

# Rampion 2 Wind Farm Category 8: Examination Documents Applicant's Examination Progress Tracker

**Date: August 2024**  
**Revision E**

Document Reference: 8.22

Pursuant to: The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure)

Rules 2010, Rule 8(1)(c)(i)

Ecodoc number: 005033263-05



## Document revisions

Revision	Date	Status/reason for issue	Author	Checked by	Approved by
A	04/02/2024	Procedural Deadline A	WSP	WSP	RED
B	20/03/2024	Deadline 2	WSP	WSP	RED
C	25/04/2024	Deadline 3	WSP	WSP	RED
D	03/06/2024	Deadline 4	WSP	WSP	RED
E	01/08/2024	Deadline 6	WSP	WSP	RED

# Contents

---

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Overview	4
1.2	Purpose of this Document	4
<b>2.</b>	<b>Examination Progress Tracker</b>	<b>5</b>

# 1. Introduction

---

## 1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 This Examination Progress Tracker has been prepared to support an application by Rampion Extension Development Limited (“Rampion Extension Development Limited”) hereafter referred to as ‘RED’ (the ‘Applicant’) is developing the Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm Project (‘Rampion 2’) located adjacent to the existing Rampion Offshore Wind Farm Project (‘Rampion 1’) in the English Channel.
- 1.1.2 Rampion 2 will be located between 13km and 26km from the Sussex Coast in the English Channel and the offshore array area will occupy an area of approximately 160km. A detailed description of the Proposed Development is set out in Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (ES), submitted with the DCO Application.

## 1.2 Purpose of this Document

- 1.2.1 This document has been produced in response to the Examining Authority’s (ExA) Rule 8 letter **[PD-007]** requesting an Examination Progress Tracker, in the form of a table, reporting on what it considers are the principal, and other notable issues in the Examination. The Applicant notes further advice provided by the ExA at Section 5, Annex B of the letter requiring further detail.
- 1.2.2 This document is intended to be a live document and the tables will be updated to provide a mid-Examination version at Deadline 2 (this version), with a final Tracker submitted at Deadline 6, Thursday 1 August 2024.
- 1.2.3 Table 2.1, below, sets out the principal issues, logs the Interested Parties that have raised them, summarises the concern(s)/objection(s) and the progress being made and sets out any progress to resolution. For ease of reference the table has used a “traffic-lighting” system to guide the reader to the likelihood of resolving the issues as follows:
- **Green:** The issue has been resolved and a mechanism for delivering this solution has been captured in a document submitted to the Examination;
  - **Amber:** The issue is capable of resolution. The Applicant will look to progress this issue with relevant Interested Parties with a view to agreeing a resolution;
  - **Red:** The issue is not capable of resolution.
- 1.2.4 The Applicant has identified the principal and notable issues in the Examination, based on the Relevant Representations and the Examining Authority’s Initial Assessment of Principal Issues contained in the Rule 6 Letter **[PD-006]**.
- 1.2.5 The summary of the issues and the assessment of likely process are based upon the Written and Relevant Representation and Local Impact Reports that have been submitted to the Pre-Exam Procedural Deadline and at Deadline 1. They also reflect the ongoing discussions between the Applicant and other interested parties.

