

Jeremy Smethurst submission for deadline 5:

Kent Street swept path diagrams:

We own the hedge and trees to the north of the A272, opposite the proposed access A63.

The new Kent Street swept path analyses now show the DCO boundary **north of the highway** boundary, where previously it was *along* the highway boundary. The DCO boundary and the swept path both appear to be through the hedges on either side of Picts Lane. This is different from the plans previously shown in REP3-030 and contradicts the DCO boundary shown in Sheet 33 of the Onshore work Plans (Doc Ref 2.2.2) and the Tree Preservation and hedgerow retention document REP4-003, where the DCO boundary follows the highway

At no point has Rampion had any discussion with us about removal of hedges. They have only said their involvement with us was to ascertain whether we owned the substrate of the soil on the highway / verges:

An email from 5th October 2023 from [REDACTED] states *"The purpose of the meeting was to discuss land matters in relation to the potential impact of any potential highway works on the presumed ownership of subsoil / part width of highway abutting the A272."* She encloses a screenshot of the workplan sheet 33 from the onshore workplans Doc Ref 2.2.2. This shows the DCO boundary along the highway boundary.

From the Land Rights Tracker: "The Land Interest's title borders an A road which is adopted highway. The Applicant identified the Land Interest as **a presumed owner of part width of the subsoil of that highway comprising plot 33/19.**"

Our hedge and woodland are marked on the retention plans as 'for retention' and root protection for the trees in the woodland to the north of the hedge (H68 and G193) Similarly H68, and H64 on the east side of Picts Lane, are described as 'trees and hedgerow to be retained' (see Arboricultural Impact Assessment REP4—038, sheet 47 of 47)

Urgent clarification is requested as to whether the DCO boundary has now changed and if not, exactly how they propose to provide the necessary turning arc for these enormous vehicles.

Landowner engagement:

With regards to the Land Rights Tracker, **in fact the plot they mention, plot 33/19, would seem to be the high voltage cable route from Oakendene to Wineham, which shows how little attention to detail there is in their documents.** This is nowhere near the correct section, which is presumably works no.14. This error is also repeated in the only letter I have received from Rampion, which is a section 42 letter sent in October 22, which states: ***"The purpose of this letter is to consult you on the potential amendments to the onshore cable corridor."*** Again, incorrect: we are not directly affected by the high voltage cable route and should have received our letters in the first consultation in 2021. My wife had to contact them repeatedly over months to get any kind of sense of what they actually wanted from us. Even now, it would seem that it is not, after all, very clear.

Both my neighbours, [REDACTED] received the same letters at the same time in 2022, and in their listings on the land rights tracker, plot 33/19 is also mentioned incorrectly.

Quite possibly this sort of error is repeated across the DCO. It is no wonder that land owners are worried, and have not engaged with the examination, and have not signed anything; it is not clear what they are being asked to sign.