

EN010117: Application by Rampion Extension Limited for the Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm

Horsham District Council response to The Examining Authority's Rule 17 Request for further Information issued on 17th July 2024

Deadline 6: HDC Response and Information Requested to the Examining Authority's Rule 17 Request for further Information [PD-017].

The Examining Authority presented further Proposed Changes to the dDCO and Written Questions to the Examination, to receive further information about matters it considered relevant. Horsham District Council's response is set out below.

The ExA's Additional Suggested Amendments to the draft DCO [REP5-005]

No.	DCO Req	ExA's Recommended Additional/Amended Requirement	HDC Response
1.	8(1)	<p><u>Works comprising Work No. 16 and Work No.18 together with the associated parts of Work No 17, access from Kent Street to Work No. 9 and 19 and use of Work No. 10 at Oakendene (excluding any onshore site preparation works) must not commence until -</u></p> <p><u>(a) the following details of the substation (Work No. 16):</u></p> <p><i>(a) siting and layout;</i> <i>(b) scale and quantum of development and its uses;</i> <i>(c) existing and proposed finished ground levels;</i> <i>(d) landscaping;</i> <i>(e) access (Work No.18); and</i> <i>(f) external appearance, form and materials for any building structures and other infrastructure including boundary treatment;</i></p> <p><u>(b) a single comprehensive construction traffic management plan covering:</u></p> <p><u>(i) the timing and routing of construction traffic along the A272 and into and out of the Oakendene compound; Substation site and Kent Street;</u></p> <p><u>(ii) the safety of construction accesses off the A272 and Kent Street;</u></p> <p><u>(iii) the safety of non-construction traffic, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians using Kent Street;</u></p> <p><u>(iv) the restriction of traffic from unsuitable routes off the A272; and</u></p> <p><u>(v) measures to minimize the volume of construction traffic passing through the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) at Cowfold; and</u></p>	<p>HDC welcomes the suggested changes as it assists in addressing its concerns raised at Deadline 5 [REP5-149] which remain outstanding.</p> <p>HDC agrees with the ExA that issues are still to be resolved in the vicinity of the Oakendene substation site.</p> <p>HDC does not find the information submitted under the Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [REP5-125] provides the level of details that is helpful to understand the extent of vegetation removal and reinstatement to be carried out, particularly at site scale in the vicinity of Kent Street and the Oakendene substation.</p> <p>This includes timing sequence of vegetation removal, retention and replanting on Kent Street, despite request for amendment to this in the Design and Access Statement and OLEMP at deadline 5 [REP5-150].</p> <p>As previously raised at Deadline 5 [REP5-150], there is no drawing 62280651-WSP-XX-XX-DR-TP0100-0139 as stated at para 3.4.4 (A272/Kent Street – Accesses A61 and A64)) in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan Rev F [REP5-069].</p> <p>HDC welcomes the recognition in the LVIA viewpoint analysis that receptors along Kent Street and residual visual effects, are higher than originally anticipated and now moved to the Significant ranking during construction, Year 1 and Year 5 [REP5-049].</p>

		<p>(c) details of vegetation removal, retention and replanting within Work Nos. 16 and 18 and along Kent Street at construction accesses A61 and A64, which shall be consistent with the Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan secured under requirement 40 and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan secured under requirement 12;</p> <p><i>for the onshore substation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority following consultation with the <u>local highway authority</u> and West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service and Works comprising Works No. 16 and 18 together with the associated parts of Work No 17, access from Kent Street to Works No. 9 and 19 and use of Work No. 10 at Oakendene, must be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</i></p>	<p>HDC disagrees with the Landscape Assessment Rev B of concerning Minor/Negligible residual effects at Year 10 of Kent Street, where the substation is located. Although the mitigation measures will help integrate the substation, this remains an uncharacteristic feature within the character area and at most it will be a residual Minor Effect. Equally, HDC considers that the loss of the tree line and woods within the area are likely to remain a residual Moderate effect. Or that as result of the temporary loss of vegetation during construction works, the wooded, rural character of Kent Street will be adversely impacted but in time the features will be reinstated.</p> <p>HDC concerns relating to wet woodland feasibility at Oakendene can only be addressed when the finalised landscaping and sustainable drainage documents are provided at the detailed design stage, and HDC encourages amendments to Requirement 8 for this information to be provided within a site-specific plan for Oakendene. HDC would prefer to have reference to SuDs and drainage but appreciate if the ExA's considers this repetition as also covered by work no. 16e) <i>surface water and drainage management measures</i></p> <p>In summary, HDC has consistency advocated in its written submission to the Examination that these issues are addressed by a comprehensive site-specific plan. Therefore, for the reasons above alone but also those made in its submissions throughout the Examination and which remain unresolved, HDC welcomes the ExA's 17th July recommended amendments under DCO Requirement No. 8.</p>

2	23(2)(b)	<p>(b) comply with commitments C-112, C-114 and C-216 of the Commitments Register with regards to the restriction of access within ecologically sensitive sites.</p> <p>restrict access within ecologically sensitive sites including Climping Beach Site of Special Scientific Interest, Littlehampton Golf Course and Atherington Beach Local Wildlife Site, Sullington Hill Local Wildlife Site, and Michelgrove Park.</p>	<p>HDC welcomes this suggested change as it would address its concerns raised at Deadline 5 [REP5-149].</p> <p>HDC understands the ExA's reasoning to delist the ecologically sensitive sites, given they are listed within commitment C-112 and C-114. To strengthen the Requirement, HDC agrees with the ExA's suggestion that adherence to commitments C-112, C-114 and C-216 should be referred to. HDC also agrees that this satisfies our concerns with regards to works within 15 metres of Parkminster Wood (ancient woodland), and amendments to C-216 with regards to providing specific measures at these accesses to demonstrate how potential indirect effects will be managed.</p>
---	----------	---	--

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

CR 3.1	Commitments Register All Relevant Interested Parties	The Applicant considers [REP5-121] that the updated Commitments Register submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-086] now address all remaining concerns. Briefly confirm this, without rehearsing previous comments.	<p>Without rehearsing previous comments, HDC outlines the outstanding issues with the updated Commitments Register, below.</p> <p>C-26 . The thresholds of significance described BS5228 are not sufficiently protective for works in tranquil locations, vulnerable receptors (e.g. Washington camping and caravanning site) and for works at night. Lower thresholds should be applied in these locations.</p> <p>C-157 states that HGV routing during the construction period to individual accesses will be developed to avoid major settlements such as Storrington, Cowfold, Steyning, Wineham, Henfield, Woodmancote <i>where possible</i>. It is still not clear how such a routing decision will be made. Storrington is also an AQMA and should be treated like</p>
-----------	--	---	---

			<p>Cowfold. HGV traffic should not be routed through Storrington.</p> <p>C-158 Storrington AQMA should also be included in this commitment.</p> <p>C-201 Local Authority's as well as WSCC be included. Local Authority's have responsibility for air quality impacts not the highways authority.</p> <p>C-231 Low frequency noise not included.</p> <p>C-263 Requires RED to apply to the Local Authority for a s61 consent where BS5228 threshold will be exceeded. This has resource implications for the Local Authority.</p> <p>C-302 No requirement for independent review. This will fall to the Local Planning Authorities and be another resource issue.</p> <p>To note for C-158 the wording is the same as for requirement 24(2)(a) so it is requested this requirement be revised as well.</p>
--	--	--	--

End