

# Rampion 2 Wind Farm Category 8: Examination Documents Applicant's Mid Examination Progress Tracker

Date: June 2024

Rev D

Document Reference: 8.22

Pursuant to: The Infrastructure Planning (Examination  
Procedure) Rules 2010, Rule 8(1)(c)(i)

Ecodoc number: 005033263-04



## Document revisions

Revision	Date	Status/reason for issue	Author	Checked by	Approved by
A	04/02/2024	Procedural Deadline A	WSP	WSP	RED
B	20/03/2024	Deadline 2	WSP	WSP	RED
C	25/04/2024	Deadline 3	WSP	WSP	RED
D	03/06/2024	Deadline 4	WSP	WSP	RED

# Contents

---

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Overview	4
1.2	Purpose of this Document	4
<b>2.</b>	<b>Examination Progress Tracker</b>	<b>6</b>

# 1. Introduction

---

## 1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 This Examination Progress Tracker has been prepared to support an application by Rampion Extension Development Limited (“Rampion Extension Development Limited”) hereafter referred to as ‘RED’ (the ‘Applicant’). The Applicant is developing the Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm Project (‘Rampion 2’) located adjacent to the existing Rampion Offshore Wind Farm Project (‘Rampion 1’) in the English Channel.
- 1.1.2 Rampion 2 will be located between 13km and 26km from the Sussex Coast in the English Channel and the offshore array area will occupy an area of approximately 160km. A detailed description of the Proposed Development is set out in Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES), [APP-045] submitted with the DCO Application.

## 1.2 Purpose of this Document

- 1.2.1 This document has been produced in response to the Examining Authority’s (ExA) Rule 8 letter [PD-007] requesting an Examination Progress Tracker, in the form of a table, reporting on what it considers are the principal, and other notable issues in the Examination.
- 1.2.2 This document is intended to be a live document and the tables will be updated to provide a mid-Examination version at Deadline 4 (this version), with a final Tracker submitted at Deadline 6, Thursday 1 August 2024.
- 1.2.3 Table 2.1, below, sets out the principal issues, logs the Interested Parties that have raised them, summarises the concern(s)/objection(s) and the progress being made and sets out any progress to resolution. For ease of reference the table has used a “traffic-lighting” system to guide the reader to the likelihood of resolving the issues as follows:
- **Green:** The issue has been resolved and a mechanism for delivering this solution has been captured in a document submitted to the Examination;
  - **Amber:** The issue is capable of resolution. The Applicant will look to progress this issue with relevant Interested Parties with a view to agreeing a resolution;
  - **Red:** The issue is not considered to be capable of resolution.
- 1.2.4 In producing this document the Applicant has reflected the principal and notable issues in the Examination, based on the Examining Authority’s Initial Assessment of Principal Issues contained in the Rule 6 Letter [PD-006], and the assessment of likely process are based upon the Written and Relevant Representations, Local Impact Reports and other submissions that have been submitted between Procedural Deadline A and Deadline 4. They also reflect the ongoing discussions

between the Applicant and other interested parties. These discussions will be set out in the Statements of Common Ground that will be submitted at Deadline 6.

## 2. Examination Progress Tracker

Table 2-1 Examination Progress Tracker

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
1	Alternatives	Arun District Council (ADC)	Whether alternatives to the Proposed Development were adequately considered including the avoidance of the Climping Beach Site of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI).	<p>Red: The Applicant has carried out an extensive route and site selection process that was guided by detailed specialist engineering, environmental assessment and engagement with local stakeholders, regulatory stakeholders and non-governmental organisations. Details of this process are set out in Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-044]. The Applicant has also stated the site of the Climping compound is primarily driven by its proximity to the landfall location and highway access to support landfall and cable construction in the area. An alternative compound location to the west of Church Lane was considered but was discounted prior to the first statutory consultation due to presence of an approved Outline Application CM/1/17/OUT for the erection of up to 300 dwellings and ancillary development.</p> <p>Status is currently not agreed as the Applicant considers that it has demonstrated that alternatives to avoid any impacts Climping Beach SSSI have been adequately considered.</p>
		South Downs National Park Authority	Whether alternatives to the Proposed Development adequately considered the route choice including its incursion into the South Downs National Park.	<p>Red: The Applicant considers that a sufficient assessment and demonstration has provided in the Planning Statement [APP-036] which shows the proposed route would align with in line with the requirements of 5.9.10 of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 (Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), 2011).</p> <p>Status is currently set as not agreed as the Applicant considers that it has demonstrated it has considered alternatives to avoid the South Downs National Park.</p>
			The South Downs National Park (SDNPA) considers the impact of the wind turbine array on the National Park to be unacceptable.	<p>Red: The Applicant has reduced the offshore array extent and quantum in the course of the project's development, as explained in sections 3.2 of ES Chapter 3 Alternatives [APP-044]. The array area at Scoping was 315 km<sup>2</sup>, which was progressively reduced in extent from the east and west to 160 km<sup>2</sup> following Scoping and PEIR consultation feedback. The number of turbines has also been reduced in accordance with consultation feedback, from 116 to a maximum of 90.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider it necessary to and is not able to reduce the array size further.</p>
			The SDNPA considers the impact of the onshore export cable on the National Park to be unacceptable.	<p>Red: The Applicant has considered a variety of grid connection points, explained in sections 3.3 and 3.4 of ES Chapter 3 Alternatives [APP-044]. A thorough process has been undertaken, resulting in the selection of the Bolney substation. Compliance with the major development test in relation to the National Park is demonstrated in the Planning Statement [APP-036].</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
				The Applicant will explain the cable routing at the DCO examination and does not consider that there is any scope, nor requirement, to change this routing.
		West Sussex County Council	Whether alternatives to the Proposed Development have adequately considered the choice of the onshore substation location.	Amber: The Applicant considers that Section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 [APP-044] provides the information on the onshore substation site selection process. This includes the site selection process and the reasons for other sites being discounted based on the multi-disciplinary factors identified. The selection of Oakendene is clearly stated as favourable for engineering, cost and landowner considerations in paragraphs 3.6.23 to 3.6.25 of Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-044].  The matter is still being discussed with WSCC.
2	Aviation	NATS Shoreham Airport	The potential effect of the wind turbine generators (WTGs) to effect civilian and defence radar systems.	Amber: Based on recent communication from NATS confirming the availability of a Radar Mitigation Scheme for the Proposed Development, the Applicant is seeking to enter commercial agreements with NATS to implement mitigation measures to reduce impacts on radar systems.  The Applicant has completed an initial assessment of the updates required to the Shoreham Airport Instrument Flight Procedure and is undertaking additional work to determine how updates to the Instrument Flight Procedure can be approved and implemented in a timescale which is advantageous to both Shoreham Airport and the Proposed Development.
3	Commitments Register and Plans	South Downs National Park Authority	Commitments Register is not definitive about the actions that will be taken in respect of mitigation, using vague and non-committed language.	Amber: The Commitments Register [REP3-049] has now been provided with the updated mechanism listed as part of the Applicant's Deadline 2 submission.  SDNPA to confirm whether this now resolves their concern.
		Arun District Council	Concerns regarding the lack of commitment and securing mechanism of mitigation, monitoring and compensation.	Green: The updated Commitments Register [REP3-049] includes a column for the securing mechanism for each embedded environmental measure and its related commitment reference. This cross-refers to the mechanism (e.g. a requirement in Schedule 1 Part 3 of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [REP3-003]).  The Applicant considers this matter agreed
		Horsham District Council	Commitments Register firmness and securing mechanisms and HDC Compensation request.	Green: The updated Commitments Register [REP3-049] includes a column for the securing mechanism for each embedded environmental measure and its related commitment reference. This cross-refers to the mechanism (e.g. a requirement in Schedule 1 Part 3 of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [REP3-003]).  The Applicant considers this matter agreed.
4	Construction Effects	Mid Sussex District Council	The Applicant has set out in their submissions (Outline Code of Construction Practice) that they intend to operate within the following core working hours:  07:00 to 19:00 hours Monday to Friday; and	Green: The Applicant considers this matter agreed with MSDC



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			<p>08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturday.</p> <p>The concern centres around the impact these working hours, and specifically a 07:00 start time on weekdays and 08:00 on Saturdays, will have on the residential amenity of neighbouring residents who live in close proximity to the construction areas.</p>	
		National Highways	<p>The construction, operation or maintenance of a site (construction/ compound/ permanent) associated with the project adjacent to or in close proximity to the Strategic Road network (SRN) and the implications for the SRN.</p>	<p>Amber: The Applicant is sharing further details of the works on and under the strategic road network with National Highways and are confident that detailed designs can be agreed.</p> <p>Mitigation is considered in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-228] in the event that negative impacts on the SRN cannot be eliminated or reduced to an appropriate and agreeable level.</p> <p>The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP1-010] has been updated at Deadline 3 and discussions are ongoing.</p>
			<p>APP-224 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice.</p> <p>APP-228 7.6 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>APP-229 7.7 Outline Construction Workforce Travel Plan.</p>	<p>Green: The Applicant considers that there is no disagreement regarding these documents.</p>
			<p>The Applicant proposes via the Book of Reference and elsewhere activities, works or consequential provisions that may affect the safety, operation, management of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and/or the roles and responsibilities of National Highways as the Strategic Highway Authority, asset owner and/or statutory consultee. The Applicant needs to fully explain the implications of their proposals in these contexts to ensure that they comply with national planning and transport policy, the National Highways Operating Licence and do not usurp or unreasonably fetter National highways.</p>	<p>Amber: The Applicant is sharing further details of the works on and under the SRN with National Highways and are confident that detailed designs can be agreed between the two parties.</p>
			<p>APP-064 6.2.23 Environmental Statement- Volume 2 Chapter 23 Transport (plus AAP107-APP110 comprising appendices thereto).</p> <p>APP-173 6.4.19.1 Environmental Statement- Volume 4 Appendix 19.1 Full results of construction road traffic modelling.</p> <p>APP-173 6.4.19 .2 Environmental Statement- Volume 4 Appendix 19.2 Full results of construction plant modelling.</p> <p>APP-196 6.4.23.1 Environmental Statement- Volume 4 Appendix 23.1 Abnormal Indivisible Loads Assessment.</p>	<p>Green: The Applicant notes that there is no disagreement regarding these documents.</p>



