parties to enable them to make representations by requested deadline of 29 th February (in particular, explanation of need for 100 m wide DCO corridor which is so wide as to make it hard to assess impacts of a 40m wide working strip within this).	<p>The context and the specifics of the land take sought by the Applicant in relation to Susie Clare Fischel (the Land Interest) is set out in Table LI36 'Applicant's Response to Susie Clare Fischel' [RR-378] (Submitted at Deadline 1). Further specific comments received in the Land Interest's relevant representations are also addressed therein.</p> <p>Order Limits</p> <p>Land owned by the Land Interest is required for construction and operation of the permanent cable easement. The land is required to be included in the Applicant's DCO at this stage to ensure that all required rights for construction and operation are secured. If a voluntary land agreement is secured within the Land Interest compulsory acquisition may not be required.</p> <p>The Applicant does not agree with the Land Interest's assertion that the powers sought are disproportionate to the actual area of land required for construction. As explained by the Applicant in the SoR (Para 9.11.7-9.11.9) [APP-021], not all of the land within the DCO boundary will need to be permanently acquired. Flexibility is sought to enable the construction of works anywhere within the area identified for those works on the works plans [PEPD-009], within which area there will be a circa 40m construction corridor and 20m permanent easement rights corridor (HDD). The final cable routing will be refined further to pre-construction surveys including intrusive site investigation. Details will be included within the stage specific Construction Method Statement, in accordance with the Outline Construction Method statement and pursuant to DCO Requirement 23. The Applicant will seek to minimise the extent of permanent rights required by taking temporary possession first of the wider construction corridor and then permanently acquiring the rights required over the narrower easement area when the location is known</p>
2.9.2	Unclear procedure set out by ExA - it appears detail of the application will be considered in Open Floor Hearing 1 on same day as preliminary hearing, and then in Issue Specific Hearing thereafter. We fail to see how Interested Parties' concerns can be fully addressed by the ExA given that these hearings are taking place prior to the submission of representations by IP's by the 29th of February deadline.	Noted, the Applicant has no further comments on this matter at this time.

Table 2-10: Applicant's Response to Jeremy Smethurst

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.10.1	<p>Bolney Parish Council make the following, very reasonable, request about the use of minor lanes, which I hope you would agree with.</p> <p>“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;</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a separate response to the Land Interest's Relevant Representation in Table 4 of the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations at Deadline 1,</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a response to Bolney Parish Council's Relevant Representation, please see Table 2, reference 2.14.1 – 2.14.4 in Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [doc ref 8.24]. Further to this, the Applicant has provided a comprehensive response in regards to traffic concerns to Cowfold/A272/A27/A23/Kent Street/Wineham Lane/Moatfield Lane/Kings Lane/ Dragons Lane, please see Table 5, Reference MPB1 in Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [8.24].</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a comprehensive response on flood risk concerns in Table 6 of the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations at Deadline 1,</p> <p>Chapter 26: Water environment, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-067] considers the potential impact of pollution to the River Adur and Cowfold Stream, resulting from the Proposed Development. The assessment concludes that there is likely to be no significant impact to water quality in the River Adur and Cowfold Stream during the construction or operational phases of the Proposed Development. The assessment also concludes that the impact resulting from changes to watercourse morphology as a result of works on or near watercourses is not expected to be significant.</p> <p>The Applicant has been engaging with Horsham District Council since 26th March 2020. This was a meeting with local authorities to introduce Project areas of search, engagement and consultation plans alongside broad timetable.</p>

REF Procedural Deadline A Comment

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

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.

