

Dear Sirs

Following the hearing on 7.2.24, Lily Robins recommended that I contact Chris Williams direct to answer our outstanding traffic and congestion questions. Despite sending several emails as detailed below, unfortunately I did not receive a reply.

Several neighbours are deeply concerned that Rampion has not listened to their experiences or completed independent traffic modelling and have not provided answers to some very basic but crucial questions regarding the numbers and types of vehicles, timings, further details of peak weeks, or the impact of their proposal on surrounding lanes and villages.

Attached is a letter from Meera Smethurst, which clearly explains the situation. Would it be possible for the Planning Inspectorate to request the necessary outstanding information from Rampion regarding the numbers and types of HGVs, LGVs and private workers vehicles to be used in the various phases? Do these HGV numbers include those transporting the additional hardcore that will be deemed necessary to combat the surface water flooding? Do they include the water Lorries needed to meet the requirements of water neutrality? Additionally, could the PI request that WSCC complete independent traffic modelling using this updated data? We would also like to know the assumptions made by Rampion and for an independent party to verify and cross reference the data provided by Rampion for transparency.

Rampion promised to provide the residents of Cowfold with details of their traffic management system in summer 2023, however, they are now stating that one will not be necessary. Everyone in Cowfold knows that Rampion will require some form of traffic management along the busy A272. It would be virtually impossible for the hundreds of Rampion construction vehicles to cut across two lanes of fast-moving traffic with some 18,000 using this stretch of road daily. It is far easier for Rampion to claim that traffic management is unnecessary, than to answer questions and have their plans scrutinised.

Locating the substation at Oakenedene will cause significant traffic chaos for thousands of road users, local residents and the surrounding local villages for several years as drivers try and find cut-throughs to avoid the traffic chaos. This unnecessary situation could easily be avoided if the alternative site were located along Wineham Lane instead, as demonstrated during the construction of Rampion 1.

Would you kindly ask Rampion to provide this basic essential information so that an informed and correct decision can be made.

Kind regards

Sue Davies

Email sent 21.4.2024

Dear Sarah,

Please do you think you would you be able to ask WSCC, on behalf of Cowfold residents, to consider commissioning their own traffic modelling of the Rampion construction traffic at Cowfold?

The thing which everyone knows about Cowfold, apart from the fact that it is a pretty, sleepy little village, is just how bad the traffic is. Almost everyone in the county has been stuck in traffic on the A272 there at one time or another. It is a well-known congestion point and apt to tip into lengthy queues for the most apparently trivial reasons.

We currently have a situation where the lived experience of residents directly contradicts the 'findings' of the Rampion consultants. There must be a flaw in the arguments they are using as the two are polar opposites; they cannot both be right. We do not want to be proved correct only when the trucks roll in and the congestion on the A272 is unmanageable for both the public and Rampion construction vehicles themselves.

A local ecologist explained to us that he is often employed by companies such as Rampion to downplay the ecology at a site to find in their favour. The only traffic modelling so far has been done by people employed by Rampion. If we were to employ consultants ourselves, they could level the same charge of bias at us.

This would be avoided if an independent assessment were to be carried out, either for WSCC or for the Examining Authority themselves, of the detailed methodology Rampion have actually used and the assumptions made. It seems to me that they have not been adequate for a complex situation of this kind. However, it would only be meaningful if the consultant had full access to our comments and an understanding of the actual pattern of current traffic and the intended movements through the village and in both directions from the compounds, and clear numbers from Rampion of *all* traffic.

We would be grateful for your help in this matter, and thank you for the support you show the community.

Best wishes

Meera Smethurst

Emails sent to Rampion- no reply received.

**From:** Susan Davies [redacted] <[\[redacted\]@googlemail.com](mailto:[redacted]@googlemail.com)>

**Date:** 25 February 2024 at 11:12:47 GMT

**To:** Rampion2 <[Rampion2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:Rampion2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Rampion 2 <[rampion2@rwe.com](mailto:rampion2@rwe.com)>

**Subject: Re: Traffic Data for Oakendene/Kent St and Wineham Lane, proposed sub- station sites**

Good morning Lily

I hope that you are keeping well and had a lovely weekend. Following your recommendation on 14.2.2024, I wrote directly to Rampion, addressed to Chris Williams, requesting the missing traffic information. Despite sending emails on both 14.2.2024 and 15.2.2024, I have not received a reply. Subsequently, on 19.2.2024, I wrote again, asking for acknowledgement of the requests. Unfortunately, I have not received a reply to any of my emails.

The absence of traffic information for both Oakendene and Wineham Lane is crucial for understanding the true impact of their proposals. Could you please verify the email address you provided, so that I could attempt to resend? Alternatively, do you have any other suggestions for obtaining this crucial information? Many thanks for your assistance in this matter.

Kind regards

Sue

On 14 Feb 2024, at 10:39, Rampion2 <[Rampion2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:Rampion2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)> wrote:

Good Morning Susan,

Thank you for your email below, the contents of which have been noted.

I have been in touch with the applicant about this and they are going to reach out to you.

I would strongly suggest contacting them using this email: [Rampion2@rwe.com](mailto:Rampion2@rwe.com) so that they have your correct contact details. I would suggest explaining the situation again and they will be able to assist further.

I hope the above information is helpful.

Kind regards

Lily

Lily Robbins | Case Manager - National Infrastructure (Energy)  
The Planning Inspectorate

████████████████████  
████████████████████  
Helpline: 0303 444 5000

Email: ██████████ [@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:██████████@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

@PINSgov The Planning Inspectorate [planninginspectorate.gov.uk](https://planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

Ensuring fairness, openness and impartiality across all our services

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Our Customer Privacy Notice sets out how we handle personal data in accordance with the law.

-----Original Message-----

From: Susan Davies ██████████ [@googlemail.com](mailto:██████████@googlemail.com)>

Sent: Thursday, February 8, 2024 5:27 PM

To: Rampion2 <[Rampion2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:Rampion2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>; Robbins, Lily

██████████ [@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:██████████@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>

Subject: Traffic Data for Oakendene/Kent St and Wineham Lane, proposed sub- station sites

Dear Lily

I hope that you're well and apologies for bothering you.

During the Hearing yesterday, Chris Williams, Rampion's director for Traffic was asked to have a word with me regarding missing traffic data. He started making a list, but then asked me to contact the Planning Inspectorate, so that the query went through them.

Please could you ask Rampion for the following data relating to Oakendene/Kent Street and Wineham Lane:

- 1 Full traffic surveys for both alternative sites
- 2 Traffic modelling for the above locations with assumptions made
- 3 The proposed Traffic Management Scheme for Oakendene/Kent St (not necessary at Wineham Lane)
- 4 Traffic Impact Assessment for both proposed sites
- 5 Details of the No of HGV's, LGV's and private workers vehicles over the construction period entering the proposed substation.
- 6 How many "peak weeks"? and how many vehicles during those peak weeks at Oakendene and Kent St?
- 7 Detailed analysis or breakdown of RTA's at the two alternative locations.

Many thanks for your help in this matter.

Kind regards

Sue Davies