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			APP-197 6.4.23.2 Environmental Statement- Volume 4 Appendix 23.2 Traffic Generation Technical Note.	
		Horsham District Council	<p>Lack of a standalone Air Quality Plan for the construction phase of the development.</p> <p>Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Sussex (2021)</p> <p>The emissions calculation and total calculated value of emissions' health damage cost associated with construction traffic were not included in the DCO Documents.</p> <p>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)</p> <p>Dust Management Plan</p>	<p>Amber: An Air Quality Mitigation Strategy <b>[REP3-053]</b> was provided to the examination at Deadline 3. HDC to confirm all these points can now be agreed.</p>
			Construction Traffic Model set up and methodology	<p>Amber: HDC will review the model and have further discussions with the Applicant.</p>
			<p>Proposals for construction noise monitoring are inadequate for a project of this scale and duration.</p> <p>Insufficient sanctions or penalties proposed in the DCO to deal with non-compliance.</p>	<p>Amber: The Outline CoCP <b>[REP3-025]</b> provides the relevant planning authority the opportunity to request that construction noise monitoring is undertaken during specific activities or at specific receptors as outlined in Paragraph. 5.4.15. The requirement for noise monitoring will be identified by the Contractor(s) based on the confirmed list of plant and equipment and construction programme and a monitoring framework will be provided in the stage specific Noise Management Plan. The monitoring proposals are equivalent to other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects of this size and nature.</p> <p>The Applicant has asked if a Clerk of Works for noise would be appropriate. The Applicant has a framework for appointing such roles.</p> <p>HDC noted that any Clerk of Works would need to be appropriately qualified. This is still under discussion with HDC.</p>
			Insufficient sanctions or penalties proposed in the DCO to deal with non-compliance with the construction noise and vibration targets.	<p>Amber: The Applicant has outlined the measures to control noise and vibration during the construction phase within the Noise and Vibration Management Plan that is to be discharged for each relevant stage, in accordance with Requirement 22 of the draft DCO <b>[REP3-003]</b>. Measures for noise control during the operational phase will be secured through Requirement 28 of the draft DCO <b>[REP3-003]</b>. The local planning authority is the enforcing body for compliance with a made DCO, under section 118 of the Planning Act 2008, with sanctions including fines.</p> <p>The Applicant has asked if a Clerk of Works for noise would be appropriate. The Applicant has a framework for appointing such roles.</p> <p>HDC noted that any Clerk of Works would need to be appropriately qualified. This is still under discussion with HDC.</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			<p>Construction Communications Plan should include provision for regular local meetings with representatives for the communities where the construction compounds will be sited. The costs should be met by the developer.</p>	<p>Amber: HDC has requested the Washington Compound, despite being temporary, be included as part of this plan. The Applicant will review this and respond in due course.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with HDC on this matter.</p>
			<p>Concerns regarding the substantial size of the compounds and limited detail to their use and length of time in operational use.</p>	<p>Amber: The outline of the requirement and description of uses for the construction compounds is given in the Statement of Reasons <b>[APP-021]</b> (Paragraph 6.10.5).</p> <p>Relevant commitments, as set out in the Commitments Register <b>[REP3-049]</b>, regarding effects of construction compounds during and after construction are C-27 (Reinstatement), C-129 (Aggregate for Surface Protection), C-196 (Landscape Re-instatement), C-204 (BS5837, tree protection), C-282 and C-285 (Arboricultural Method Statement).</p> <p>The LVIA has been based on a maximum envelope for construction development within the construction compounds (Figure 18.2c, Volume 3 of the ES <b>[APP-098]</b>). The Applicant acknowledges that significant landscape and visual effects associated with the presence of the compound on the local landscape character and views from the A272, PRoW and residential properties.</p> <p>Further detail of compound usage has been added to the CoCP and ES Chapter 4 at Deadline 3.</p> <p>HDC to consider whether additional detail in CoCP is sufficient to resolve this issue</p>
		Arun District Council	<p>Chapter 21 of the ES states with respect to construction noise effects that determination of the need for Section 61 consent will be determined by contractor at detailed design stage following review of construction noise assessments, if it is determined that there is 'significant deviation' from initial predictions.</p> <p>These values replicate the values set out in Table E.2 of British Standard (BS) 5228 in particular for the 0800 – 1800 time period. Proposed construction hours are stated as 0700 – 1900 hours where for the shoulder hours (0700 – 0800 and 1800 – 1900) Table E.2 suggests a trigger value of 70dB LAeq, T.</p> <p>For some locations that are close to exceeding the 65dB threshold value, the assessment outcome has been increased to reflect potential impact. This has not been done consistently and where there are predicted values that are also close to the threshold value, the outcome has not been increased.</p>	<p>Green: The Applicant notes that this has now been agreed following Expert to Expert call on 15/03/2024.</p>
			<p>There are insufficient details of the noise modelling inputs for the operation of the construction compound.</p>	<p>Green: The Applicant acknowledges that the plant list table assumed for the operational noise modelling of the construction compounds has not been</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
				included in Appendix 21.2: Construction Plant List, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-177]. This will be amended accordingly. The Applicant notes that this has now been agreed
		Arun District Council	The spatial extent is greater than Rampion 1 and ADC continues to have significant concerns regarding the scale relative to the proximity to the coastline and the resulting significant visual effects.	The Applicant can confirm that the Local Impact Report was submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-039] and the applicant has subsequently responded at Deadline 2 in Applicant's response to Arun District Council's Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-021]. The Applicant and ADC to discuss compensation measures.
5	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)	Arun District Council	Significant concerns regarding the cable route passing beneath and near to the Climping SSSI and ecological sensitive areas. Nationally scarce invertebrates have been identified on the sand dunes of Climping beach. We note access would be restricted in the SSSI and no groundbreaking activity.  However, there remains the potential for unplanned events and localised degradation of habitat within the SSSI, which is of a concern.	Green: ADC is happy with clarification provided by the Applicant on concerns.  ADC has confirmed they have no further comments on survey and that they have no further concerns regarding Climping Beach SSSI.
			Biodiversity net gain (BNG) has not been assessed at the district level ADC. We would expect biodiversity net gain to be achieved within the administrative area of Arun.	Amber: ADC is happy with the response provided by the Applicant regarding commitment to BNG. The Applicant clarified that they will be actively looking for terrestrial units in Arun.  The Applicant is seeking to organise a further meeting to discuss the BNG Metric Calculation discussion.  The Applicant can confirm that the Local Impact Report was submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-039] and the Applicant has subsequently responded at Deadline 2 in Applicant's response to Arun District Council's Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-021].  ADC to confirm this point has now been agreed to.
		Marine biodiversity net gain	Green: ADC is content with the Marine BNG proposed.	
		Horsham District Council	Likely adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley Sites due to a failure to demonstrate that the development would be Water Neutral.  Lack of clarity on the distinction between what constitutes essential mitigation and compensation, and BNG.  Biodiversity net gain has not been assessed at the district level. HDC would expect biodiversity net gain to be achieved within the administrative area of Horsham district.	Amber The Applicant has provided some further information in WE1.1 a) - c) of Applicant's Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) [REP3-051] to address HDC's comments, including the provision of high level indicative estimates as requested.  Awaiting HDC to confirm acceptance following further discussions on 22/05/24 with Natural England, with the aim of agreeing a joint position.  Green: HDC confirm in their response to the Examining Authorities first written questions that the Applicant has followed the mitigation, following provision of clarifications.

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
				The Applicant has provided a Biodiversity Net Gain assessment at the district level at Deadline 3.
			Feasibility of habitat creation at Oakendene substation site.	Amber: HDC has requested further details and have suggested an indicative cross-section. Capacity and slope angles in the basins have been flagged by HDC as questionable for accommodating trees.  HDC has welcomed the proposal for wet woodland but want clarity through further details before they are happy to sign this issue off as agreed,  Issue to be double checked with the ecologists and the arboricultural specialists, but the Applicant is confident of viability of plans.
		Environment Agency (EA)	Agreement on assessment Study Area.	Green: The Applicant and the EA have reached agreement on these topics.
			Agreement on data sources gathered for baseline considered acceptable for assessment.	
			Concerns of cables passing through chalk feature and permanent habitat loss.	Green: The Applicant and the EA have reached agreement on these topics.
			Concerns about the release of significant quantities of Bentonite during the drilling process during the offshore construction phase and the potential impacts to the newly establishing kelp beds in proximity.  Assurances were given at the last expert topic group meeting that contact had been made with the Sussex Kelp Recovery Project and discussions/consultation were ongoing. The Environment Agency would welcome further clarification on this.	Green: The Applicant and the EA have reached agreement on these topics.
			Agreement on nature conservation assessment Study Area.  Agreement of data gathered for baseline considered acceptable for assessment.  Agreement of assessment approach / methodology.  The Environment Agency is happy with the quantity of data collected on biodiversity elements and comfortable that concerns the Environment Agency has previously raised are being addressed.  Preconstruction surveys will be carried out for water vole and Great Crested Newts where the route intersects suitable habitat. The Environment Agency supports this given the timeframes involved in the proposal.	Green: The Applicant and the EA have reached agreement on these topics.
			Agreement of fish and shellfish ecology Study Area and data gathered for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment.	Green: The Applicant and the EA have reached agreement on these topics.