## 2. Examination Progress Tracker

**Table 2-1: Examination Progress Tracker**

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
1	Alternatives	Arun District Council (ADC)	Whether alternatives to the Proposed Development were adequately considered for the onshore corridor route at landfall and location of Climping Compound.	<p><b>Red:</b> Not agreed – No Material Impact. This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-090 [REF ADC03] submitted at deadline 5.</p> <p>The Applicant has carried out an extensive route and site selection process that was guided by detailed specialist engineering, environmental assessment and engagement with stakeholders, regulatory stakeholders and non-governmental organisations. The Alternatives Chapter covers the landfall selection and - though this area overlaps with the Climping Beach SSSI, impacts are avoided as the works are limited to underground cable installation. The site of the Climping compound is primarily driven by its proximity to the landfall location and highway access to support landfall and cable construction in the area. An alternative compound location to the west of Church Lane was considered but was discounted due to presence of an approved Outline Application for up to 300 dwellings. Other alternatives were also considered following feedback on the first statutory consultation but were discounted due to them being located in Flood Zone 2 and 3.</p>
	Alternatives	South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)	Whether alternatives to the Proposed Development adequately considered the route choice including its incursion into the South Downs National Park.	<p><b>Red:</b> Not agreed – Material Impact. This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA03] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that it has appropriately considered Alternatives and met the key policy tests in the National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 (Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) (2011) relating to development taking place within the SDNP. The SDNPA maintain their concerns.</p>
	Alternatives	West Sussex County Council	Whether alternatives to the Proposed Development have adequately considered the choice of the onshore substation location.	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC02] submitted at deadline 6. Section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 [APP-044] provides the information on the onshore substation site selection process. This includes the site selection process and the reasons for other sites being discounted based on the multi-disciplinary factors identified. The selection of Oakendene is clearly stated as favourable for engineering, cost and landowner considerations in paragraphs 3.6.23 to 3.6.25 of Chapter 3: Alternatives, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-044]. The Applicant has provided additional responses during the course of the Examination which have been considered in order to reach agreement.</p>
2	Aviation	NATS Shoreham Airport	The potential effect of the wind turbine generators (WTGs) to effect civilian and defence radar systems.	<p><b>Green:</b> Both the final versions of the Statements of Common Ground with NATS [APP-8.26] and Shoreham Airport [APP-8.11] reflect the final agreements with regards to both radar mitigations and flight instruments procedure respectively.</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
3	Commitments Register and Plans	SDNPA	Commitments Register is not definitive about the actions that will be taken in respect of mitigation, using vague and non-committed language.	<b>N/A:</b> The Commitments Register [REP4-057] has been prepared to provide a summary of the embedded environmental measures to be implemented to manage the potential environmental impact of the Proposed Development. The register also identifies the securing mechanism in the DCO and relevant supporting documents. Comments on individual commitments are considered under the relevant sections and the Applicant and SDNPA concluded this overarching PAD could be marked 'not applicable' in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA03] submitted at deadline 6.
		Arun District Council	Concerns regarding the lack of commitment and securing mechanism of mitigation, monitoring and compensation.	<b>Red:</b> Not Agreed – no material impact This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-090 [REF ADC02] submitted at deadline 5.  Arun District Council still had concerns regarding the nature of some of the wording of the commitments (at Deadline 5) but noted the Requirements as a securing mechanism and the commitment by the Applicant to providing a Community Benefits Package in consultation with ADC.
		Horsham District Council	Commitments Register firmness and securing mechanisms and HDC Compensation request.	<b>Green:</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-091 [REF HDC34] submitted at deadline 6.  The Applicant updated the <b>Commitments Register [REP4-057]</b> and included a column for the securing mechanism for each embedded environmental measure and its related commitment reference. This cross-refers to the mechanism, for example a requirement in the <b>draft Development Consent Order</b> Schedule 1 Part 3 [REP4-004]. Where there was an accompanying document such as an outline plan submitted with the DCO Application with which works must be undertaken in accordance with, this is also referred to under the 'Relevant Application Documents' column. The Applicant updated the Commitments Register as the Examination has progressed to refine the wording of commitments and provide assurance in respect of mitigation delivery. Further information was provided within the Application documents (as referenced in the Commitments Register [REP4-057]) as to how mitigation measures will be delivered. This included updates to the Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP4-045], with stage specific management plans to accord with this document secured by requirement 24 of the draft Development Consent Order [REP4-004]
4	Construction Effects	Mid Sussex District Council	<p>The Applicant has set out in their submissions (Outline Code of Construction Practice) that they intend to operate within the following core working hours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>07:00 to 19:00 hours Monday to Friday; and</li> <li>08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturday.</li> </ul> <p>The concern centres around the impact these working hours, and specifically a 07:00 start time on weekdays</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-092 [REF MSDC01] submitted at deadline 5.</p> <p>The Applicant has amended the proposed core working hours, which are now agreed with MSDC.</p>



