

In this final submission to the Inspectorate I would request my previous submissions continue to be considered as no issues have been resolved during the course of the enquiry and, indeed, many have emerged as more serious than was apparent at the beginning of the process.

It has become more and more apparent that the implications of Rampion's proposal are vastly different from the submission that was originally approved. If we knew then what we know now would that initial approval ever have been granted. And how much more is there still to emerge – when it will be too late. Rampion are refusing to give so many details of plans and surveys until after they have received consent. Should these not have been made available before their initial submission? One is forced to the conclusion the work was simply not done and everything that has emerged during the consultation has been 'seat of the pants' reaction.

I ask the Inspectorate to consider the grounds for the refusal of Kent Street battery storage proposal. "The proposed development, by reason of its scale, visual dominance and absence of screening from Kent Street and PROW 1787/2, would result in significant localised harm to the landscape character and visual amenity of the area, contrary to Policies 2, 25, 26, 32, 33 and 36 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy 7 of the emerging Horsham District Local Plan, and paragraph 163(b) of the NPPF (2023)."

Surely this is even more true for the vastly greater Rampion proposal?

Statements in the King's speech and also during the green belt and rural affairs parliamentary debate this week indicate the Government has increased sensitivity to these issues. Surely this must mean we have an obligation to consider the least environmentally damaging options for our green energy lest we destroy our wildlife in the effort to save our planet. Specifically :

- There has been a woeful lack of consultation both prior and during the process from Rampion. Personally I was unaware of this project until initial approval had been granted and I have yet to meet any other resident who was. There was clearly a failure properly to compare the initial options and when these are now reconsidered in the light of current understanding of the project Cowfold is manifestly the LEAST suitable of all the options. Should Rampion not be asked to 'think again'?
- Cowfold's traffic survey clearly demonstrates the huge impact the project will have on A272 traffic volumes, congestion, air quality, accidents, delays, noise and pollution, not to mention the impact on small businesses in the area. These have been ignored by Rampion. A272 traffic increase – without this project – is already at concerningly high levels impacting on village life.
- Rampion's traffic survey for Kent Street has not been published in full and what is available is highly suspect (e.g. it is unclear whether they understand the difference between an HGV and a horsebox). Presumably the Inspectorate will require to see the full survey? This is in addition to the increasing destruction of the Kent Street environment becoming apparent through the need to negotiate HGV traffic along a lane identified as 'Unsuited to heavy vehicles' and the need for passing places and junction turning spaces which only emerged during this review. This would involve the construction of four 45m passing places on the lane, ie a total of 180m of verges and associated destruction. Some of these passing places go through the hedges as the existing lane and verges are not wide enough and would require the removal of yet more large oaks. The destruction would be horrific in addition to the hedge and tree loss already planned.
- The environmental harms are enormous and irreparable, specifically but not limited to Cratemans and the green lane; loss of habitats, especially red list species such as nightingales, reptiles and badgers, many veteran trees, hundreds of metres of important hedges. Rampion have consistently played down these effects and ignored information submitted to them.
- Rampion propose substantial harm to a listed building (Oakendene) with loss of historic parkland. Oakendene is a historic Estate and must be viewed as a whole; the destruction of the parkland and it's relationship to the surrounding landscape must be preserved.
- Rampion's proposal of close boarding screens will merely compound the eyesore and create an industrial landscape in this essentially rural area.
- Comments in the recent King's speech call into doubt the necessity for this project with 'far more generation (already) in the queue that we will need' although Rampion couch their plan as being 'in the national interest'. Furthermore, at the parliamentary debate on the green belt and rural affairs this week, Steve Reed MP The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs stated at the conclusion of the debate: "Nature underpins all the Government's missions. Without nature, there is no economy, no health, no food and no society. Nature is at crisis point. The Tories left Britain one of the most nature-depleted countries on Earth. A third of our bird and mammal species face extinction.... This Government are committed to the legally binding environmental targets set under the Environment Act 2021—targets that the Tories missed, but that this Government will meet by working in a new partnership with the nature non-governmental organisations".