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
		Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	<p>Agreement on assessment study area.</p> <p>Agreement of assessment approach/methodology.</p> <p>Agreement on data sources gathered for baseline considered acceptable for assessment.</p> <p>The MMO agrees with Cefas that the justification to scope out operational EMF, noise and accidental pollution is satisfactory.</p>	Green: The MMO agrees with the Applicant's position on these matters at page turn on 23/02/2024.
			Concerns of cables passing through chalk feature and permanent habitat loss.	Amber: Page Turn Meeting (23/02/24): Continued discussion for suitable mitigation methods
			<p>There is information missing from Table 9- 14 and the sensitivity from smothering should be reconsidered. Please see comments in Section 4.3 of our relevant representations.</p> <p>The comments should be reviewed and updated, or further justification provided.</p>	<p>Amber: The MMO is hopeful that the Applicant will update the information required for this to be resolved during Examination.</p> <p>The Applicant responded to this as part of Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations <b>[REP1-017]</b>.</p>
			<p>Agreement of study area and data gathered for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment.</p> <p>MMO are satisfied that fisheries would indeed be consulted with, in relation to shellfish landings.</p> <p>MMO agrees the source of literature, data and publications listed in the presentation slides are appropriate of fisheries and fish ecology for the purpose of the EIA.</p> <p>MMO agrees that no new fisheries surveys are required to inform the characterisation. However, as noted, this is caveated by adding that the MMO defers to Natural England and The Seahorse Trust regarding the need for any additional surveys for seahorses.</p> <p>MMO agree that scoping in effects of Electro Magnetic Fields (EMF) on elasmobranch and electro-sensitive fish is appropriate.</p> <p>Agree with seasonal restriction for black seabream during cable installation.</p>	Green: The MMO agrees with the Applicant's position.
			<p>There is discrepancies between Chapter 8 and Appendix 11.3 on the worst-case duration of monopile and jacket foundation installation.</p> <p>Discrepancies to be amended with the correct maximum duration of piling per day, so that impacts can be assessed properly and mitigated.</p>	Green: The MMO has thanked the Applicant for acknowledging the inconsistencies in Figures 8.9 and 8.10 of Chapter 8: Fish and Shellfish – Figures, Volume 3 <b>[APP-081]</b> , and for providing revised figures as recommended by the MMO in Chapter 8: Fish and Shellfish, Volume 3 of the ES – Figures <b>[REP1-007]</b> , submitted at Deadline 1.



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			<p>Whilst the Applicant has completed a herring potential spawning habitat and Sandeel potential habitat suitability assessment. The Applicant has not followed the recommended MarineSpace (2013a) and (2013b) methodologies.</p> <p>MMO requests that the Applicant revises their habitat suitability assessments by following the MarineSpace (2013a and 2013b) methods and provides 'heat' maps of herring potential spawning habitat, and sandeel potential habitat, for the fish ecology study area as an addendum to the ES and update the conclusion from this information.</p>	<p>Amber: At Deadline 3, the MMO provided feedback on the herring and sandeel heatmapping exercise undertaken by the Applicant. The Applicant has reviewed this feedback and is revising the heatmaps accordingly. These will be submitted to Examination at Deadline 4.</p>
			<p>MMO does not consider a SELss of 141 dB re 1 mPa<sup>2</sup>s used for a 44cm captive seabass to be an appropriate or conservative threshold. MMO understands there was no agreement between MMO, Natural England (NE) and the Applicant on a noise threshold or proxy species for black seabream prior to submission of the Application. If the Applicant wants to pursue a noise threshold route the MMO would expect to see more noise modelling based on the 135 dB threshold. However, even if this is provided the MMO is unlikely to agree a threshold approach for black seabream. Further mitigation may be required.</p>	<p>Amber: The MMO believes this may not be fully resolved during Examination but is hopeful that the Applicant will provide the modelling and further discussions can take place. MMO hopes these concerns will be resolved during Examination, noting they have not been resolved through pre examination.</p> <p>A further call has been scheduled between the teams of experts to discuss further.</p>
			<p>The Applicant has concluded in paragraph 8.9.195 that, as the UWN contours do not directly overlap with the spawning grounds as indicated by the Coull et al. (1998) shapefile, the magnitude of a behavioural impact to spawning herring from UWN is considered to be negligible. Whilst the Coull et al. (1998) spawning maps are valuable for providing an indication of the location of herring spawning grounds based on historic data, it is more appropriate for the Applicant to draw their conclusions from overlap with areas of higher IHLS larval abundance as this is a more recent, direct measure of herring spawning intensity for this region. Further to this, Figures 8.18, 8.19 and 8.21, which present UWN for sequential pinpiling, sequential mono-piling, and simultaneous pin-piling, all indicate that the likely range of impact of TTS in fish is also anticipated to overlap the herring spawning grounds.</p> <p>Update to the conclusion should be made and further discussion on mitigation should take place.</p>	<p>Amber: The Applicant has responded to this and it has been covered in the Deadline 1 written response to the relevant representations <b>[REP1-056]</b>.</p>
			<p>It is not clear why July has been treated separately within the Applicant's proposed mitigation zoning plan. Black seabream are at their most sensitive when undertaking spawning and guarding their nests, and as a result, the conservation objectives of the Kingmere Marine</p>	<p>Amber: MMO believes this may not be fully resolved during Examination but is hopeful that the Applicant will provide the updates and further discussions can take place. MMO hopes these concerns will be resolved during Examination, noting they have not been resolved through pre examination.</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			<p>Conservation Zone (MCZ) are of heightened importance during the spawning period. As we have clear evidence that black seabream continues to spawn and maintain their nests into and during July, we must consider that July is part of the spawning period.</p> <p>July should be included in the defined mitigation period for the zoning plan however as above any mitigation must have the correct modelling.</p>	
			<p>The MMO considers it necessary for a seasonal piling restriction to be implemented in order to prevent disturbance to spawning herring and their eggs and larvae at the Downs spawning ground during the spawning period of 1st November to 31st January (inclusive).</p> <p>This restriction may be subject to refinement, providing the additional UWN modelling (135dB) and further discussions on mitigation. However, at this time, the MMO considers that a seasonal piling restriction be implemented.</p>	<p>Amber: The MMO believes this may not be fully resolved during Examination but is hopeful that the Applicant will provide the updates and further discussions can take place. MMO hopes these concerns will be resolved during Examination, noting they have not been resolved through pre examination.</p> <p>The Applicant is in the process of responding to the MMO's feedback, which will be submitted at Deadline 4. The Applicant is looking into additional measures that could be implemented throughout the piling campaign to mitigate the potential impacts from underwater noise on sensitive features such as herring. An update on this work, will be provided at Deadline 4.</p>
			<p>Pre- and post-construction surveys should be implemented to enhance the baseline data and to validate any predictions made in the ES on nesting habitat recoverability. These surveys should be suitably timed and use appropriate methods.</p> <p>Therefore, MMO recommends that a requirement for pre- and postconstruction monitoring of black bream nesting habitat be included in the DML to ensure that the habitat recovers and continues to support black bream nesting, and that comparisons of nest location and density pre- and post-construction can be made. This should be clearly referred to within conditions 16-18.</p>	<p>Amber: The MMO believes this may not be fully resolved during Examination but is hopeful that the Applicant will provide the updates and further discussions can take place. MMO hopes these concerns will be resolved during Examination, noting they have not been resolved through pre examination.</p> <p>Documentation to be agreed between Natural England and MMO.</p>
			<p>The MMO agrees that the use of proxy species may be suitable (use of the audiogram for red seabream as a proxy for black seabream in terms of hearing ability), but requires, inter alia, additional evidence for the efficacy of noise abatement measures, further (longer term) evidence for the baseline soundscape at Kingmere MCZ, and seeks clarification on noise spectra.</p> <p>Updates are required to this document.</p>	<p>Amber: The MMO is hopeful that the Applicant will update this document for this to be resolved during Examination.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to this and it has been covered in the deadline 1 written response to the relevant representations <b>[REP1-056]</b>.</p>
			<p>The MMO agrees that the general approach and methodology for the underwater noise modelling is appropriate and that the basis for noise assessment on marine receptors has drawn upon the most contemporary and authoritative criteria for marine mammals and fish. However the MMO seeks clarifications on a range of</p>	<p>Amber: The MMO is hopeful that the Applicant will update this document for this to be resolved during Examination.</p> <p>MMO have share the document and are hoping Cefas will have reviewed them and that a further discussion can take place.</p>



