

I believe Rampion are deliberately attempting to avoid any proper consideration of the traffic implications for the village and surrounding area by ignoring or dismissing concerns and I am anxious that the Inspectorate fully understand the implications of Rampion's continued reliance on superficial and obfuscating plans.

- There is no clarity on numbers of vehicles of all types and the vague numbers they do produce are not in line with Rampion 1.
- There is still no plan for Oakendene access and Rampion are now proposing this is finalised after they have received consent. In light of the potential congestion on the already frequently overloaded A272 this is unacceptable.
- There is still no adequate plan to manage the A272 access point for Kent St and the Oakendean compounds.
- * Rampion have stated they will not need traffic lights. This is bizarre given they were necessary for the smaller Rampion 1 project. This, coupled with the lack of clarity over vehicles would appear to indicate a strategy of refusing to address the issue in the hope it will go away. They must not be allowed to get away with this.
- Are we to believe Rampion's statement that they won't need a holding bay? They certainly did to Rampion 1. Another refusal to engage?
- Rampion's submission to Cowfold Parish Council concerning traffic movements was totally unacceptable – and telling in its omissions. By denying the congestion problem they avoid having to address it. No account is taken of bottle necks on mini-roundabouts, no accounting for additional passenger vehicles, allowance for the known danger when large vehicles negotiate mini-roundabouts, some ridiculous comments about 'public transport'! All this has the hallmarks of being prepared by someone who has never even visited the village!
- By refusing to acknowledge any congestion Rampion sidestep the Air Quality issues. Surely they must not be allowed to get away with that?

Submission ID: 27576

May I please ask the Inspectorate to take into account the separate submission made to Horsham regarding the battery storage site (Horsham Planning Ref DC/24/0054).

Surely this must also be counted as part of the total proposal?

HDC's commissioned site analysis reported

"we have concerns regarding the sensitivity of the site in terms of landscape character and visual amenity. The site is surrounded by a strong network of PRoW and not only contains strong valued landscape features but also provides an area of sensitive vistas to the north toward the High Weald National Landscape (formally ANOB) and south toward the South Downs National Park."

Thank you.