Table 2-11: Applicant's Response to Protect Coastal Sussex

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.11.1	<p>OESEA</p> <p>i) The Applicant openly demonstrates blatant disregard for the UK Government's rolling Offshore Energy Strategic Environment Assessment (OESEA) visual buffer advice and argues at every opportunity, including in its Environment Statement (ES), that the OESEA is not relevant to the Rampion 2 Design, or Examination.</p> <p>ii) Unfortunately, the Rule 6 documents the ExA circulated does not indicate that the Examination process would consider, or apply, UK visual buffer advice.</p> <p>iii) We believe that runs counter to the body of relevant policy, including the National Policy Statements, as well as good design practice and common sense concerns raised by a sufficient number of statutory consultees and many Interested Parties (IPs).</p> <p>iv) Respect for OESEA visual buffer advice to provide minimum distances between large turbines clearly visible from the shore and designated landscapes is policy relevant. It otherwise needs to be a Principal Issue and explicit in the Examination. In our main Submission that follows we offer practical suggestions in that regard.</p>	<p>There is no UK Government Policy that defines distance limits for offshore wind farms from shore. Buffers for offshore wind farm development are not defined on a project-by-project basis, but through strategic assessment. The Offshore Energy Strategic Environmental Assessment (OESEA) (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), Offshore Petroleum Regulator for Environment and Decommissioning and Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 2023) proposes that for areas outside designated landscapes, wind turbine generators (WTGs) of this size would be likely to exceed medium magnitude less than 27.5km from shore and therefore could be significant within that distance. The OESEA (2023) does not suggest no-go areas for development, including site in proximity to the South DOWNS National Park and the heritage coast, it is rather a strategic tool and is not guidance or a roadmap for placing of wind farms, which are allocated by The Crown Estate and it is not in the Applicant's remit to locate sites to avoid unacceptable impacts. High level 'buffer' studies do not ultimately replace the need for site specific assessment, which has been undertaken in Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-056], of which the findings have informed the design of the Proposed Development and the embedded environmental measures, as described in Section 15.7 of Chapter 15: Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-056].</p> <p>The revised NPS (Department of Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) 2023a; 2023b and 2023c) are important and relevant to the determination of the present DCO Application. The Proposed Development type is recognised as being a critical national priority in the revised NPS EN-1 (DESNZ, 2023a) and NPS EN-3 (DESNZ, 2023b), for which there is an urgent need to deliver.</p>
2.11.2	<p>2. Consideration of Alternatives under Section 4.4 of EN-1</p> <p>i) The emphasis the ExA gives to the consideration of within-project alternatives in its Initial Assessment of Principal Issues in the Rule 6 Letter Annex C is welcome. However, no mention is made of applying the Alternatives Section 4.4 in NPS EN-1.</p> <p>ii) Consideration of alternatives is a clear policy requirement in Examinations of NSIP infrastructure, such as Rampion 2, that disrupt designated landscapes, their functions and national protection objectives (in this case including South Downs National Park).</p> <p>iii) Rampion 2 invokes the EN-1, para 5.9.10 policy requirement to, "... include assessment of: ... the cost of, and scope for, developing all or part of the development elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way, taking account of the policy on Alternatives set out in Section 4.4". (our underlining)</p> <p>iv) The European Convention on Landscapes, the Marine Policy Statement (2021), the NPS (2023), and the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 which came into force in late 4 December 2023 further reinforce and strengthen policy provisions for the protection of National Parks in ways that include the consideration of Alternatives.</p>	<p>Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-044] describes the alternatives studied by the Applicant and a comparison of their environmental effects across the project as a whole. This includes the alternatives considered and consulted on prior to the DCO Application. As described in Chapter 3 Alternatives, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-044], the Proposed Development has been developed through a multi-disciplinary design process including environment, engineering, landowner and cost considerations.</p> <p>Section 4.4 of the Planning Statement [APP-036] sets out the consideration of the key policy test regarding nationally significant infrastructure development taking place in the South Downs National Park (SDNP) in line with the requirements of 5.9.10 of NPS EN-1 (2011). The consideration of the need for the development is outlined in paragraphs 4.4.7 – 4.4.21 of the Planning Statement [APP-036]. The consideration of the cost and scope of development alternatives outside the SDNP is outlined in paragraphs 4.4.22 – 4.4.67. This section draws on Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-044] which details the process of site selection and the consideration of alternatives. Section 3.3 of Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-044] outlines the alternatives considered in terms of grid connection and Section 3.4 sets out the alternatives considered in terms of landfall and onshore cable route. Together, these sections outline the cost and scope of delivering the reasonable alternatives outside of the SDNP. Therefore, this has been appropriately considered, as summarised in the Planning Statement [APP-044].</p> <p>The detrimental effects on the environment, landscape and recreational opportunities and extent to which these could be moderated is considered in paragraphs 4.4.68 – 4.4.90 of the Planning Statement [APP-036]. Specifically, paragraphs 4.4.69 – 4.4.75 considers the environment; paragraphs 4.4.76 – 4.4.84 consider landscape; and paragraphs 4.4.85 – 4.4.88 consider recreational activities. Section 4.4 of the Planning Statement [APP-036] draws on various assessments in the aspect chapters within the ES (particularly Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2 of the ES [PEPD-020], Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impact, Volume 2 of the ES</p>

REF	PROCEDURAL DEADLINE A COMMENT	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>v) We suggest procedures for considering Alternative under EN-1 Section 4.4 can be announce at the Day 1 Hearing 7 Feb 2023, along with steps to provide related system value modelling analysis and relevant written or oral testimony, as indicated in Sections 2 and 3 of our main submission herein on how the Examination may be conducted.</p>	<p>[APP-059]; and Chapter 17: Socio-economics, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-058] to outline the detrimental effects of the onshore cable route and the extent to which these could be moderated. The Commitments Register [APP-254] sets out the full range of embedded environmental measures to minimise or mitigate the environmental effects including those of relevance to the SDNP.</p> <p>The Applicant therefore considers that it has appropriately considered the key policy tests in NPS EN-1 5.9.10 (Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), 2011) relating to development taking place within the SDNP.</p>
2.11.3	<p>3. Inviting expert views and testimony on Alternatives and National benefit metrics</p> <p>i) The Planning Inspectorate (PINs) Advice Notes state that expert testimony is often called upon in Examinations requiring specific technical expertise to better inform the Examination process. That is important in this case, given the background of ExA members appears largely to be more Chartered Town Planning with no indicated energy sector or power system expertise and we are considering the merits of an energy project.</p> <p>ii) Relevant Representations made this point about the need for expertise to be invited directly by this ExA, or encouraged, to help breakdown and assess the national benefits of Rampion 2, as needed to make critical policy judgements, such as whether adverse impacts (local and national disbenefits or Rampion 2 outweigh its national benefits; as well as for the consideration of Alternatives under Section 4.4.</p> <p>iii) Otherwise, those critical judgements risk being overly subjective, or superficial tick box exercises. In our view that would be highly inappropriate for considering a £3-4 bn energy infrastructure investment commitment, plus given what is at stake for local communities, as well as the wider public and national interests.</p> <p>iv) We believe the ExA approach and procedure for inviting and encouraging relevant expert testimony, preferably both written and oral should be explicit. For Examination efficiency, this can be linked with the assessment of Alternatives, as under Section 4.4 of EN-1 in the manner noted in the main representation herein.</p>	<p>Noted, the Applicant has no further comments on this matter at this time.</p>
2.11.4	<p>4. Clarity on Sustainable Development metrics</p> <p>i) The achievement of sustainable development, legally defined as activities (especially major infrastructure projects) that provide balance across mutually-reinforcing environment, social and economic objectives and achieve net gains under each objection is at the heart of the UK planning system.</p> <p>ii) We observed there is no mention of the word “sustainable” in the Rule 6 Letter and Annexes that set out how the Rampion 2 Examination will be framed and conducted, let alone the procedure, approach or metrics to</p>	<p>Noted, the Applicant has no further comments on this matter at this time.</p>