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			<p>issues relating to noise criteria, propagation loss, and comparability of the data from Rampion 1 data with the proposed Rampion 2 predictions within the Appendix.</p> <p>Updates are required to this document.</p>	
			<p>The MMO considers the overall approach to mitigation is somewhat reasonable, however a number of issues still require further discussion. The MMO notes that the basis for the piling mitigation relies on a disturbance threshold of 141dB but that this has not yet been agreed with all Parties. Given the uncertainties regarding behavioural responses and the zoning approach, MMO recommends a conservative approach be taken by the Applicant in relation to underwater noise and recommended noise abatement measures across the entire site rather than zoning. MMO strongly recommends the Applicant commit to using noise abatement technologies which achieve the greatest amount of noise reduction.</p>	<p>Amber: The MMO provided responses to the ExA Questions at Deadline 3 <b>[REP3-051]</b>. The MMO maintain that 135dB SELss (Single Strike Sound Exposure Level) as per Hawkins et al., (2014) should be used as an appropriate behavioural threshold for Black Sea Bream.</p> <p>The Applicant maintains that a threshold of 141 dB SELss is a reasonable precautionary threshold for Black Sea Bream as supported by Kastelein et al. (2017).</p>
			<p>The MMO supports the seasonal restriction (among other commitments) to ensure Offshore Export Cable Corridor installation activities are undertaken outside the black seabream breeding period (March – July) to avoid any effects from installation works on black seabream nesting within or outside of the Kingmere MCZ (Commitment C-273).</p>	<p>Green: The MMO agrees with the Applicant's position.</p>
			<p>Agreement of study area and data gathered for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment for the Marine Mammals Study area and baseline data.</p> <p>Agreement of assessment methodology for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment for the Marine Mammals Study area and baseline data.</p>	<p>Green: The MMO agrees with the Applicant's position.</p>
			<p>In the Environmental Statement, the sensitivity of all cetaceans to PTS-onset is assessed as Low. In the PEIR, all cetaceans were originally assessed as having a 'Medium' sensitivity to PTS.</p> <p>Until and unless empirical evidence can shed light on whether this opinion holds water, the precautionary principle will continue to apply. Therefore, cetaceans should be assessed as having a high sensitivity to PTS.</p>	<p>Amber: The Applicant responded to this at in the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations <b>[REP1-017]</b>.</p>
		<p>Mid Sussex District Council</p>	<p>The habitats to be created at the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension include the planting of additional trees and this element of the proposals should</p>	<p>Green: MSDC is happy with the Applicant's position.</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			<p>be subject to agreement/consultation with the District Council at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the inclusion of ecological enhancements (such as the new bat boxes at Oakendene substation) within the Terrestrial Ecology Design Principles for the substation extension.</p>	<p>Amber: Applicant has stated they agree with the ambition set out by MSDC, but the site is under National Grid ownership (who are statutory undertaker) so the Applicant is restricted with regards to what can be provided. MSDC believe the point still stands.</p> <p>Currently awaiting confirmation of agreement by MSDC.</p>
		Natural England	<p>Natural England has major concerns regarding the feasibility of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) and therefore its likely effectiveness in mitigating impacts. The concerns are focused on the areas of Climping Beach SSSI, Sullington Hill, and Michelgrove Park.</p> <p>Geotechnical information needs to be provided to understand the feasibility and effectiveness of this approach.</p>	<p><b>Red:</b> The <b>Outline Construction Method Statement [APP-255]</b> provides further information regarding the detailed design of the trenchless crossings in Section 3.4 and the further information required to inform this (e.g., ground investigation). The detailed design of a trenchless crossing will be undertaken within the established parameters assessed in the ES as detailed in 4.5.27 of Environmental Statement Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2 [APP-045] and secured in Schedule 1 Part 3, requirement 10 of the draft <b>Development Consent Order [REP3-003]</b>.</p> <p>The approach to minimising and effectively managing the risks of trenchless crossings is outlined in the <b>Outline Construction Method Statement [APP-255]</b> and the <b>Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP3-025]</b>.</p> <p>The potential risks of HDD have been considered by the relevant chapters of the ES and are assessed as Low.</p>
			<p>Agreement on assessment study, data sources gathered for baseline considered acceptable for assessment and assessment approach/methodology for Benthic Ecology.</p>	<p>Green: The Applicant welcomes Natural England's agreement of the assessment approach/methodology.</p>
			<p>Habitats of Principal Importance (including but not limited to <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i>, chalk, and peat and clay exposures), Annex I habitats (stony reef, bedrock reef) and black seabream nests could be affected. It is currently unclear whether the proposed mitigation will be effective.</p> <p>We advise that geotechnical information is collected to inform a Cable Burial Risk Assessment and is submitted into the Examination.</p> <p>Comprehensive pre-construction surveys will also need to be agreed with Natural England to inform mitigation proposals.</p>	<p>Amber: Peat and clay exposures have been added to the specified habitat features in an updated Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan <b>[REP3-046]</b> submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>Commitment C-283 has been updated at Deadline 4 in accordance with suggestions from the Examining Authority in Issue Specific Hearing 2.</p>
			<p>Agreement of study area and data gathered for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment for Fish and Shellfish Ecology.</p>	<p>Green: The Applicant welcomes Natural England's agreement of the assessment approach/methodology.</p>
			<p>Conducting Drop Down Video surveys outside of the bream nesting season means that the survey outcomes will be limited to confirming only the presence of potential</p>	<p>Amber: The assessment presented provides an appropriate baseline for the purposes of EIA. Any information gaps associated with the timing of the baseline survey with respect to bream nesting locations will be addressed</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			<p>remnant nests and cannot be relied upon to determine the presence or absence of bream nesting. NE will therefore not be in a position to agree with any conclusions on absence or extent of nesting black bream based on surveys undertaken between July and August, which will be based on a lack of visible active nests.</p>	<p>through collection of pre-construction survey data to inform nesting areas and the consequent mitigation plan measures associated with offshore cable route design, as noted below.</p> <p>To address the potential variability in bream nest locations, the Applicant has committed to the mapping of principal densities and aggregations of black bream nesting through pre-construction survey, as set out within the Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan <b>[REP3-047]</b>.</p>
			<p>Natural England does not agree with that there will be no significant risk of hindering the achievement of the conservation objectives in relation to Beachy Head West MCZ (TTS and behavioural impacts due to piling).</p> <p>Further evidence is required on the modelling impacts and the efficacy of noise abatement measures.</p>	<p>Amber: The Applicant is confident that the implementation of a noise abatement system year-round will ensure the conservation objectives of the Beachy Head West MCZ are not hindered. Natural England is to confirm this is acceptable.</p>
			<p>NE does not agree with that there will be no significant risk of hindering the achievement of the conservation objectives of Kingmere MCZ due to Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS) and behavioural impacts due to piling noise.</p> <p>Piling activities from 1st March to 31st July inclusive have the potential to hinder the conservation objectives of Kingmere MCZ for black seabream, and therefore a full seasonal restriction is needed.</p>	<p>Amber: In response to Natural England's request, The Applicant is submitting a Without Prejudice measures of equivalent environment benefit (MEEB) derogation case at Deadline 4 <b>(Document Reference 8.74)</b>.</p>
			<p>In relation to black seabream as a feature of Kingmere MCZ, Natural England does not support a behavioural threshold being derived for black seabream from studies using proxy species or research using playback sound or based on captive fish (rather than in the wild).</p> <p>Natural England does not agree with the use of the thresholds proposed by Rampion 2 for black seabream disturbance.</p>	<p>Red: the Applicant is not willing to adopt a full seasonal restriction in relation to underwater noise impacts on black seabream.</p>
			<p>All discussions regarding the status of Marine Mammals have been agreed.</p>	<p>Green: The Applicant welcomes agreement with Natural England on all topics related to marine mammals.</p>
			<p>Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area (FFC SPA).</p> <p>In-combination impacts on kittiwake.</p>	<p>Amber: The Applicant had a meeting with Natural England to discuss ornithology aspects on 17<sup>th</sup> April and has submitted an updated Without Prejudice Derogation case and Schedule 17 at Deadline 4.</p>
			<p>In-combination impacts on guillemot and razorbill.</p>	<p>Amber: The Applicant had a meeting with Natural England to discuss ornithology aspects on 17<sup>th</sup> April and possible compensation options for Guillemot and Razorbill and provided an initial list of sites being considered. Following this, The Applicant has provided a Guillemot and Razorbill Evidence and Roadmap <b>[REP3-059]</b> and has commenced surveys on the identified sites. An updated Schedule 17 has been submitted at Deadline 4 to include Guillemot and Razorbill.</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			Farne Islands SPA – In-combination impacts on guillemot	Amber: The Applicant had a meeting with Natural England to discuss ornithology aspects on 17 <sup>th</sup> April and possible compensation options for Guillemot and Razorbill and provided an initial list of sites being considered. Following this, The Applicant has provided a Guillemot and Razorbill Evidence and Roadmap [REP3-059] and has commenced surveys on the identified sites. An updated Schedule 17 has been submitted at Deadline 4 to include Guillemot and Razorbill.
			Natural England does not agree with Applicant's view that the cumulative effects on great black-backed gull are not significant.	Amber: As requested, the Applicant will consider further options to mitigate impacts with respect to great black-backed gull and where required, engage further on potential options with Natural England.
			Impacts on Arun Valley SPA and Ramsar site – requirement for water neutrality.	Amber: It was agreed on May 22 <sup>nd</sup> 2024 at an expert to expert meeting between Horsham District Council and Natural England that they arrange a bilateral meeting to reach position on water neutrality.
			Short snouted seahorse ( <i>Hippocampus hippocampus</i> ) features of MCZs – impacts of piling on underwater noise levels.  Natural England does not agree with that there will be no significant risk of hindering the achievement of the conservation objectives in relation to Beachy Head West MCZ (TTS and behavioural impacts due to piling).	Amber: The Applicant is confident that the implementation of a noise abatement system year-round will ensure the conservation objectives of the Beachy Head West MCZ are not hindered. This is to be confirmed with Natural England.
			Natural England argue that there is the risk of a temporary loss of Functionally Linked Land (during the construction phase) lasting for several years longer than predicted before it is returned to its previous agricultural condition.  NE advise that this extended timeframe needs to be further assessed with the ES Actions	Amber: Habitats likely to attract wildfowl within the Arun Valley and Adur Valley are a considerable distance from the Arun Valley SPA and Ramsar site suggesting that any functional linkage is likely to be weak at best. Data from two years of wintering bird surveys show that occurrence of the designated features in and around the proposed Order Limits in the Arun Valley occurs in small numbers and sporadic. Although numbers of designated features in the Adur Valley are larger the distance to the designated site is in excess of 13km and occurrence is associated with flooded fields suggesting that any temporary habitat loss will be small and consistent with other areas (e.g., arable fields) being used should restoration not have occurred. Adverse effects on the integrity of the Arun Valley SPA and Ramsar site can therefore be discounted.  The Applicant discussed the issue with Natural England on 22/05/2024 and provided mapping to illustrate issue. Natural England considering this information with aim of concluding agreement.
			Adverse Effect on Integrity (AoEI) on Special Areas of Protection (SPA)	Green: The Applicant welcomes Natural England's agreement of no AoEI in-combination for gannet and LBBG in relation to FFC SPA and Alde-Ore Estuary SPA, respectively.
		South Downs National Park Authority	Significant concern that the conclusion 'no significant effects have been identified on terrestrial ecology features' is based on insufficient survey data, ecological assessment	Amber: Following our Deadline 3 submission and the meeting on 17/04/2024, we think this matter should be split into the following areas:



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			<p>and mitigation proposals. SDNPA therefore disagree with this conclusion.</p>	<p>Landscape-scale effects on terrestrial ecological features;                      Dormice;                      Bats;                      Demonstration of net loss within the National Park and how this has been avoided and mitigated;                      Compensatory measures (S106);                      Delivery of BNG in the National Park.</p> <p>Once this has been done the Applicant will help expand our position. At this point, the status for all is still a point of discussion.</p>
			<p>Insufficient evidence has been provided to support the conclusion of no likely significant impact of HDD drilling on chalk streams and chalk grassland habitats, as well as the impact on users of the public rights of way network and open access land.</p>	<p>Amber: HDD is a mitigation that has been used routinely for linear projects (electrical transmission cables and pipelines (e.g., gas, oil and water) for both large infrastructure and smaller scale applications. HDD has been used frequently to cross a range of sensitive ecological features including designated sites, ancient woodland, rivers and other priority habitats. For example, an HDD crossing of 550m through chalk substrate, with a sizeable change in elevation (80 to 90m difference) was successfully completed at Dunstable Downs on the Kensworth to Rugby Pipeline project for CEMEX in 2008 (including crossing part of Dunstable and Whipsnade Downs SSSI). It is also notable that HDD within chalk substrate was carried out successfully on the route of the transmission cable for the Rampion 1 OWF. The approach to minimising and effectively managing the risks of trenchless crossings is outlined in the Outline Construction Method Statement <b>[APP-255]</b> and the Outline Code of Construction Practice <b>[REP3-025]</b>.</p> <p>An extensive response has been provided to SDNPA for comment and the Applicant will discuss this further with SDNPA.</p>
			<p>Insufficient evidence provided to demonstrate 25 metre stand-off &amp; HDD 6 metres underneath ancient woodland ground level will not cause the loss or deterioration of this irreplaceable habitat by damaging roots, damaging or compacting soils, increasing levels of air and light pollution, noise and vibration, changing the water table or drainage, damaging functional habitat connections or affecting the function of the woodland edge. Insufficient evidence is provided to support the conclusion of low frac-out risk.</p>	<p>Amber: The 6m rooting depth is based on Forestry Commission (2005) '<i>The influence of soils and species on tree root depth</i>'. This states that it is uncommon for roots to penetrate more than 2m and 80-90% of roots are found within the top 60cm of the soil profile. It goes on to state that 90 –99% of a tree's total root length is within the upper 1m of soil, and that data from wind throws in the October 1987 storm showed no trees with roots below 3m and only 5% had rooting depths greater than 2m. Therefore, the 6m minimum drill depth was chosen to comfortably avoid contact with roots and allow at least 2 to 4m of soil between the roots and path of the drill. The Forestry Commission were directly consulted on this proposed measure and did not object to it during a bilateral meeting with the Applicant.</p> <p>The 25m stand-off is in excess on UK Government guidance on ancient woodland (Natural England and Forestry Commission, 2022) which</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
				<p>recommends a minimum buffer of 15m. The additional 10m was added to ensure indirect effects such as run-off and disturbance (noise and light) could be managed. Individual commitments are in place to manage dust, noise, pollutants and light (commitments C-24, C-26, C-76, and C-105 in the Commitments Register <b>[REP3-049]</b>). The Applicant considers this a sufficient, and precautionary, distance from ancient woodland in light of the range of commitments to be imposed. It is also worth noting that launch / retrieval of the drill on all crossings where ancient woodland or veteran trees are present occur within agricultural fields and therefore compaction and direct effects on a woodland edge ecotone will not occur.</p> <p>Awaiting Confirmation from SDNPA that the matter is resolved.</p>
			<p>Lack of consideration of effects on Dark Skies in assessment of landscape and visual impact and on sensitive ecological features. Trenchless crossings are in the most vulnerable ecological locations by definition (excepting roads) and are located within a dark skies landscape. As HDD areas will be lit at night during active drilling operations, it is critical that artificial light spill and glare is avoided around sensitive features (woodland/scrub/boundary vegetation/hedges/treelines). A standard construction lighting approach set out in the OCCP is not sufficient.</p>	<p>Amber: SDNPA will review the latest details provided at Deadline 3. If these are in line with our most recent conversations NB with further detail and specific wording being provided in the CoCP, this matter may be agreed.</p> <p>SDNPA will review the latest details provided at Deadline 3. If these are in line with the Applicant's most recent conversations NB with further detail and specific wording being provided in the CoCP, this matter may be agreed.</p> <p>Deadline 3: Applicant added SDNP lighting technical guidance note to be followed into the Outline Code of Construction Practice <b>[REP3-025]</b> and will have an expert to expert meeting to discuss further.</p>
		Sussex Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	<p>Agreement of study area and data gathered for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment.</p> <p>No further site-specific fish and shellfish surveys studies required now as consensus has been reached and Sussex IFCA defer to other statutory authorities.</p> <p>Seabass have now been included in the UWN assessment in the Fish and Shellfish ecology ES chapter.</p>	<p>Green: Agreement has been reached on all these topics.</p>
			<p>There is a high level of uncertainty regarding the proposed development, due to the extended use of the Rochdale Envelope. This makes it challenging to pass meaningful comments on mitigation measures for installation techniques. Therefore, there is little certainty of the actual environmental impacts of the project and how the developer will mitigate these impacts. Chapter 8: Fish and Shellfish Ecology Through the ETG process, Sussex IFCA stressed that site-specific fish and shellfish surveys were considered more appropriate than solely relying on desk-based studies to inform the baseline assessment. Sussex IFCA remain concerned about the lack of up-to-date site-based survey data and the age of the baseline datasets utilised.</p>	<p>Amber: Applicant states that these are part of Ongoing discussions with Natural England. Applicant will respond with more information once the relevant pre-construction surveys are completed.</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			<p>Sussex IFCA have had serious concerns regarding the likelihood of significant impacts to black seabream during the construction, operation, and maintenance of Rampion 2. The proposed mitigation from sedimentation and noise generation has alleviated some of these concerns however, pre-construction site-specific surveys are needed to inform micro-siting of all elements of construction to minimise the environmental impact. The Authority would also welcome clarity around how the Applicant will be held accountable on any commitments made at this stage in the process.</p> <p>The Authority has concerns about the impact of underwater noise in relation to disturbance of black seabream and would like to see a commitment to noise abatement technology during the nesting season. The threshold for disturbance of breeding black seabream is unknown, therefore we suggest a baseline of background noise occurring during a successful nesting season is used to inform a suitable target for noise abatement mitigation to achieve.</p>	<p>Amber: Sussex Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority have requested to be involved in the consultation of the pre-construction surveys. Applicant to look into possible need for separate Marine License.</p>
			<p>The impacts from underwater noise to herring is still a serious concern to Sussex IFCA. Herring are deemed highly sensitive, due to a combination of their restricted habitat requirements (they spawn directly onto the seabed) and their sensitivity to underwater sound over large distances. The Authority recommends a seasonal piling restriction to limit disturbance to spawning populations during the spawning season (November-January) or methods such as bubble curtains.</p> <p>The Authority welcomes the opportunity to submit further comments during the examination of the application and wishes to support RWE in determining the scope of the conditional mitigation, the temporal and spatial restrictions together with monitoring requirements of the marine licence. It is important that developments like Rampion 2 should not compromise the Sussex IFCA's ability to maintain and promote sustainable fisheries and protection of the marine environment within the region.</p>	<p>RED: Applicant confirmed that SxIFCA will be able to respond to any relevant information submitted at Deadline 3</p>
		West Sussex County Council	<p>Ecological impacts of temporary habitat loss and inherent risk of poor reinstatement (failure with tree planting, hedgerow 'notching' and other habitat restoration) are greater than assumed.</p>	<p>Amber: The Applicant's position has been updated.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the updated materials at Deadline 3 and Deadline 4 address the points raised by WSCC, including in their Deadline 3 response [REP3-073].</p>



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			Through being delivered off-site, and by a third party, there are concerns that it will not achieve the intended nature conservation benefits, and in the expected timeframe.	Amber: The Applicant's position has been updated. The Applicant considers that the updated materials at Deadline 3 and Deadline 4 address the points raised by WSCC, including in their Deadline 3 response [REP3-073].
			There is a lack of information on advance habitat creation (both on-site and offsite), including locations, specifications, timescales and how it will be secured.	Amber: The Applicant's position has been updated. The Applicant considers that the updated materials at Deadline 3 and Deadline 4 address the points raised by WSCC, including in their Deadline 3 response [REP3-073].
			There is insufficient detail in the OLEMP regarding advance planting, habitat reinstatement, planting specifications and programme, and maintenance and monitoring specifications.	Amber: An updated version of Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, including the indicative landscape plan and a phasing plan was provided at Deadline 3. A further updated will be provided at Deadline 4 addressing points raised by WSCC in the Issue Specific Hearing 2.
			Unknown impact/reasoning on arboricultural features.	Amber: Arboricultural Impact Plan to be submitted by Applicant at DL4.
			Loss of significant arboricultural features.	Amber: Applicant has clarified tree losses at Oakendene – Awaiting WSCC view on matter
			Loss of potential woodland within the County.	Amber: Applicant Clarification provided that the Queen's Canopy project has been considered by the project. New saplings are in place – mitigation discussions are still ongoing with the relevant Affected Party.
			Removal or damage caused to hedgerows including those determined as 'important.'	Green: This matter has been agreed on 06/11/2023.
			Unsuitable methods of notching. Negligent aftercare and commitment to care requirements during movement of hedgerows. Unknow suitability of method for the hedgerows proposed for this technique.	Amber: Awaiting WSCC's agreement on applicants position.
			Essential planting rates stated not being secured as a requirement within the DCO.  Further Comments: WSCC generally support the tree protection measures and essential replacement planting strategy set out within the environmental mitigation section of the arboricultural impact assessment (AIA). Stage-specific landscape and ecological management plans (LEMP) will require the delivery of arboricultural method statements, tree protection plans and landscaping plans; however, WSCC request the outline landscape and ecological management plan and outline code of construction practice are amended to secure the delivery of the LEMP (and relevant contents mentioned above) in accordance with the submitted AIA.	Green: The Applicant welcomes that WSCC noted their support the tree planting methodology itself in a bilateral meeting on 13/12/23.

