

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Rampion2](#)  
**Subject:** Interested Party Number 20045181  
**Date:** 09 July 2024 17:58:06  
**Attachments:** [Deadline 5 Submissions July 2024.docx](#)

---

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at [REDACTED]]

Dear ExA

Please find attached our Deadline 5 representation

We are also members of the CowfoldVRampion Action group along with other hundreds of people and we fully endorse their latest submission

Many thanks

Emily Mulcare Ball

## **Deadline 5 Submissions July 2024**

We notice with dismay that Rampion have not answered at Deadline 4 the extensive representations made by Cowfold v Rampion at Deadline 3. This Action Group produced data and queries which the applicant does not seem to want to answer which we find very disingenuous.

As members of Rampion v Cowfold we also fully endorse our submission for deadline 5 July submission and would ask to ExA to ask the Applicant to properly listen to our concerns and answer our questions.

Our further representations are:

REP4-071 – Ref 7a – the EXA asked questions to the Applicant on the Kent Street Traffic Management Plan

- The applicant gives details of the communication for the compound to the access points along Kent Street BUT in the 5 points listed by the applicant they have not considered existing traffic on Kent Street and how this will interact with their 5 point plan. As represented in many previous deadlines Kent Street has delivery lorries, horses, tractors, agricultural vehicles etc which will not fit into this plan
- Also the Applicant has not recognized how many small sub-contractor vehicles will use Kent street and Access points A61 and A64. If Access point A63 has a queue (lorries heading west turning right against oncoming traffic) such small vans will try and skip this by coming down Kent Street. Chaos will quickly ensue.
- We would like to see drawings and proof that (as asked by the ExA) that two HGVs can pass each other along Kent Street next to the passing places. This ties in with West Sussex CC and their statement on the current drawings in REP4-86 where they also state

*Clarification is needed whether the A272 road widths on the tracking drawings are accurate. The drawings appear to show the A272 being quite wide. The actual lane widths appear to be no more than 3.5 metres in each direction. The A272 does widen in the vicinity of the Kent Street junction but only to accommodate a taper at the Picts Lane junction opposite.*

- The applicant is still stating that the 4 passing places are within highways land, we have asked for legal proof before and would ask again as this is not highways land and is outside of the DCO area, this is again stated by West Sussex CC Highways where they state in REP4-86 (page 12)

*The passing places are noted. The extent of public highway varies along Kent Street as such it's not a given that these are within the highway. The highway boundary would need to be determined and shown on the relevant drawing alongside the proposed passing places. Confirmation would be required the passing places are also within the DCO Limits.*

The 4 x passing places are not long enough to enable stationary lorries and passing lorries at the same time. Indeed, some of the passing places are smaller than the longest proposed lorries. If these passing places are the key to the Kent Street Strategy then they should be detailed in every respect with drawings showing ditches and Ecatepec widths, otherwise more destruction of Kent Street will entail.

Kent Street will have to be closed to enable the proposed works to take place on the road and passing places, residents will be massively inconvenienced.

The applicant has not produced any detailed designs for access A62 / A61 and A64 to date. These access points will affect the landscape views on the substation from the road. We would ask the ExA to implore the applicant to give a concise description of the landscape and visual impacts all along Kent Street. What is the total amount of tree and hedge loss along Kent Street.

We agree with the comments by HDC that the removal of vegetation on the new proposed Kent Street/ A272 junction will

HDC raises significant concern with the removal of the existing vegetation in this corner as it plays a significant role in mitigating visual effects not only at operational stage but also during construction. In addition, the widening of the bell mouth and various passing points will also have significant effects to the rural character of Kent Street and its permanent widening would not be supported.

We also strongly agree with Horsham DC when they state

The principle of Kent Street being used for construction traffic and HGV's is of significant concern for HDC given the likely impact it will have on the character and visual amenity of Kent Street. This is becoming more apparent and significant the more detailed design emerges.

HDC would welcome its inclusion in the review of the LVIA at deadline 4 and HDC urges the applicant to further explore the use of haul roads as an alternative.

The ExA have asked about removing Kent Street Access Points A61 and A64 and using haul roads. In the Applicant's response REP4-74 (page 30) point 45 they state that this would cost around £1m for a bridge on the west of Kent Street. Just because it costs more does not mean it is unviable – this additional cost would not make the project unviable. It would appease Kent Street residents and would be a tiny fraction of any build contingency. It would also help alleviate concerns Horsham DC have about access points on Kent Street.

It is only now at this very late stage that Parish Councils, Horsham DC and West Sussex DC are becoming aware of the complete inadequacy of the use of Kent Street and its Access points. Something residents have been talking about since Deadline 1.

We agree with the representation by Bolney Parish Council REP4-102

*“REP3-031 is the Applicant's revised Outline Construction Workforce Travel Plan. This has been amended and now states that the Travel Information Pack which the Applicant will prepare to issue to the workforce will 'advise those driving to the site of recommended routes to avoid the use of*

*narrow unclassified rural roads, **where possible**' [emphasis added]. Bolney Parish Council contends that this wording is wholly inadequate and falls short of the Applicant's response in REP2-14. Again, the Parish Council would ask that the Outline Construction Workforce Plan be amended to specifically name the five rural lanes in the Parish as being prohibited from use by LGVs and construction workers.*

We also request the same for Bulls Lane, Picts Lane, Thornden, Kent Street itself and would urge the parish council to do so also. We know that otherwise they will inevitably go where google maps or colleagues tell them to go to avoid the congestion Rampion will be creating.

We would also like to see studies on TRAFFIC TURNING at junctions such as the A272 and Kent Street and on the A272 and Oakendende Industrial estate. When traffic flow is at peak levels this could coincide with multiple Lorrie's Turing out and against oncoming traffic. This currently quickly causes delays and traffic quickly blocks up along the A272 – this will be dramatically increased by the increased usage of the junctions.

We are still worried about the enormous low loaders for the cables and how they will travel along Kent Street and over the culvert bridge which is only max 2.85m wide to the grass, can this bridge take this weight, again no analysis has been completed. It will fine say the Applicant until it collapses and the whole of Kent Street have to suffer as a consequence.

We received a letter about claiming professional fees and costs from the Applicant, it on the 26/6/24 but was dated on the 6/6/24 – this has always been the case with our communication with the Applicant. This letter has only been issued due to concerns expressed in open hearings about fees and insistence by the ExA. The Applicant is failing in its duty to compensate fees and only 'persons affected' with considerable money are able to constantly keep updated in the DCO process. This is why so many affected persons are not participating in the deadlines.

Another example of delayed communication. We received our heads of terms for an option on a small piece of land on the 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2024 but the letter was dated 15<sup>th</sup> March 2024, Lucy Tebutt confirmed to me on the phone on the 25/4/24 that the wrong date had been put on the letter.

Communication and negotiation has been terrible by the Applicant and the high hurdle of the DCO process has not been achieved.

We hope the ExA will take our comments on board.

Thank you