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>be applied to inform the essential judgement on whether Rampion 2 would advance or undermine achieving sustainable development on the south coast and project-affected inland areas.</p> <p>iii) NPS EN-1 is clear on the overarching policy relevance of energy infrastructure contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. It requires more than a passing reference in the Rampion 2 Examination on multiple grounds, including the project's case specific transformative nature and unique extent of its consequent social, environment and economic effects due to its scale and inshore location. 1 This requires expertise and background in power system planning, supply reliability and affordability and across the metrics of national benefits related to carbon offsetting and delivering decarbonisation of the power sector by 2035, not only for the key policy concerns, but also to address the policy requirement for the Examination to consider EN-1 (overarching) Section 4.4 Alternatives. 5.</p> <p>iv) We believe the Examination should have a clear, explicit aim to establish whether Rampion 2 would advance or undermine the achievement of sustainable development. The approach and metrics to be employed for this assessment and judgement should be clearly set out as a Principal Issue in this Examination.</p>	
2.11.5	<p>5. Consideration of underwater and landscape noise</p> <p>i) Both underwater noise (UWN) adversely affecting marine life and landscape noise affecting people were raised as concerning issues in a number of PAD Statements and RRs.</p> <p>ii) UWN impacts on marine mammals and fish can have significant biodiversity implications as noted in PAD Statements including the Marine Management Organisation and Natural England. Landscape noise that consists of construction noise for 4-5 years from both offshore and onshore activities (e.g., piling, horizontal drilling, construction work camp activities, traffic noise, vessel and helicopter noise, etc.) all add to the concerns.</p> <p>iii) Noise and vibration was a Principal Issue in the Navitus Bay Wind Park Examination. It does not appear in the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues for the Rampion 2 Examination.</p> <p>iv) We believe that underwater and landscape noise should be an explicit consideration in the Examination process along with appropriate coverage in topic specific hearings. UWN as it relates to impacts on marine mammals, fish and net biodiversity gain / loss, should be included in the unspecified topic-specific hearings on environment effects in the 7-9 February 2023 sessions in Brighton.</p>	<p><u>Noise concerns on marine ecology receptors</u></p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the Proposed Development to consider and assess the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The DCO Application includes a series of documents that address the potential effects of noise on ecological receptors. These include the following aspect chapters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 8: Fish and shellfish ecology, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-049]; • Chapter 9: Benthic, subtidal and intertidal ecology, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-050]; • Chapter 11: Marine mammals, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-051]; and • Chapter 12: Offshore and intertidal ornithology, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-052]. <p>The assessment concluded that the magnitude of impact on all marine species in the chapters outlined above (fish, shellfish, benthic, marine mammals, ornithology) from potential changes to noise and vibration exposure as a result of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development following the implantation of embedded environmental measures is negligible to minor adverse, which is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>A number of plans and protocols that outline the management measures and mitigation proposed throughout the offshore construction stage to reduce the effects of noise and vibration on marine ecology receptors, including commitments C-52, C-54, C-102, C-265, C-274, C-280, and C-281. These measures restrict the offshore construction works programme around sensitive breeding seasons, use of low noise technology, sequencing approach, soft start and ramp up procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Piling Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol [APP-236]; • Draft Unexploded Ordnance Clearance Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol [APP-237]; and

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [APP-239]. <p><u>Noise concerns on human receptors</u> The Applicant has undertaken an EIA of the Proposed Development to consider and assess the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The Development Consent Order (DCO) Application includes a series of documents that address the potential effects of noise on human receptors. These include the following aspect chapters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 17: Socio-economics, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-058]; • Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-062]; and • Chapter 28: Population and human health, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-069]. <p>Section 21.15 in Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-062] assessment concluded that the potential effect during the construction phase will be negligible to minor adverse following the implementation of embedded environmental measures, which is not significant in terms of EIA.</p> <p>The noise from offshore piling (see Section 21.9 in Chapter 21: Noise and vibration, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-062]) at onshore receptors has been predicted using Danish Statutory Order no. 1284 (2011), which is currently the most reliable prediction methodology for noise over water. The assessment concluded that the magnitude of impact on human health from offshore piling noise exposure as a result of the Proposed Development is negligible, which is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>Chapter 17: Socio-economics, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-058] assessed the potential effects on tourism. The assessment concluded that there would be a negligible effect on the tourism economy, which is not significant in terms on EIA.</p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [PEPD-033] outlines management measures and mitigation proposed at all onshore construction areas to reduce the effects relating to noise and vibration from construction of the Proposed Development, including commitments C-10, C-26, and C-263. Commitment C-263 for the production of a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) during detailed design based on the principles in the Outline CoCP [PEPD-033], detailing best practicable means and location specific mitigation. The NVMP will be based on further assessment on where noisy construction activities, including piling will occur. Additional measures will be considered at these locations, such as mufflers, acoustic shrouds, and temporary noise barriers, where appropriate.</p>
2.11.6	<p>6. Drawing lessons from previous South Coast windfarm DCO Examinations</p> <p>i) Two previous wind farm Examinations on the south coast offer lessons to better understand the nature and likely scale of Rampion 2 impacts, namely: Rampion 1 (consented in 2014) and the Navitus Bay Wind Park Application (refused consent in 2015).</p> <p>ii) Drawing lessons from those Examinations should be encouraged and taken into account in this Examination. This is important as the Applicant's ES asserts Rampion 2 is equivalent to the existing Rampion installation</p>	<p>i) Applications for an order granting development consent should be determined in accordance with section 104 of the Planning Act 2008. It should be noted that since the determination of the Rampion Offshore Wind and Navitus Bay applications, revised National Policy Statements for Energy have been designated which will be relevant to the Secretary of State's decision. In particular, the critical national priority applied to renewable energy generation infrastructure demonstrates the enhanced policy need for schemes like Rampion 2.</p> <p>ii) Noted, the Applicant has no further comments on this matter at this time.</p> <p>iii) The reinstatement of land following the Rampion 1 works is not a matter for this DCO Application.</p>