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			Enhancement of existing features were expected as mitigation.	Amber: The Applicant's position has been updated. The Applicant considers that the updated materials at Deadline 3 and Deadline 4 address the points raised by WSCC, including in their Deadline 3 response [REP3-073].
6	Historic Environment	West Sussex County Council	Due to the scale of the proposals, significant effects upon the historic environment are inevitable. Given the absence of field evaluation, the presence of nationally significant archaeology has not yet been ruled out.	Green: The assessment within Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2 of the ES [PEPD-020] identifies significant effects on historic environment receptors. The Planning Statement [APP-036] outlines the position with regards the planning balance with regard to the benefits of the project and the harm to heritage assets that is identified in Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2 of the ES [PEPD-020], as per paragraphs 4.7.66 and 5.4.10 of the Planning Statement [APP-036]. Commitments C-225 and C-79 in the Commitments Register [REP3-049] provide for mitigation through design and archaeological recording. The Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) [REP3-035] sets out the methodological approach for archaeological investigations which ensures further investigation will be undertaken prior to construction. WSCC agree that there agree with the applicant on this issue.
			Risk of harm to nationally significant heritage assets where the cable corridor intersects with an area of exceptionally high archaeological significance, potential and sensitivity	Amber: Further discussion with the Applicant is required. WSCC strongly feels that further assessment is justified and required, as it would quantify the likelihood and severity of potential harm to nationally significant heritage assets of archaeological interests. This would allow PINS to more fully and accurately assess the impacts of the Project upon the historic environment
			Lack of archaeological field evaluation – Landfall, onshore cable corridor and substations	Red: Not agreed- Non Material
			Lack of prior archaeological field evaluation within areas of exceptionally high archaeological potential and significance – Cable corridor section LACR-01d	Red: The applicant disagrees with the assertion that the PEIR FSIR identifies a lack of archaeological potential for LACR-01d. The nature and depth of any surviving archaeological remains will be considered against the extent of construction impacts to inform where impacts to archaeological remains may be avoided.
			Issues with some ES assessment methodologies	Amber: Further details of specific concerns are provided within the Local Impact Report [REP1-054]. The Applicant has responded to this as part of the Applicant's response to WSCC's Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-020] and to Historic England Relevant Representation 6.7.
			WSCC is concerned about the proposed harm to grade II listed Oakendene manor, arising via changes within its setting from construction and operation of Oakendene substation and compounds. WSCC does not consider that there is sufficient evidence to conclusively rule out substantial harm.	Amber: The Applicant has responded to this as part of the Applicant's response to WSCC's Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-020] (References 15.3 and 15.8). The Applicant has now arranged for photography in the vicinity of Oakendene Manor, which will be provided to the examination at Deadline 4.

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			Some of the content and wording of the Commitments Register and draft DCO may not robustly secure the delivery of historic environment commitments.	Amber: Further details are set out within the Local Impact Report [REP1-054].
			Scope and methodology of mitigation measures set out within the Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation	The applicant notes that Detailed comments from WSCC are still outstanding. Once these are received, An Expert to Expert meeting can be arranged for any outstanding comments/issues that need discussing in detail.
		Mid Sussex District Council	The proposed extension to the existing substation will have a degree of less than substantial harm in respect of the special interest of identified heritage assets. Consideration should be given to further planting around the site to mitigate any negative impact on views from the PROW to the east, and Bob Lane to the south.	Green: A single heritage asset was scoped into the ES assessment of effects from the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension works Grade II Listed Twineham Court Farmhouse (NHLE 1025579). This is reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2 [APP-066]. MSDC agreed with the Applicant's position.
			Mid Sussex District Council consider that the site of the proposed substation extension has some limited positive contribution to the setting of each of these heritage assets. As such it is considered that the height of the Bolney substation extension will have an impact on the currently positive contribution this part of the site makes to the setting of these heritage assets.	Amber: The Applicant had disagreed with Coombe House's inclusion. MSDC stated that as the proposal affects the approach to Coombe House, there is a low-level impact (lower though than Twineham Court Farmhouse). MSDC has suggested the possibility of mitigation screening to address this historic environmental concern. This concern will be covered in the Local Impact Report. Both parties agree that screening planting as proposed in the LEMP [REP3-037] would mitigate impacts. The ExA has requested that MSDC comment on this point.
		South Downs National Park Authority	The risk to areas of known highly significant archaeology have not been appropriately weighted, investigated and assessed through the selection process for the cable corridor or the final assessment of the proposed development.	Red: The <b>Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)</b> [REP3-035] sets out the methodological approach for archaeological investigations which ensures further investigation will be undertaken prior to construction. Engagement will be undertaken with South Downs National Park Authority to provide comment/input to this document which will be updated and finalised during the Examination. SDNPA consider that if there is going to be no further discussion. Whilst it is noted the effect has already been noted as significant in the ES, it is the scale/type/timing of further investigation in combination with the nature/type/significance of the potential archaeological remains that mean even with acknowledgement of the effect, there could still be a material impact.
			Lack of consideration of historic landscape character in assessment. Likely missing effects cannot be considered to inform appropriate mitigation strategy.	Red: Based on the consideration of the Written Representations at Deadline 2, the Applicant has moved this to Not Agreed. SDNPA to review this.
		Historic England	Inadequate onshore archaeological baseline assessment and evaluation.	Amber: Further discussion on detail of areas for evaluation, phasing of this work, methodologies, and flexibility of approach required. It would be beneficial for this discussion to include the County Archaeological Officer jointly with Historic England, and the Applicant's consultants/representatives. The results of this then need to be detailed in the oWSI and other key documents where commitments are secured.

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			Inaccurate assessment of magnitude of impact and significance of effect.	<b>Red:</b> Unlikely to reach agreement - the Environmental Statement Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2 [APP-066] provides an assessment of effects in the absence of further mitigation. An agreed scheme of archaeological investigation, recording and dissemination, following any mitigation by detailed design, would still result in loss or truncation of archaeological remains but the archaeological interest would be preserved by record before the loss occurs.
			Limitations of marine archaeology evaluation	<b>Amber:</b> still awaiting update from Christin.
			Inadequate Outline Marine WSI	<b>Amber:</b> HE to confirm agreement once updated WSI has been submitted.
			Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation	<b>Amber:</b> Since provided by RWE - HE to confirm when reviewed.
		Arun District Council	The impact on Listed buildings at No's 45-47 South Terrace, locally listed buildings at 4, 8-95 South Terrace & 16 Granville Road and South Terrace Area of Character.	<b>Red:</b> Applicant has now addressed in Deadline 2 response in Applicant's response to Arun District Council's Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-021].
7	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects	South Downs National Park Authority	Significant concern that the geographic extent of effects on landscape character is underestimated and therefore effects are downplayed.	<b>Amber:</b> The Applicant does not agree that the geographic extent has been underestimated. Appendix 18.1: Landscape and visual impact assessment methodology, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-167] sets out the methodology for this part of the assessment.
			Limited consideration of perceptual qualities in assessment. This is likely to have resulted in missing effects and therefore has not sufficiently informed an appropriate mitigation strategy.	<b>Amber:</b> The key baseline characteristics of each Landscape Character Assessment including any perceptual qualities such as tranquillity, views, and aesthetics have been recorded and included in the assessment of landscape sensitivity assessment where relevant. The exception to this is in relation to the assessment of effects on the South Downs National Park (SDNP) which provides an assessment of the SDNP Special Qualities. It is not therefore agreed that there are 'missing effects.' Local authorities are invited to suggest and evidence how s106 funding would mitigate specific identified harms.
			Significant concerns over assessment of construction effects, which are assessed as 'negligible to zero' on South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Area (LCA) I3 Arun to Adur Scarp Down. It is difficult to see how this conclusion has been reached given the construction immediately abuts this LCA above and below scarp, as well as going under. Scarp area is open access land.	<b>Amber:</b> The construction effects on this LCA are assessed as "Negligible to Zero" in Appendix 18.3: Landscape Assessment, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-169]. This is mainly because the project description defines that this section of the onshore cable corridor will be underground during the construction due to the use of trenchless crossing techniques. Therefore, there can be no direct significant effect on this LCA. It is therefore not agreed that Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impacts, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-059] / Commitment Register [REP3-049] needs amendment in respect of these areas.  Applicant has provided example wireline of the 3D model demonstrating visual effects on views, viewing beyond the landscape character area boundary rather than any significant change to the landscape character of the I3 Arun to Adur Scarp Down at Deadline 4.
			It is not clear how views have been selected and assessed in respect of the effect on landscape character, including tranquillity.	<b>Amber:</b> The viewpoint selection process is set out on pages 78-79 of Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impacts, Volume 2 [APP-059] and the viewpoint assessment process is described in Appendix 18.1: Landscape and visual impact assessment methodology, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-167]. Attention is



