



MOSCA Middleton on Sea Coastal Alliance

IP Number 20045287

Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impacts

Comments on Unanswered questions underlining: Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impacts

To the Rampion 2 Examination Authority (ExA) on the Development Consent Order (DCO) Application

Co-Chairs: Melanie Jones and Mike Visram

Submission date: 19 March 2024

Further to our Written Representation. Our comments below refer to the questions already asked, and to the continuing lack of answers on the Visual impact of the proposed Development which have still not been properly addressed by the applicant and referenced in our Summary 15 January 2024, and following on from the Hearing in Brighton starting 6 February 2024

The visual impact of this proposal will be a significant change of character and industrialisation of the open sea

- There is a persistent lack of visual interpretation required from the Applicant that has not been rectified. This would ensure a fair considered decision on the application, not been rectified. We request these visual animations be brought into the Examination process urgently, to ensure that the application has been fairly and truthfully examined as requested by the Planning Inspectorate prior to and to be available at, the Hearing in February. This requirement is fundamental to the transparency of the application.

The applicant was still unable to present either indicative drawings or animated real-life visual representations for the Hearing. We understand they 'did not have time to do so when requested' by PINs. To our knowledge this lack of visual aids continues to be absent from the crucial information that is needed to enable, both residents and PINs to evaluate fairly the impact of the suggested array (two and half times

higher and the rotor sweep much wider than Rampion 1) giving this project a highly significant structural and visual footprint.

- What mitigation can be offered in consideration of the importance of the visual impact on those who live, work, and visit the area that are forced to 'host' this development and will feel the impact and loss of amenities coupled with the impact on mental health and enjoyment of the beach and seascape contradicted by the urbanisation of the open sea, in effect fencing in the openness of the seascape?
- Why has considered argument not been given to whether the existing visual impact of the open ocean as it currently exists has characteristics that will significantly be altered by the introduction of new visually industrial structures giving a very different aspect of the open sea and coast and therefore cause a significant change to the character of the coastline. Visual animations are a critical part of the future impact and though not available within the consultation process is an important planning principle for fair assessment.
- Why recognising the critical importance of giving weight to applying OESEA 4 visual buffers compliance re Seascape, Landscape, and Visual Impacts regarding turbines over 225mtrs tall has not been undertaken. OESEA4 and the White Report limit the installation of Turbines over 225m tall to locations not less than 33-40 kilometres (20.5-25 miles) distant from National Parks and similar sensitive features. The closest inshore rank of the Rampion 2 proposal is only 13 kilometres (8 miles) from the shore. This application does not comply with the legislation – how can it therefore proceed?