REF	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
<p>in respect to impacts; whereas, we and many Ips see the scale and likely effects of Rampion 2 are far more like Navitus Bay.</p> <p>iii) South Downs National Park in its PAD Statement and Sussex Wildlife in their RR, for example, indicates the recovery and restoration of the Rampion 1 transmission route through the Park is problematic; not as reported by the Applicant as being successful.</p> <p>iv) Similarly, surveys and conclusions drawn on the likely socio-economic and social effects of the visual impacts of Navitus Bay turbines on south coast residents and the tourism economy are relevant. The Rampion 2 Applicant is virtually silent on Navitus Bay in its PEIR and Application documentation and even its desk study reviews of UK experience.</p>	<p>The methodologies that will be used to ensure construction (including restoration) is undertaken in a sensitive and appropriate way can be found in the Outline Construction Method Statement [APP-255], the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [PEPD-033], and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) [APP232]. These documents are secured within the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-019] under Requirements 12, 22 and 23 of the draft DCO [PEPD-009].</p> <p>iv) Chapter 7: Other marine users, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-048] addresses the potential effects of the Proposed Development on recreational boating, sailing, and fishing. It also includes an assessment of effects on diving and water sports (including surfing). The assessments conclude the likely effects from the Proposed Development on these activities is not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>The assessment within Chapter 17: Socio-economics, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-058] explores the impact on tourism and finds that overall, when all influencing factors are considered, the effect of the Proposed Development on the volume and value of tourism across Sussex is expected to be negligible across employment, gross value added, volume and value of the tourism economy, access to and enjoyment of onshore recreation activity, which is considered not significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>In addition to this, the Applicant has included a number of commitments specifically included to maximise the benefits of all project phases (construction, operation, and decommissioning) on the local economy and the local employment benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C-34 RED will identify opportunities for companies based or operating in the region to access supply chain for the Proposed Development. • C-35 RED will work with local partners and seek to maximise the ability of local people to access employment. <p>To further facilitate these commitments, the Applicant has developed an Outline Skills and Employment Strategy [PEPD-037]. The strategy sets out the approach that will be adopted by the Applicant, with the aim of promoting skills and employment opportunities for local economic benefit within the Sussex area. Based on engagement undertaken to date, a key ambition of the Applicant is to focus on providing sustainable careers, rather than just jobs.</p>

Table 2-12: Applicant's Response to Paul Lightburn

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.12.1	<p>Concerns about the threat of closure of Private Means of Access (PMA) Kings' Lane, Cowfold during the laying of Rampion2 onshore cables, on behalf of residents and property owners.</p> <p>The categorisation of King's Lane on the plans as a 'bridleway and public footpath' only, is incorrect. This is a Private Means of Access (PMA) subject to legacy access rights granted to neighbouring properties by the freehold owners of the roadway.</p> <p>When we first saw the early plans and realised that the cable trench is due to cross our lane in wide open trenches at two places, we raised questions at public meetings and other forums about how alternative access was to provided and was told, "all would be resolved in due course." On 29 Nov 2022 Carter Jonas stated by email (with copies to various Rampion/ RWE addresses): 'We have noted on file that King's Lane serves numerous dwellings and farming activities.' But the latest plans still state "temporary public right of way closures" and shows no alternative means of accessing our properties. Subsequent correspondence with RED's stakeholder manager has resulted in general statements, but none give us the absolute assurances we need. For example: anyone trying to sell a property is unable to provide to potential purchasers the necessary guarantees of uninterrupted access</p>	<p>The context and the specifics of the rights sought by the Applicant in relation to Paul Lightburn (the Land Interest) is set out in Table LI30 Applicant's Response to Paul Lightburn [RR-293] (Submitted at Deadline 1). Further specific comments received in the Land Interest's relevant representations are also addressed therein.</p> <p>In summary the Applicant seeks new rights (i.e. operational access rights) over Kings Lane/ Moatfield Lane, for this purpose, but does not propose to acquire the land. In addition, Kings Lane/ Moatfield Lane is crossed twice (Plot 32/11 and Plot 32/3) by the proposed cable route (Works No. 9 – Cable installation works (including construction haul road and operational access)), which will involve open-cut trenching installation methodology, and therefore the Cable package of rights and restrictive covenants are sought.</p> <p>The private road known as Kings Lane and Moatfield Lane carries the designation of Bridleway 1730 and footpath 1782, which is the highest level of public access available. As it is not a public road, it has been included within the red line boundary of the project to secure a right of vehicular access to operate and maintain the cables.</p> <p>Kings Lane and Moatfield Lane provide a route to access A-60 which is defined in Table 23-24 within Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-064] as an operational access only for the onshore cable route. Paragraphs 23.4.21 and 23.4.22 within Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-064] describe the expected operational and maintenance phase activities which includes periodic testing of the cable through attendance by up to three light vehicles such as vans in a day at any one location. Unscheduled maintenance or emergency repair visits for the onshore cable will typically involve a very small number of vehicles, typically light vans. Infrequently, equipment may be required to be replaced, then the use of an occasional HGV may be utilised, depending on the nature of the repair. (Paragraph 23.4.22 within Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-064])</p> <p>Sheet 32 of the Onshore Works Plan [PEPD-005] also shows that Kings Lane and Moatfield Lane is for operational purposes only.</p> <p>As shown in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [PEPD-033] the crossing of the onshore cable route is identified within Appendix A under reference TRX-1de-32 as being crossed by open cut method. This means that during construction access to properties located along Kings Lane and Moatfield Lane will be temporarily affected. The strategy to maintain private means of access during this period is described in Paragraph 5.7.10 of the Outline CoCP [PEPD-033]. The following general principles will apply to the managed or private means of access during the cable route construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any access restrictions or effect on individual properties will be kept to a minimum and the Applicant will work with local stakeholders to develop individual solutions to keep disruptions as low as is reasonably possible. All crossings of private means of access will be developed to allow emergency access at all times.