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
				<p>also drawn to the 'Limitations of Visualisations' on page 46 of Appendix 18.1: Landscape and visual impact assessment methodology, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-167].</p> <p>A number of viewpoints were examined at Expert to Expert Meetings 15/02/24 and 28/03/24 and the explanation / clarification provided here reiterated, noting that the LVIA refers to particular viewpoints and receptors as part of the assessment for each landscape character unit and again as part of the assessment of the SDNP and special qualities in Appendix 18.3.</p>
			<p>At the Third Statutory Consultation Exercise (Further Supplementary Information Report – 2023) the SDNPA advised micro-siting of viewpoints be undertaken in consultation with Stakeholders.</p> <p>This has not taken place and viewpoint locations have not been agreed.</p>	<p><b>Amber:</b> The Applicant considers that the suite of viewpoints and visualisations related to the SDNP (both within its boundary and from the surrounding area) provide a range of illustrative material to accompany the LVIA depicting a variety of receptors and different LCAs at various distances and directions, including 'worst case' examples. The Applicant maintains that the viewpoints selected are proportionate and appropriate. Should the SDNPA wish to advise on further micro-siting of specific viewpoints, the Applicant will continue to engage with SDNPA to refine the locations where we reach agreement for this to be necessary.</p> <p>A number of viewpoints were examined at Expert to Expert Meetings 15/02/24 and 28/03/24 and clarification provided to confirm that all consultation requests for viewpoint micro-siting had been undertaken. Appendix 18.6: Viewpoint Directory has been updated at Deadline 4 with further explanation on micro-siting. In addition, amendments to some viewpoints, requested as part of the Expert to Expert Meetings have also be provided at Deadline 4.</p>
			<p>Sequential testing viewpoints do not adequately reflect the continuous views as a visual receptor moves along the South Downs Way available that will be affected by the proposals. The SDNPA therefore considered the impacts on receptors have been underestimated.</p>	<p><b>Amber:</b> The use of sequential viewpoints along the South Downs Way to support and illustrate the LVIA was set out at PEIR and Scoping and was not disputed. Use of kinetic viewpoints was not raised during consultation. The Applicant does not accept that the visual effects on views from the South Downs Way as experienced by people on this route is underestimated. The assessment has been based on a combination of desk and site-based assessment. The Applicant will continue to engage with SDNPA and explain this part of the assessment in more detail.</p> <p>It is therefore not agreed that additional kinetic viewpoints are needed or that the LVIA presented in Chapter 18: Landscape and Visual Impact, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-059] or the Commitment Register [REP3-049] needs amendment.</p> <p>Kinetic / sequential viewpoints were discussed at Expert to Expert Meetings 15/02/24 and 28/03/24. Examples of 3D model wirelines, shared as part of Expert to Expert Meetings will be provided at Deadline 4 and sequential viewpoint added to figures and Appendix 18.2 and 18.6.</p>
			<p>Significant concerns over likely success of proposed hedge notching. The examples cited for use of the technique in the Lake District and Norfolk Broads are not likely to have</p>	<p><b>Amber:</b> The Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP3-025], commitment C-115 and the assessment in Chapter 22 Terrestrial Ecology and Nature Conservation, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-063] therein describe the approach to</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			<p>encountered the challenges of dry, free draining chalk soils. No proven testing undertaken to evidence proposals. If this would not work, the landscape, ecological and visual impact would be significant. Clarity required to explain why 6m width notching technique cannot be used for all hedges regardless of importance.</p>	<p>hedgerow notching. In response to Relevant Representations the text for C-115 has been amended to ensure it is easier to understand.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further explanation at Terrestrial Ecology Expert to Expert meeting (17/04/2024)- setting out that notching means taking out small sections of hedgerow as opposed to a clear cutting of a wider section.</p> <p>Hedgerows are planted by landowners as common practice across the south downs. At Deadline 4 - Further detail has been added to the LEMP on monitoring and remedial action should any issues be detected for newly planted or translocated vegetation.</p> <p>An Expert to Expert Meetings will be held to address this issue.</p>
			<p>Despite significant Proposed Whole Development Effects being identified in section 18.2, these appear to be omitted in Chapter 18, therefore we disagree with the conclusions in terms of the effect of the proposed development, both during construction and once operational.</p>	<p><b>Amber:</b> The Applicant confirms that ‘Whole Project’ effects are identified and assessed in Appendix 18.2: Viewpoint Analysis, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-168] and they are also assessed in relation to the onshore cable in Appendices 18.3: Landscape Assessment, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-169] and 18.4: Visual Assessment, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-170]. Chapter 18: Landscape and Visual Impact, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-059] refers to ‘Whole Project’ effects in respect of the Oakendene Substation and the Existing National Grid Bolney Substation Extension and provides a summary in relation to the onshore cable in paragraphs 18.11.31, 41, and 59. The ‘Whole Project’ effects combine the SLVIA and LVIA and the onshore elements are mitigated. Further mitigation and compensation measures are not considered by the Applicant to be necessary in respect of onshore, although as noted in response to SDA-03, the Applicant will continue to engage with SDNPA on this matter and discuss options for compensatory measures.</p>
		<p><b>Natural England</b></p>	<p>The Development will have Significant landscape impacts on SDNP due to onshore cable installation. Natural England advises that due to the substantial lack of credible and detailed evidence in relation to the mitigation proposed, the assessment of effects as set out in the LVIA cannot be relied upon, and that there will be significant residual adverse landscape and visual effects on the SDNP and on its special qualities, setting or integrity. Further information needs to be provided to evidence that the proposed mitigation measures are feasible and effective.</p>	<p><b>Red:</b> In a meeting with Natural England, the IP stated that this matter would not be resolved on the grounds of the use of HDD by the Applicant, and therefore needs to be shown as a disagreement.</p>
			<p>Section 245 (Protected Landscapes) of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023</p>	<p><b>Amber:</b> Applicant's Post Hearing Submission – Issue Specific Hearing 1 Appendix 5 - Further information on South Downs National Park [REP1-024] from Deadline 1, was updated for Deadline 4 including how the Applicant has sought to further the purpose of the National Park.</p>
		<p><b>West Sussex County Council</b></p>	<p>SLVIA viewpoints, SLVIA worst-case scenario, SLVIA Assessment – PEIR, SLVIA assessment conclusions on significant effects and a lack of night-time view assessment</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> The Applicant and West Sussex Council have reached agreement on these topics.</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			for West Sussex receptors outside of the International Dark Sky Reserve (IDSR).	
			SLVIA assessment professional judgement - It is recognised that some elements are matters of professional judgement, however, in some cases it is considered that these may have been downplayed, specifically with regards to receptors along the West Sussex coastline.	<b>Amber:</b> The Applicant notes some difference in professional judgement but that WSCC agree with the concluding findings of the assessment on the significance of effects.
			Confirmation a worse case Maximum Design Scenario has been assessed.  The Maximum Design Scenario has balanced the number of turbines between both Zone 6 and the western Extension Area. If the DCO does not secure the location or placement of these, has the worst case been assessed for the receptors of West Sussex.	<b>Amber:</b> The Applicant welcomes WSCC's feedback on the appropriate detail and usefulness of the SLVIA presented in Chapter 15 of the ES. The Applicant has produced and submitted a 'Seascape, Landscape and Visual MDS Clarification Note' submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-037] which provides further justification that the MDS, with a balance of turbine numbers between the Zone 6 and western Extension Area, is representative of the worst case in terms of seascape, landscape and visual effects.
			Concerns about the layout and extent of offshore wind turbines and the securement of a Project with lesser impacts to receptors in West Sussex.	<b>Amber:</b> The spatial extent of the Rampion 2 array area has been reduced and designed according to a set of SLVIA specific design principles (ES Chapter 15, Section 15.7) [APP-056] which provide embedded environmental measures by reducing the magnitude of effects and minimising harm on the perceived seascape qualities and views, focusing particularly on the SDNP. Opportunities to reduce effects through further design principles specific to West Sussex are limited by the technical, economic and functional requirements of the Project to produce renewable energy, as well as other environmental factors. The Applicant submitted a Seascape, Landscape and Visual Design Principles Clarification Note' at Deadline 1 [REP1-037], which provides further commentary on these SLVIA specific design principles.[MMdA1] [MC2].
			The Application downplays the potential visual and landscape impacts of construction activities, with too strong a reliance on it being short term, and reinstatement being phased/carried out as soon as possible (with reference to Commitments C7 and C19).	<b>Amber:</b> To be discussed further at page turn June 10.
			Viewpoint locations (and associated visualisations) at Oakendene substation, cable route and compounds are lacking, and/or not representative of worst-case impacts.	<b>Amber:</b> The Applicant has gone through viewpoints in detail at LVIA Expert to Expert meetings (both for viewpoints within the National Park and for viewpoints outside the National Park. Actions to take forward errata and complete viewpoint photography in the vicinity of the Oakendene substation have been completed and photomontages are to be formally submitted at DL4.
			There is a need to provide a full assessment/quantification of all landscape visual receptors impacted which will be wide ranging as indicated by Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTVs), and to recognise that selected viewpoints are only indicative of impacts for a limited proportion of receptors affected.	<b>Red:</b> Not agreed, no material impact. The LVIA in Chapter 18: Landscape and visual assessment, Volume 2 [APP-059] provides a full assessment of landscape and visual receptors if read as a whole with all of the Appendices (Appendix 18.1 Landscape and visual impact assessment methodology, Volume 4 [APP-167] to Appendix 18.6: Viewpoint directory, Volume 4 [APP-172]). This is regardless of whether there is a viewpoint to illustrate this or not, i.e., the Applicant has not limited the LVIA to only those receptors at the viewpoints.



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			The RVAA is not fit for purpose, with an unclear methodology and conclusions drawn which lack objectivity. Recognises that it is possible that other residential properties not included in the RVAA may be significantly affected but has only considered those 'most affected' – Contrary to that suggested this is not consideration of a 'worst case' scenario. Concern about lack of views from upper floors, and not clear how conclusions of RVAA (in terms of the magnitude of visual impacts) has been factored into the LVIA. Impacts on visual receptors underplayed.	<b>Amber:</b> Answers to the comments above have been provided in column 4 of the SoCG. The RVAA Appendix 18.4 to be amended to provided further assessment and information including progressive restoration / duration.
			Lack of detail/clarity in the Design and Access Statement. At present design principles (which it is assumed will be tied to detailed design and 'requirements') are not presented in a clear manner relevant to each topic, or confusingly overlap. No engagement on these principles has been undertaken or clarity on any independent design review. Design elements within the outline landscape plan need securing and further developing.	<b>Amber::</b> To be discussed further at page turn June 10.
			WSSC has a significant concern about option LACR-01d taken forward by the Applicant. The archaeological sensitivity of this section of the route is exceptionally high.	<b>Red:</b> Paragraphs 3.4.55 to 3.4.67 of Environmental Statement - Volume 2 Chapter 3 Alternatives [APP-044] provides a detailed description of the justification for the route selection in this location. This includes comparison of alternatives to selected route. As presented in Environmental Statement - Volume 2 Chapter 3 Alternatives [APP-044] paragraphs 3.4.63 and 3.4.66 and the bullet points that follow these, each of the alternative routes presented pass through Archaeological Notification Areas (ANAs) with potential or known archaeological remains of high heritage significance. The high potential for archaeological remains of high heritage significance in the SDNP was given substantial weight (based on their potential and known archaeological significance) in the decision-making process, in accordance with the protection afforded by policy in NPS EN-1 (2011). Based on the available historic environment evidence, when comparing the environmental effects or policy outcomes during the decision-making process, there was no material difference for each route for archaeology.  The Applicant has responded to this as part of the Applicant's response to WSSC's Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-020] (References 15f, 15.1, 15.6 & 15.82)  This point is not agreed.
		<b>Mid Sussex District Council</b>	Queries were raised regarding the National Grid Bolney Substation Extension Landscape Mitigation Management Plan and reducing the loss of vegetation.	<b>Green:</b> Mid Sussex District Council is happy with the Applicant's position on all landscape issues.
		<b>Horsham District Council</b>	Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) and the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment methodology.	<b>Amber:</b> The Applicant clarifies that appropriate monitoring, maintenance and management will be undertaken for 10 years post-planting as per C-199. This

