

Fundamental Flaws and inaccurate numbers.

The fundamental problem is that Rampion has significantly under estimated their vehicle numbers and the negative local impact for the proposed substation at Cowfold. Rampion 2 is at least 30% larger than Rampion 1, yet the number of vehicles entering and leaving the site appear to be significantly lower, which does not represent an accurate picture and is misleading. There are numerous inconsistencies within the figures, demonstrating inaccuracies. The following does not appear to have been considered accurately:

- 1 **Private workers vehicles:** This is estimated to be over 356,000 (30% more than for Rampion 1). Why has this been excluded from Rampions numbers?
- 2 **LGV's traffic routes and numbers**
HGV's: These will need to deliver additional hardcore to shore up the land due to it being a flood plain. This issue was only discovered by Rampion after they had chosen the site, so is not within any of their original numbers.
- 3 **Water tankers:** To comply with water neutrality requirements, water tankers will need to provide water to wash all the vehicles' wheels and clean the roads. This site is composed of heavy clay, which becomes water logged, resulting in very muddy vehicles requiring a great deal of water. None of this was factored into the original numbers because Rampion only discovered it was a flood plain after they had announced their choice of site in August 2021.
- 4 **Engineering and Ground Works:** As the proposed site is a flood plain, considerably more engineering works and ground works will be required, which were not included in the original numbers.
- 5 **Impact on local businesses.** There are over 100 small businesses on and around the Oakendene site whose daily businesses will be hugely disrupted by this proposed traffic chaos. Has anyone completed an economic local impact report?
- 6 **Loss productivity.** Sitting in traffic jams will result in millions of pounds of lost productivity each year.

Rampion Vehicle Numbers.

WSCC appear to have taken the figures provided by Rampion at face value and not investigated their validity or composition. WSCC has confirmed that they are under resourced, which could account for the lack of due diligence. They have also advised that they are "only a consultee" and have no control over the decisions made; therefore they are not responsible. This effectively means that they do not want to be accountable or responsible when things go wrong. However, when thousands of commuters are unnecessarily stuck in traffic delays for several years because insufficient due diligence was completed, questions will be asked, but it will all be too late.

Cowfold Traffic

The reason the traffic numbers are so important is that the traffic travelling through Cowfold village during rush hours is currently at or very near capacity, with queues regularly extending from the centre of Cowfold, past Oakendene to Kent Street. Any additional vehicles or installation of traffic management such as traffic lights has an immediate and devastating impact on local lanes and surrounding villages as commuters try and find ways to avoid the long queues of the A272.

Traffic seldom extends two miles along the A272 to the junction of Wineham Lane, and that is fundamentally why this alternative location would be more acceptable to both local residents and the 18,000 daily commuters.

There also appears to be a misconception that Kent St and Wineham Lane are comparable in some way, but they are not. Kent Street is a delightful single-lane, quiet tree-lined country track with minimal traffic, a width restriction, and a small bridge. There are a number of equestrian properties along this lane, and it is frequently used by horse riders, dog walkers, and cyclists because of its tranquil nature. Wineham Lane, on the other hand was extended in the 1960's to a two-lane road for the construction of the main substation and frequently has HGV's and fast-moving vehicles. The environmental damage to this previously unspoilt and untouched haven proposed for Kent St would be absolutely catastrophic and devastating.

To manage the thousands of vehicles cutting across the busy A272 from the Oakendene site, Rampion is fully aware that the installation of traffic lights would result in miles and miles of traffic jams for several years and would cause absolute chaos. They have proposed a 40mph speed limit and some banksmen; however this is not a solution that is likely to enable traffic to run smoothly and may well result in more accidents and people sitting in long traffic queues whilst in the 40mph traffic zone.

In conclusion

All this traffic mayhem, further environmental damage, and massive disruption could easily be avoided if the proposed substation were located next to Rampion 1 along Wineham Lane. During the construction of Rampion 1, there were no such traffic delays at this Wineham Lane junction because traffic does not extend and back up daily to this junction of the A272.

