

Jeremy Smethurst response to Written Representations, Local Impact Reports and the Applicant's Documents, Deadline 2

Oakendene:

I understand, from a recent discussion between Chris Tomlinson and a resident, that the engineering design is currently very superficial. How then can there be any certainty about the extent of the ability to deal with flooding, or even traffic numbers assessed along the A272 or Kent Street?

Flooding at Oakendene:



The written representation by Jane Lamb (REP1-105) graphically illustrates the perils of trying to do anything on the proposed battery storage farm land near Oakendene in winter. Not only is the land saturated and at risk of flooding, but how will the construction team even be able to work or park there? The topographical map above (from <https://en-gb.topographic-map.com/>) shows the substation site is even lower, and photographs and videos I have previously submitted show that the

ground conditions are much worse at the substation site. The map also shows that Wineham Lane North is considerably higher than either. This is another factor which contributes to the difference between the Oakendene and Wineham Lane North sites alongside the flood maps which show water draining **from** the Wineham site, but **to** Oakendene from a wide area to the north and east and not just the “small contributing catchment area (in the region of 1.7km²)” as stated by Rampion (REP1-023, para 1.3.5). The flood maps and flood risk are discussed further by CowfoldvRampion in their Impact Statement (see Addendum to Water Environment p220).

Choice of Substation site:

Rampion are for the first time recognising that there is a UKPN 132kV cable running under the Oakendene substation site. Para 3.8.6 in the Rampion 1 Alternatives document by E-on: **“The area to the south of the existing substation was discounted due to the presence of several UK Power Networks 132kV underground cable circuits running along the southern boundary of the existing substation.”** How then, can this not have been a significant factor in the ‘engineering constraints’ mentioned by Rampion in their comparison of Wineham Lane North and Oakendene (REP1-021)? Unless of course, they didn’t know about it because they hadn’t consulted Cowfold at that stage.

Lodge Hill and nightingale territory:

In REP1-017 Rampion, in their response to CowfoldvRampion mention the high density of nightingales at Lodge Hill despite the noise from the ranges and that therefore the temporary construction noise will not impact on the habitats along the cable route. The habitats between the A281 and Oakendene will be severely disrupted by the cable installation and the haul road which goes right through them. The nesting sites at Lodge Hill are in the huge safety zone *around* the training area, which, by definition is left largely undisturbed by both the army and the public.

This is currently also the case at Cratemans, but this will be destroyed by the haul road. The suggestion that the situation is equivalent to that at the army range sites is misleading.

Traffic issues:

- OCTMP APP 228, table 4-4: Whilst the list of vehicle types and its classification is noted, ordinarily the definition of an HGV is a vehicle with a gross weight of 3.5 tons or more; the Table implies an HGV is 7.5 tons or more. For the purposes of the Table, the standard definition of an HGV should be included.
- On 11th October [REDACTED] when questioned about this table, replied: *The definition as set out in the Environmental Statement is applicable to all our assessments and tables; LGV refers to Light Goods Vehicles that are less than 3.5t. HGVs are goods vehicles heavier than 3.5t.* But the table has not been amended. I therefore share WSCC’s concern that the table should be amended. **Also, does this mean that the numbers of HGVs as quoted in all Rampion’s figures are in fact a gross underestimation?**
- In addition, what is the rationale for excluding LGVs and passenger vehicles from the pollution assessments? Presumably most LGVs, and many passenger vehicles will be diesel and *all* will contribute to traffic numbers and congestion.

- What is the weight bearing capacity of Kent Street and the culvert under the lane before access A61? This must be ascertained before any use of Kent Street can be agreed. The substrate is not likely to be designed to carry such a load. Any repairing would need to be done in an ongoing fashion to ensure residents can continue to travel to and from their homes, but the repair work will also cause major disruption in itself.
- Pollution impacts: Does the modelling Rampion have done take into account the triple effect as detailed in CowfoldvRampion's Written Representation p90? ie the road is at capacity, slower so increased exposure per vehicle, less turbulence, and stop start movements. This assessment should also be done at the Oakendene part of the A272, where standing traffic will be waiting to turn in and out of the compounds, and several houses have gardens running directly along the roadside.