REF **Procedural Deadline A Comment**

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

- Contractors will be required to accommodate reasonable requests for access during the working day by temporary plating of the trench unless a suitable diversion is provided around the works.
- The trench will be plated or temporarily backfilled outside of construction working hours where feasible to restore access, unless a suitable diversion is provided around the works.
- Any access restrictions or closures will be communicated to all residents and businesses with affected rights of access.
- A nominated point of contact on behalf of the applicant will be communicated to all residents and businesses at least three months before the start of construction.

A final Code of Construction Practice will be required to be submitted and approved on a staged basis, in accordance with the [Outline CoCP \[PEPD-033\]](#), pursuant to requirement 22.

Table 2-13: Applicant's Response to Janine Creaye

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.13.1	I do not agree that 'sufficient information has been provided to assess the effects of development on biodiversity' We have evidence of 'unimproved Lowland Meadow' habitat in the cable construction route approaching the substation site in Cowfold. This is rare habitat for Horsham District and is deemed BAP Priority. There are no surveys covering this area in the submission's National Vegetation classification Survey Report 6.4.22.4, except one which was at Gratwicke Stud Farm where they have ploughed and seeded grass only in 2020 (Baker and Talbot 1), and one in the flood plain of the Cowfold Stream (Baker and Talbot 2) which is not obvious quality meadow as it is often under water. The species rich meadows are all across the higher ground in between the two surveys and in the path of the cable and haul road. We have entered data into the biodiversity records covering the density of meadow plants here in 2023 and have an ecologist report confirming the quality of the habitat which will be submitted in the next stage.	<p>The Applicant notes this response and will respond following review of the further information described.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a separate response to the Land Interest's Relevant Representation, please see Table 4 of the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations at Deadline 1.</p>
2.13.2	There are also no surveys submitted covering reptiles in the cable route (slow-worms, grass snakes and adders are all present and been added to records in 2023), or toad migration (there is an established breeding site at 'Kings' pond with migration all down Kent Street and Moatfield Lane) and incomplete surveys of crested newts have been submitted. The bird surveys only registered 5 nightingales in the whole onshore construction, when our surveys have recorded 22 nesting sites specifically in the Cowfold cable section alone.	<p>Reptile surveys were only undertaken at the site of the proposed substation at Oakendene and in the vicinity of National Grid's Bolney substation (Appendix 22.12 Reptile Survey [APP-190]). This is because reptiles (other than sand lizard and smooth snake) are dealt with routinely on construction sites through the implementation of a method statement as per that described within the Outline Code of Construction Practice [PEPD-033].</p> <p>Great crested newts have been identified along the length of the route. The Proposed Development would not result in the loss of any breeding habitat but will result in the loss of terrestrial habitat (mostly temporarily). This would be dealt with strategically through an application for entry to the district level licence scheme run by Nature Space for West Sussex. It is noted in commitment C-214 (Commitments Register [APP-254]) that further great crested newt survey will be undertaken prior to construction to inform the application. It is however, noted that to gain entry to the district level license scheme no further survey data would be required.</p> <p>Breeding bird surveys were undertaken following standard industry practice. The survey is focused on a particular location, as opposed to the whole area, as it is focused on identifying birds where a potential effect may be understood. Further, the nature of all biodiversity surveys is that they are focused on sampling, as opposed to a full identification of all territories present.</p>
2.13.3	I refute that the Rampion project 'will not be removing irreplaceable habitat'. I suggest that HDC review the submitted maps for tree and hedge loss in the Cowfold area. There are 26 significant trees to be removed in the substation site alone, some with veteran features, there is a Green Lane and wildlife corridor which is marked for tree removal, some designated 'good quality' many with veteran features of fungi, hollows, dead lower limbs, all within the group G35 (Annex2: Arboricultural Impact Plan – inset 43). There are 22 trees in the construction corridor and 11 within the area marked for removal. With the tree loss critically also comes the loss of a well-used wildlife track, outlying badger setts, and double tree boundary landscape feature. Cratemans Farm on the same map loses trees in 3 different areas and not only is there species rich lowland meadow in between a lot of blackthorn scrub which inevitably will be lost as the open trench runs right through it. Even though the scrub maps submitted	<p>The Applicant uses the term 'irreplaceable habitat' in line with Government definition. Irreplaceable habitat is defined in the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) (2023) in paragraphs 5.4.14 and 5.4.15 as ancient woodland, ancient trees, veteran trees, blanket bog, limestone pavement, coastal sand dunes, spartina salt marsh swards, mediterranean saltmarsh scrub and lowland fen. This list is the same as that published in The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024.</p> <p>Losses of hedgerows, scrub and woodland have been minimised through avoidance in the design of the Proposed Development. Where notching of hedgerows is required during the construction of the onshore cable corridor, reinstatement will be within 10 years in most cases. The Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [PEPD-033] includes Vegetation Retention Plans which show areas of vegetation to be retained. The permanent losses of tree lines or hedgerows within the onshore substation footprint will be compensated for through the landscape design and secured through the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) [APP-232] (through woodland, scrub, and parkland tree planting in the area around the substation).</p>