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
				is in the Outline LEMP [REP3-037] in Section 5 and is secured in the draft DCO [REP3-003] in requirement 12 and 13. The Applicant will continue to engage with HDC on these points and update the associated documents as appropriate.
			Concerns regarding the substantial size of the compounds and limited detail to their use and length of time in operational use.	<b>Amber:</b> The Applicant proposes to amend Commitment C-68 of the Commitments Register [REP3-049] subject to agreement with HDC. Horsham District Council to review and confirm this is agreed by 22 February 2024. Further detail of compound usage has been added to the CoCP [REP3-026] and ES Chapter 4 at Deadline 3 [APP-045]. Still an ongoing point of discussion
		<b>Arun District Council</b>	The spatial extent is greater than Rampion 1 and ADC continues to have significant concerns regarding the scale relative to the proximity to the coastline and the resulting significant visual effects.	<b>Amber:</b> The Applicant can confirm that the Local Impact Report was submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-039] and the applicant has subsequently responded at Deadline 2 in Applicant's response to Arun District Council's Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-021]. The Applicant and ADC to discuss compensation measures.
			Concerns regarding visual effects of the landfall construction compound (Work No.8) and Climping Compound (Work No.10); the latter is substantial in size	<b>Amber:</b> The Applicant acknowledges that significant landscape and visual effects associated with the presence of the landfall construction compound and the Climping Compound on the local landscape character and views. The Applicant can confirm that the Local Impact Report was submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-039] and the Applicant has subsequently responded at Deadline 2 in Applicant's response to Arun District Council's Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-021]. Considered an ongoing point of discussion
			Permanent Infrastructure Corridor details	<b>Green:</b> ADC is happy that this point has been clarified. Agreed at Page Turn Meeting- 13/02/24.
		<b>Natural England</b>	SLVIA Seascape impacts on the South Downs National Park (SDNP), including the Sussex Heritage Coast (SHC)	<b>Amber:</b> Natural England considers that the Applicants conclusions cannot be drawn as mitigation hasn't gone far enough. This is still currently under discussion.
			SLVIA Seascape impacts on the Isle of Wight Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (IoWAONB) and Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (CHAONB)	<b>Amber:</b> Natural England considers that the Applicants conclusions cannot be drawn as the Applicant has not provided a formal assessment of effects on Special Quality 5 of the IoWAONB 'dark starlit skies'. This is still currently under discussion.
<b>8</b>	Traffic and Access	<b>West Sussex County Council</b>	Concern about the number temporary accesses particularly onto rural roads and the A283.	<b>Amber:</b> Further design work relating to accesses, with a consideration of ecology and landscape effects, was presented to the examination in Technical Note Construction Access Update Assessment Summary [REP3-055].

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			Insufficient justification and supporting information for proposed temporary and permanent access arrangements.	<b>Amber:</b> WSCC has listed those accesses for which it seeks further information through provision of Road Safety Audits.  The Applicant is undertaking these audits and will provide such information direct to WSCC.
			Mitigation included within the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) (REP1-010)	<b>Amber:</b> The Applicants Position covers the one example location quoted. There are other locations and other issues (e.g. Kent Street which is also narrow). As such, there are more general issues that need to be dealt with through discussions.
		<b>Horsham District Council</b>	The key concern is that the Construction Traffic Management Plan does not account for emissions of the on-road and off-road construction traffic.	<b>Amber:</b> Awaiting HDC to confirm that this point is now agreed to.
			The number of temporary accesses, this was a point previously questioned by West Sussex County Council. The Applicant should seek to reduce the number of accesses or justify the need and purpose for those accesses shown.	<b>Amber:</b> Applicant's position updated. HDC to confirm that this point can now be agreed to.
			Construction Traffic Model set up and methodology	<b>Amber:</b> Applicant's position updated – HDC will decide on agreement after review.
			Temporary and permanent accesses	<b>Amber:</b> The Applicant has confirmed to HDC that there is no intention to do anything to the existing accesses.  HDC will respond in the coming weeks.  HDC to consider whether Access Review is sufficient to resolve concerns
			Locations are identified as requiring access via single track roads. No mitigation or management measures are detailed.	<b>Amber:</b> HDC to consider if the measures presented in the Construction Access Traffic Management Strategy resolves their concerns
		<b>Mid Sussex District Council</b>	The environmental effects of the construction traffic impact, Appropriate mitigation through a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan, the use of the existing access onto Wineham Lane for the construction/operational phases of the substation extension and the principle of Low Carbon Energy Schemes provided that any adverse local impacts, including cumulative impacts, can be made acceptable.	<b>Green:</b> Mid Sussex District Council is happy with the Applicant's position regarding traffic and access topics.
		<b>South Downs National Park Authority</b>	The SDNPA has concerns regarding the impact on the local highway network during construction for both the onshore and offshore aspects of development, and the Public Rights of Way Network within the National Park.	<b>Amber:</b> A detailed assessment of the construction impacts of the Proposed Development on the local high network is provided in <b>Chapter 23: Transport, Volume 2</b> of the ES [APP-064]. This is still an ongoing point of discussion.  The Applicant has confirmed they are working with West Sussex County Council and are happy to have most road safety audits completed post consent.  An Ongoing Point of Discussion

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
		<b>National Highways</b>	<p>Traffic attracted to, generated by or rerouted as a result of the proposals and the potential implicants for the SRN</p>	<p><b>Amber:</b> The Applicant is in consultation with National Highways regarding the concerns raised and is preparing additional evidence regarding construction access to / from the A27. Where appropriate, this additional information will be incorporated into updates to the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan <b>[REP3-029]</b>.</p> <p>The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan <b>[REP3-029]</b> was updated at Deadline 3.</p>
			<p>Concerns were raised regarding the Proposed Development's Compliance with DfT Policy C1/22.</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> The main transport effects are temporary and during construction period, National Highways is satisfied that sufficient is being done by the Applicant to ensure compliance with C1/22.</p>
9	Coastal Processes	<b>Natural England</b>	<p>Concerns regarding that sea defences at Climping that have failed in recent storms, will cause further coastal erosion and flooding. It is imperative that landfall HDD burial depths and cable protection options are adequately interrogated to future proof the asset integrity and minimise the need for future cable protection in the coastal zone.</p>	<p><b>Amber:</b> Following Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1), the Applicant has provided further information in request to Action Point 7 to provide more detail on HDD at Climping Beach, see Deadline 1 Submission – 8.25.6 Applicant's Post Hearing Submission Issue Specific Hearing 1 Appendix 6 – Horizontal Directional Drilling at Climping Beach <b>[REP1-025]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided responses to the Examining Authority Questions regarding climate resilience considerations at landfall, please see responses to the Examining Authority's Written Questions FR 1.1 and CC 1.2 in in Applicant's Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) <b>[REP3-050]</b>.</p>
			<p>In most cases Natural England agree with the position on WCS, except the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to the seabed due to spud legs, anchoring and propeller wash.</li> <li>• Maximum design scenario (MDS) sandwave clearance width and length.</li> <li>• Suspended sediment, plume concentration, extent, orientation, and subsequent deposition footprint.</li> <li>• Chalk drill arising nature and evolution.</li> <li>• Changes to tidal conditions due to the scheme layout(s) alone or in combination with other project and plans.</li> <li>• Changes to the sediment transport regime due to the scheme layout(s) alone in combination with other project and plans.</li> <li>• Temporary sand/gravel bed impacts in shallow water.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amber:</b> These specific identified potential pressures/impacts are considered by the Applicant to be accounted for and included within the MDS envelope for each potential impact type (e.g., seabed disturbance associated with cable burial, sandwave levelling, changes to the wave regime, changes to patterns of currents, landfall activities and infrastructure, scour) in the Environmental Statement, Volume 2, Chapter 6: Coastal Processes <b>[APP-047]</b>.</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Status at Deadline 4
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-lay grapnel run (PLGR), UXO and boulder clearance.</li> <li>• Impacts to the sandwave field within the array area and their recovery.</li> <li>• Impacts on Kingmere MCZ due to changes in the wave regime.</li> <li>• Impacts to sandbanks and sandwaves due to changes in the tidal regime.</li> <li>• Extent and magnitude of overlapping wakes between Rampion 2 and Rampion 1.</li> <li>• Impacts in the nearshore, inter-tidal and shallow areas due to the presence of cable protection measures during operation.</li> <li>• Palaeochannel infill substrate scour.</li> </ul>	
		<b>Environment Agency</b>	The assessment study area, data gathered for baseline assessment and the assessment methodology.	<b>Green:</b> The Applicant welcomes the Environment Agency's on all coastal processes related topics.
		<b>Marine Management Organisation</b>	The assessment study area, data gathered for baseline assessment and the assessment methodology.	<b>Green:</b> The Applicant welcomes the Marine Management Organisation's agreement on these topics.
			<p>The MMO notes that each of the four cables may require excavation at the punch out site. If this material were to contain chalk, then this might cause mounds on the seabed and the impact of chalk rather than silt sand and gravel has not been considered.</p> <p>The impact of chalk should be considered as part of the discussion in the impact assessment.</p>	<b>Amber:</b> The Applicant has responded to this and it has been covered in the deadline 1 written response to the relevant representations. MMO are to confirm if the provided evidence is now acceptable.
			<p>Multiple clarifications and updates are required to ensure correct understanding from the MMO. Please see comments in Section 4.2 of our relevant representative.</p> <p>The comments should be reviewed and updated, or further justification provided.</p>	<b>Amber:</b> 28/03/24: Awaiting response from MMO.



