

## **Rampion 2 Offshore Windfarm – EN010117 SDNPA Further Comments on Deadline 5 Submissions**

SDNPA would like to make the following comments in respect of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [REP5-072] and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [REP5-068] submitted by the applicant at Deadline 5. It is hoped that these can be taken on board within the final versions of the document.

### **1. Landscape and Ecological Management Plan**

- 1.1 The LEMP now includes updated references and information relating to the Vegetation Retention and Removal Plans and stage-specific LEMPs, which is welcomed.
- 1.2 The inclusion at paragraph 2.7.7 of non-native species in suitable areas outside of native woodland areas, to increase climate resilience, is welcomed. Reference to emerging guidance or best practice in terms of the range of species and circumstances for planting should also be made.
- 1.3 The inclusion of ‘Mitigation Principles for Tree Planting’ at paragraphs 2.7.12 – 2.7.18 is welcomed, including the hierarchy of new planting provision in line with the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) hierarchy.
- 1.4 With respect to translocated hedges at paragraph 4.5.5, where it is stated “whilst in temporary position the hedgerow would be regularly watered”, clarification should be provided regarding the frequency. Further, at paragraph 4.5.6, where it explains that translocated hedges replaced in their original position will be subject to “regular watering (at least for a period of 10 weeks), the minimum frequency should also be applied to this stage of the translocation.
- 1.5 We note that paragraph 5.1.5 is in line with the SDNPA emerging preferred schedule for the earlier stages of BNG delivery and compliance monitoring, which is welcomed.
- 1.6 SDNPA also welcome the addition of reinstatement of temporary access points, junction alterations and passing places on the public highway. These should be identified on the Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plans.

### **2. Construction Traffic Management Plan**

- 2.1 With respect to temporary construction accesses, we consider all accesses within the SDNP should be treated as a field gate access or farm track where there are no existing visibility splays or splays are not appropriate, these would be managed through traffic management measures, rather than cutting back of the vegetation. We would expect this to unequivocally cover accesses A-26 and A-28.
- 2.2 We note that cable drum vehicles are classified as Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL). However, it is not clear at 4.11.2 whether the vehicle figures include the escort vehicles these require – as it is expected they would also access the cable corridor.

If this is the case, can the number of AIL cable drum vehicles be separated out from the other HGV numbers indicated as using the A-26/A-28 loop?

- 2.3 Despite the fact that all traffic can use A-26 for left-in/right-out manoeuvres, A-28 has been retained. Would it be possible to limit A-28 for solely AIL exit (with traffic management through use of lights) and all other HGV and LGV exit via A-26 (turning right). This would limit the number of vehicles passing the scheduled monument at Muntham Court (albeit, they would be the heaviest), and would possibly reduce the number of weeks the temporary lights on the highway would be required.
- 2.4 Having accepted that cable drum vehicles are AIL, paragraph 8.4.27 should reference this; currently this paragraph only references AIL for the onshore substation.
- 2.5 In Appendix A (Access Proposals) A-24 is still included, however SDNPA understood this was to be removed following Issue Specific Hearing 2.
- 2.6 SDNPA query the need for A-27 as an operational access, given A-26 is also noted to be for construction and operational purposes and is only 250m from A-27.

*Appendix D: Technical Note – Construction Accesses (Traffic Management Strategies)*

- 2.7 As noted above, in section 2.4 could the amount of traffic using A-28 be reduced to limit the impact on the scheduled monument?
- 2.8 Further clarification is required in respect of the approach to where Public Rights of Way meet Michelgrove Lane (paragraph 2.4.12). What is the distance from which speeds need to reduce? SDNPA also consider that the general access speed should be reduced to 20mph or lower in this location, to take account of residents as well.