REF **Procedural Deadline A Comment**

contradict this. It is not possible that the open trench, haul road and tree removal will leave undisturbed scrub. This thorny scrub (as championed by Knepp's 'Scrub heroes' project), is the nesting sites for the nightingale population and takes decades to reach the thickness and density needed for these and many other birds to breed. They do not require new wet scrub planting or woodland, but dense blackthorn scrub which takes many years to establish. It cannot be reinstated in any way that retains the continuity of the breeding sites. In point 5.13 in this document the Cowfold Stream is termed 'in bad ecological state' from desk study. As this is the heart of the concentrated nightingale population, cuckoos and turtle doves have been heard last year in the undisturbed areas either side and skylarks nest at the field edges adjacent to the Cowfold Stream at Cratemans Farm, enhancement cannot be considered without a proper assessment of what is currently here.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

Embedded environmental measures, detailed within **Appendix 22.16: Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Volume 4** of the ES [APP-194] will be implemented to necessitate unnecessary tree removal or pruning, alongside maintaining the quality, condition, or safety of remaining trees.

The impact of the Proposed Development on breeding birds, including nightingale, has been assessed in **Chapter 22: Terrestrial ecology and nature conservation, Volume 2** of the ES [APP-063]. The assessment concludes that the impact on breeding birds from reduction in habitat connectivity, disturbance and displacement will not be significant. The **Indicative Landscape Plan** within the **Design and Access Statement (DAS) [AS-003]**, details additional habitat which is being provided to support the local nightingale population at the onshore substation at Oakdene. This includes wet woodland, woodland, scrub and parkland trees.

Table 2-14: Applicant's Response to Meera Smethurst

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.14.1	<p>To suggest that movements in and out of the substation site, related compounds and the adjacent route through Kent Street can be restricted to outside peak hours or can be reasonably managed by traffic lights etc is to misunderstand the traffic situation at this point on the A272. This is an extremely busy road, with approximately 18000 vehicles per day. At peak times, which in practice means from 7.30 to 9.30 am and 4.00 to 6.30 pm there is standing traffic from Cowfold to beyond these construction sites. Avoidance of peak time movements would bring the Rampion construction works to a halt for several hours each day. Yet to allow them to continue, including their arrival at these compounds at the beginning of the day and then carry out the complex movements in and out of these compounds will surely make travel on this road intolerable for residents and workmen alike. The impracticality of allowing this site to be put forward simply has not been thought out. So far no credible means of addressing this issue has been put forward by the applicant or accepted by WSCC. The fundamental problem with this location, as opposed to traffic turning on and off the road at Wineham lane is that here, because of the effects of the nearby mini roundabouts in Cowfold, the road traffic is at or near capacity much of the time.</p> <p>Similarly, any traffic management, such as traffic lights, on Kent Street will be impossible as the road is far too narrow. Once through the lights, the traffic will have nowhere to go as it will simply encounter the queue waiting on the other side.</p>	<p>The likely significant transport effects of the construction phase of the Proposed Development has been assessed within the Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-064] and Chapter 32: ES Addendum (Document reference: 6.2.32) (submitted at Deadline 1). There are four receptors within Cowfold that have been assessed.</p> <p>Of the four receptors assessed, the A272 Bolney Road east of Cowfold Village centre is the closest to the Oakendene construction compound. As part of the Proposed Development this is forecast to experience an average weekly flow of 39 HGVs, equivalent to an increase of 5.5% or 3-4 per hour.</p> <p>At peak construction activity, access A-62 (Oakendene Compound) will cater for 326 HGV two-way movements and 456 LGV two-way movements across a one-week period. This is the equivalent of 156 construction traffic two-way movements per day or 12-13 per hour (approximately 6 entering and 6 exiting the compound).</p> <p>At peak construction activity, access AA-63 (Oakendene Substation) will cater for 326 HGV two-way movements and 564 LGV two-way movements across a one-week period. This is the equivalent of 178 construction traffic two-way movements per day or 14-15 per hour (approximately 7 entering and 7 exiting the access junction).</p> <p>Noting a 24-hour future baseline flow of 20,578 vehicles on the A272 Bolney Road east of Cowfold Village centre, the Proposed Development will generate a 3.8%-4.3% increase in traffic at Oakendene. As day-to-day variation of traffic on a road is frequently + or -10%, it can therefore be assumed that projected changes in traffic of less than 10% will result in no significant transport effects.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a separate response to the Land Interest's Relevant Representation, please see Table 4 of the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations at Deadline 1.</p>

