

Dear Sir,

This is an addition to the Deadline 5 submission already submitted by CowfoldvRampion. We felt it was necessary as a result of the change notification submitted by Rampion on 8<sup>th</sup> July, and we trust that the ExA will therefore allow it. We trust also that the ExA will not treat the Rampion submission as a deadline 4 entry as there has been only a day to consider it.

We note the 2008 guidelines state this *“should not be the routine practice”*. The only reason it has happened now is due to overwhelming evidence about the potential risks to ancient woodland, which if the application had carefully thought through *before* submission, would not have been necessary. This was brought up very early in the examination; there is no excuse for leaving it to such a late date. The applicant appeared unconcerned about the proximity to ancient woodland until this became an issue in the examination that would not go away.

The guidelines go on to state:

*“It is expected that applicants will discuss the implications of any changes they wish to make with relevant statutory consultees and notify the Examining Authority **at the earliest opportunity**. This means that proposed change requests must be made **at an early stage** in the examination to enable any appropriate consultation on the change within the statutory examination period.”*

They have not submitted it “at an early stage in the examination”; indeed, the opposite is true; only making the alteration as a result of mounting pressure.

Nor have they allowed time so that *“sufficient consultation on the changed application can be undertaken to allow for the examination to be completed within the statutory timetable;”*

Or that *“the application (as changed) is still of a sufficient standard for examination;”*

Whilst the changes to the woodland buffers are potentially welcomed, we do not accept that the above criteria have been fulfilled because this change actually raises more questions than it resolves:

- **it throws in to further doubt why they need so many other areas on the DCO where reasons for acquisition remain very unclear.** If they can apparently make the proposed alterations so easily, why did they want the land in the first place and why can they not reduce other parts of the boundary?
- It is also not demonstrated that in some of these reduced areas, most obviously at Sweethill Farm and Michelgrove, that the width remains sufficient to accommodate both the cable and a haul road. It will not be acceptable for the Applicant simply to say they ‘are confident it will be’; proper diagrams with dimensions must be produced to ensure the change is possible, and that they will not simply be asking for ‘unforeseen’ alterations post consent.

We therefore do not agree that *“these potential changes are not material, and thus not subject to further consultation requirements.”*

At this late stage there is no opportunity to properly scrutinise these issues.

In respect of proposed change H specifically, the Applicant appears to introduce a new temporary construction access on Bob Lane, contrary to all agreed plans so far in the examination. There also appears to be a considerable loss of land earmarked for mitigation ie work no. 17, which previously extended all the way up to the east of the substation extension, through a considerable part of work no. 19, and which has now been reduced to a narrow strip to the south. There is no explanation of how this can be compensated for. Again, therefore, we believe this to represent a material change.

We disagree with the Applicant's statement that "*no consultation is necessary on this change, as it results in no new or different environmental effects,*" as several affected parties made their views clear from the outset that the use of Bob Lane would be unacceptable.

Meera Smethurst

On behalf of CowfoldvRampion