We would urge the Planning Inspectorate to ask Rampion to provide:

- 1 Up-to-date, accurate, and verifiable numbers for HGV's LGV's and private vehicles including flow diagrams and details of their calculations. How many people would travel per private vehicle? Is it realistic?
- 2 Accurate traffic counts for both A272 Oakendene site and Kent Street, in comparison to Wineham Lane.
- 3 Updated traffic modelling (detailing the assumptions made). Taking account of the impact on traffic flows with HGV's/LGV's and private vehicles going into and out of the Oakendene sites and Kent Street, with the different proposed measures of banksmen or traffic lights. In comparison to Wineham Lane.
- 4 A detailed Traffic Management Plan.
- 5 An accurate count of how many HGV's and LGV's will come through Cowfold village. There are inconsistencies with the data and flow diagrams provided.

Additionally, the alternative site at Wineham Lane should be given very careful consideration as it would avoid these ongoing substantial problems.

From: [Susan Davies](#)
To: [Rampion2](#)
Cc: [Rampion2](#)
Subject: Fwd: Rampion 2- Traffic and Transport
Date: 22 May 2024 19:15:51

Dear Lily

I hope that you are keeping well. Apologies that I haven't been able to contribute recently as the pressures of work have been overwhelming. However, I have read the submission made by WSCC and am absolutely astonished that they have not investigated the traffic issues adequately, nor given this significant issue sufficient resources considering the upheaval and mayhem that it will cause. Please could you pass our ongoing concerns to the Planning Inspectorate, who are fully aware of the issues at stake. WSCC are obviously under resourced, as confirmed by the email below.

Thank you for your help in this matter.

Kind regards

Sue

Begin forwarded message:

From: Amy Harrower [REDACTED] [@alhcs.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@alhcs.co.uk)>
Subject: RE: Rampion 2- Traffic and Transport
Date: 9 January 2024 at 16:24:48 GMT
To: Susan Davies [REDACTED] [@googlemail.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@googlemail.com)>
Cc: Michael Elkington [REDACTED] [@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@westsussex.gov.uk)>, Rampion 2 <Rampion2@westsussex.gov.uk>

Hi Sue,

Many thanks for your email.

Unfortunately, given the pressure on staff resources dealing with Rampion 2 (and the Gatwick DCO) in addition to the business as usual, the County Council is not able to help with this matter or to enter in to dialogue about technical matters. However, any correspondence that you send to the project inbox (rampion2@westsussex.gov.uk) will continue to be taken into account, as necessary, in our dealings with the Applicant and in formal submissions as part of the DCO process going forward.

Best wishes

Amy

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

From: Susan Davies [REDACTED] [@googlemail.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@googlemail.com)>
Sent: Tuesday, January 9, 2024 11:19 AM
To: Amy Harrower [REDACTED] [@alhcs.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@alhcs.co.uk)>
Cc: [REDACTED] [@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@westsussex.gov.uk)
Subject: Rampion 2- Traffic and Transport

Dear Ms Harrower

I hope that you don't mind me contacting you direct. I've just read your excellent Relevant Representations submitted to the Planning Inspectorate. Regarding the Traffic and Transport section, I see from previous documentation that there have been numerous extremely pertinent questions raised by National Highways (NH), WSCC and HDC regarding highways and that these have not been answered by Rampion.

Please find attached a document which demonstrates the very poor due diligence undertaken by Rampion, and shows contradictory or missing data that should have been disclosed. Neither have the alternative options available on Wineham Lane been thoroughly investigated.

I've written to [REDACTED] on numerous occasions asking for additional information regarding their proposed traffic control measures, but have not received a reply. Do you think that it would be possible to ask Rampion for details of their proposed traffic control measures at the Oakendene/Kent St sites, and also for their analysis (with assumptions), of the implications on the existing road network and local community.

We have been advised that in situations such as these, a full traffic survey, traffic modelling and a Traffic Impact assessment should be completed for both options. Please could you find out if and when this is likely to be completed.

I look forward to hearing from you and thank you for your help in this matter.

Kind regards

Sue Davies