Table 2-15: Applicant's Response to the Maritime and Coastguard Agency

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
2.15.1	<p>1. Navigable Sea Room</p> <p>The changes to the Red Line Boundary (RLB) as presented in Figure 6.1 of the NRA have led to an overall increase in the navigable sea room available in the vicinity of The Dover Strait TSS to the south, Inshore Traffic Zone (ITZ) to the east and the approaches to the Solent to the west. In addition, as noted in paragraph 371 of the NRA and although not formally designated as a navigation corridor, the introduction of a structures exclusion zone (NRA Figure 17.1) compliant with MGN 654 to the west of Rampion 1 is welcomed by the MCA.</p> <p>Guidance from MGN 654 has been used to show the minimum width required for the 3.6NM long corridor and 1.3NM as a worst-case scenario is compliant. The inclusion of this structures exclusion zone and the reduction in the western boundary in proximity to Owers Bank and in particular the Owers south cardinal mark, has been welcomed by key stakeholders. MCA is content with these changes and agrees with the assessment and conclusion that it will not pose an unacceptable navigational risk.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments of the Maritime and Coastguard Agency which are headed 'Examination Timetable – Deadline 1 – Written Representation'. The Applicant will provide a substantive response at Deadline 3 as part of its responses to Written Representations.</p>
2.15.2	<p>2. Shipping and Navigation Mitigation Measures</p> <p>In response to MCA queries at the PEIR stage we are content that adequate focus has now been given to increased vessel grounding risks as addressed in chapter 13, sections 13.9- 13.11 and section 19.1.4 of the NRA. Consideration has also been given to the effects of reduction of depth in relation to Chart Datum of any scour protection and cable installation and associated works, with a Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP) and Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) as embedded mitigations C-41 and C-45 respectively.</p> <p>Additionally, it should be noted that the requirement for an Emergency Response Cooperation Plan (ERCoP), as referenced in Table 13-14 of the ES Chapter 13 Shipping and Navigation, will be secured in the DCO/DML under the condition for complying with MGN 654. There will not be a specific condition for the completion of an ERCoP</p> <p>The list of mitigation measures in Table 24-1 of the NRA and Table 13-14 of the Shipping and navigation ES Chapter is relevant and appropriate and will serve to reduce identified risks to ALARP.</p>	
2.15.3	<p>3. Layout Design</p> <p>The turbine layout design must be compliant with MGN 654 and it will require MCA and Trinity House approval prior to construction to minimise the risks to surface vessels, including rescue boats, and search and rescue aircraft operating within the site. MCA will seek to ensure all structures are aligned in straight rows and columns with a minimum of two lines of orientation. Mitigation C-86 in table 13-14 of Chapter 13 and Table 24-1 of the NRA, confirms the intention to continue discussions with the MCA and Trinity House. Further advice will be provided once the layout discussions have started.</p>	
2.15.4	<p>4. Marking and Lighting.</p> <p>MCA will seek to ensure the turbine numbering system follows a 'spreadsheet' principle and is consistent with other windfarms in the UK. All lighting and marking arrangements will need to be agreed with MCA and Trinity House. The MCA requires all aviation lighting to be visible 360° and compatible with night vision imaging systems, as detailed in CAP 764 and MGN 654 Annex 5.</p>	
2.15.5	<p>5. Emergency Response and Search and Rescue.</p> <p>There is an expectation that the presence of wind farms will increase the likelihood of the requirement for emergency response, not just from navigational incidents but from other incidents such as medical evacuation or pollution. A SAR checklist based on the requirements in MGN 654 Annex 5 will need to be completed in agreement with MCA before construction starts. This will include the requirement for an approved Emergency Response Co-operation Plan (ERCoP).</p> <p>During SAR discussions, particular consideration will need to be given to the implications of the site size and location. Attention should be paid to the level of radar surveillance, AIS and shore-based VHF radio coverage and give due consideration for appropriate mitigation such as radar, AIS receivers and in-field, Marine Band VHF radio communications aerial(s) (VHF voice with Digital Selective Calling (DSC)) that can cover the entire wind farm sites and their surrounding areas. It will be expected that RED will provide this AIS and VHF capability to the MCA with direct access to HM Coastguard systems.</p>	

REF	Procedural Deadline A Comment	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE
	<p>Chapter 9 of the NRA regarding lessons learned within the offshore industry references SAR helicopter trials at the North Hoyle offshore wind farm in 2005. This is now a dated document and while references may still be made, there may be more benefit in referring to documents written by the MCA in 2019, titled: "MCA report following aviation trials and exercises in relation to offshore windfarms" and "MCA report following aviation trials at Hornsea Project 1 windfarm".</p> <p>A minor note in way of clarification is that the UK is now divided into six districts and 18 areas. Paragraph 143 of the NRA refers to these areas as 'geographical regions'. Full list of the areas is available at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coastguard-rescueservice-areas-and-stations.</p> <p>Section 9.6.2 of the NRA references incidents in European offshore wind farms which although not in the UK, does show that vessels are interacting with windfarms/turbines. We would recommend that an allision/collision per windfarm would be a more accurate representation rather than per turbine, as presented in paragraph 155, since it is the presence of the windfarm which the NRA is addressing.</p>	
2.15.6	<p>6. Construction scenarios. We would expect to see some form of linear progression of the construction programme avoiding disparate construction sites across the development area, and the consent needs to include the requirement for an agreed construction plan to be in place ahead of any works commencing.</p>	
2.15.7	<p>7. Cable Routes. Export cable routes, cable burial protection index and cable protection are issues that are yet to be fully developed but the commitment to Cable Specification and Installation Plan (CSIP) and Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) as embedded mitigations C-41 and C-45 respectively are welcomed. As a reminder however due cognisance needs to address cable burial and protection, particularly close to shore where impacts on navigable water depth may become significant. Any consented cable protection works must ensure existing and future safe navigation is not compromised. It is noted in Table 4-14 in Volume 2 Chapter 4, that the export cables will be High Voltage Alternate Current (HVAC) which is expected to have no impact on electro-magnetic fields and ships' magnetic compasses.</p>	
2.15.8	<p>8. Safety Zones. The requirement and use of safety zones as detailed in the application as embedded mitigation C-56 in table 13-14 of chapter 13 is noted, and MCA will comment on the safety zone application once submitted, as a statutory consultee. Safety zones during the construction, maintenance and decommissioning phases are supported. A detailed justification would be required for a 50m operational safety zone, with significant evidence from the construction phase in addition to the baseline NRA required supporting the case. Safety zones triggered by a Service Operation Vessel connecting to a wind turbine will not be supported.</p>	
2.15.9	<p>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (APP-019) We would like to comment on the draft conditions in the Deemed Marine Licences as follows:</p> <p>Schedule 11:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5(12) move to Schedule 12 and amend to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In case of buried cables becoming exposed on or above the seabed, the undertaker must within three days following identification of a cable exposure, notify mariners, regional fisheries contacts and the Kingfisher Information Service of Seafish of the location and extent of exposure. Copies of all notices must be provided to the MMO, MCA, Trinity House, and the UKHO within 5 days. • 9 (8) Amend to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o All dropped objects must be reported to the MMO, UKHO and HMCG using the Dropped Object Procedure Form as soon as reasonably practicable and no later than 6 hours of the undertaker becoming aware of an incident. Immediate notification should be made to HM Coastguard via telephone where there is a perceived danger or hazard to navigation. On receipt of the Dropped Object Procedure Form, the MMO may require relevant surveys to be carried out by the undertaker (such as side scan sonar) if reasonable to do so and the MMO may require obstructions to be removed from the seabed at the undertaker's expense if reasonable to do so. • 13(1) the condition implies there must be a safety zones application. This is not a mandatory requirement and suggest it can be removed. 	

REF Procedural Deadline A Comment
APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

- 14 remove reference to ERCoP. Amend to:

o No part of the authorised project may commence until the MMO, in consultation with the MCA, has confirmed in writing that the undertaker has taken into account and, so far as is applicable to that stage of the project, adequately addressed all MCA recommendations as appropriate to the authorised project contained within MGN654 "Offshore Renewable Energy Installations (OREIs) – Guidance on UK Navigational Practice, Safety and Emergency Response Issues" and its annexes.

- 16(2)(a) amend to:

o A swath bathymetric survey to IHO Order 1a of the area within the Offshore Order Limits extending to an appropriate buffer around the site, must be undertaken. This should fulfil the requirements of MGN654 and its supporting 'Hydrographic Guidelines for Offshore Renewable Energy Developers', which includes the requirement for the full density data and reports to be delivered to the MCA and the UKHO for the update of nautical charts and publications. This must be submitted as soon as possible, and no later than [three months] prior to construction. The Order Limit shapefiles must be submitted to MCA. The Report of Survey must also be sent to the MMO.

- 24 amend to:

o The undertaker must submit a close out report to the MMO, MCA, UKHO and the relevant statutory nature conservation body within three months of the date of completion of construction. The close out report must confirm the date of completion of construction and must include the following details:

- the final number of installed wind turbine generators;
- as built plans; and
- latitude and longitude coordinates of the centre point of the location for each wind turbine generator and offshore platform, substation, booster station and meteorological mast; provided as Geographical Information System data referenced to WGS84 datum.

Schedule 12:

- 5(8) add MCA for receiving notices.
- 5(9) add MCA for receiving notifications.
- 5(11) replace with wording from Schedule 11 Condition 5(12).
- 9(8) amend to:

o All dropped objects must be reported to the MMO, UKHO and HMCG using the Dropped Object Procedure Form as soon as reasonably practicable and no later than 6 hours of the undertaker becoming aware of an incident. Immediate notification should be made to HM Coastguard via telephone where there is a perceived danger or hazard to navigation. On receipt of the Dropped Object Procedure Form, the MMO may require relevant surveys to be carried out by the undertaker (such as side scan sonar) if reasonable to do so and the MMO/NRW/MS/DAERA may require obstructions to be removed from the seabed at the undertaker's expense if reasonable to do so.

- 13 remove condition. Safety zones do not apply to cables.

- 14 remove reference to ERCoP. Amend to:

o No part of the authorised project may commence until the MMO, in consultation with the MCA, has confirmed in writing that the undertaker has taken into account and, so far as is applicable to that stage of the project, adequately addressed all MCA recommendations as appropriate to the authorised project contained within MGN654 "Offshore Renewable Energy Installations (OREIs) – Guidance on UK Navigational Practice, Safety and Emergency Response Issues" and its annexes.

- 16(2)(a) amend to:

o A swath bathymetric survey to IHO Order 1a of the cable routes within the Offshore Order Limits extending to an appropriate buffer around the site, must be undertaken. This should fulfil the requirements of MGN654 and its supporting 'Hydrographic Guidelines for Offshore Renewable Energy Developers', which includes the requirement for the full density data and reports to be delivered to the MCA and the UKHO for the update of nautical charts and

REF **Procedural Deadline A Comment**

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE

publications. This must be submitted as soon as possible, and no later than [three months] prior to construction. The Order Limit shapefiles must be submitted to MCA. The Report of Survey must also be sent to the MMO.

- 18 add the following post-construction hydrographic survey requirement:
 - o The undertaker must conduct a swath bathymetric survey to IHO Order 1a of the installed export cable route and provide the data and survey report(s) to the MCA and UKHO. The MMO should be notified once this has been done, with a copy of the Report of Survey also sent to the MMO. This should fulfil the requirements of MGN654 and its supporting 'Hydrographic Guidelines for Offshore Renewable Energy Developers', which includes the requirement for the full density data and reports to be delivered to the MCA and the UKHO for the update of nautical charts and publications.

- 24 amend to:
 - o The undertaker must submit a close out report to the MMO, MCA, UKHO and the relevant statutory nature conservation body within three months of the date of completion of construction. The close out report must confirm the date of completion of construction and must include the following details:
 - latitude and longitude coordinates of the inter array and export cable routes; provided as Geographical Information System data referenced to WGS84 datum.