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
			and 08:00 on Saturdays, will have on the residential amenity of neighbouring residents who live in close proximity to the construction areas.	
	<b>Construction Effects</b>	<b>National Highways</b>	The construction, operation or maintenance of a site (construction/ compound/ permanent) associated with the project adjacent to or in close proximity to the Strategic Road network (SRN and the implications for the SRN.	<b>Amber:</b> The Applicant shared further details of the works on and under the SRN with National Highways and are confident that detailed designs for the construction, operation or maintenance of a site compound could be agreed. A geotechnical report in respect of trenchless crossing has been approved by NH. Road Safety Audits in respect of access A-21 and A-22 have been provided to NH and the Applicant will continue to seek approval of these.  Mitigation measures requested by NH were included in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-228].
	<b>Construction Effects</b>		<b>APP-224</b> 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice. <b>APP-228</b> 7.6 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan. <b>APP-229</b> 7.7 Outline Construction Workforce Travel Plan.	<b>Green:</b> This was agreed in the final SoCG REP5-098 [REF NH06] submitted at deadline 6.  The Applicant considers that there is no disagreement regarding these documents. NH agreed.
	<b>Construction Effects</b>		The Applicant proposes via the Book of Reference and elsewhere activities, works or consequential provisions that may affect the safety, operation, management of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and/or the roles and responsibilities of National Highways as the Strategic Highway Authority, asset owner and/or statutory consultee. The Applicant needs to fully explain the implications of their proposals in these contexts to ensure that they comply with national planning and transport policy, the National Highways Operating Licence and do not usurp or unreasonably fetter National highways.	<b>Red:</b> This is not agreed to in the final SoCG REP5-098 [REF NH09] submitted at deadline 6  An annotated version of the National Highways preferred form of protective provisions was shared with National highways. A response was received on the 15 May 2024 which the applicant then responded to on the 20 May 2024, with a follow up meeting held on 23 May 2024. It is considered unlikely that agreement can be reached on the terms of these Protective Provisions.
	<b>Construction Effects</b>		<b>APP-064</b> 6.2.23 Environmental Statement- Volume 2 Chapter 23 Transport (plus AAP107-APP110 comprising appendices thereto). <b>APP-173</b> 6.4.19.1 Environmental Statement- Volume 4 Appendix 19.1 Full results of construction road traffic modelling. <b>APP-173</b> 6.4.19 .2 Environmental Statement- Volume 4 Appendix 19.2 Full results of construction plant modelling. <b>APP-196</b> 6.4.23.1 Environmental Statement- Volume 4 Appendix 23.1 Abnormal Indivisible Loads Assessment.	<b>Green:</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-098 [REF NH10, NH11, NH12, NH13, NH14 ] submitted at deadline 6  The Applicant notes that there is no disagreement regarding these documents.

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
			<b>APP-197</b> 6.4.23.2 Environmental Statement- Volume 4 Appendix 23.2 Traffic Generation Technical Note.	
	<b>Construction Effects</b>	<b>Horsham Council</b> <b>District</b>	<p>Lack of a standalone Air Quality Plan for the construction phase of the development.</p> <p>The concern is that air quality improvements in the Cowfold Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) do not stall and that the improvements are continuous and maintained into the future.</p> <p>The Air quality and emissions mitigation guidance for Sussex (2021) draws on Defra’s methodology for the appraisal of impacts produced by a project. It requires that each application (major and/or in relevant proximity of an AQMA) is supported by an air quality mitigation plan detailing measures to mitigate and/or offset the impacts and setting out itemised costing for each proposed measure.</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-091 [REF HDC01] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The overarching Air Quality Mitigation Strategy Rev A [<b>REP3-053</b>] has been deemed acceptable by HDC.</p>
	<b>Construction Effects</b>		<p>Proposals for construction noise monitoring are inadequate for a project of this scale and duration.</p> <p>Insufficient sanctions or penalties proposed in the DCO to deal with non-compliance.</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-091 [REF HDC07] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p><b>Section 9</b> of the <b>Outline CTMP [REP4-045]</b> includes further information on the management and enforcement of the CTMP to ensure the objectives are met, continually monitored and reviewed.</p>
	<b>Construction Effects</b>		<p>Insufficient sanctions or penalties proposed in the DCO to deal with non-compliance with the construction noise and vibration targets.</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-091 [REF HDC04a] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p><b>Section 9</b> of the <b>Outline CTMP [REP4-045]</b> includes further information on the management and enforcement of the CTMP to ensure the objectives are met, continually monitored and reviewed.</p>
	<b>Construction Effects</b>		<p>Construction Communications Plan should include provision for regular local meetings with representatives for the communities where the construction compounds will be sited. The costs should be met by the developer.</p>	<p><b>Green :</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-091 [REF HDC04b] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that an Outline Construction Communications Plan has been produced and provided to the examination at Deadline 5.HDC have acknowledged the Applicant has responded to concerns by the submission of the OCCP.</p>
			<p>Concerns regarding the substantial size of the compounds and limited detail to their use and length of time in operational use.</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-091 [REF HDC20] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The outline of the requirement and description of uses for the construction compounds is given in the <b>Statement of Reasons [APP-021]</b> (Paragraph 6.10.5). Relevant commitments, as set out in the <b>Commitments Register [REP4-057]</b>, regarding effects of construction compounds during and after construction are: C-27 (Reinstatement), C-129 (Aggregate for Surface Protection), C-196 (Landscape Re-</p>



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
				<p>instatement), C-204 (BS5837, tree protection), C-282 and C-285 (Arboricultural Method Statement).</p> <p>The LVIA has been based on a maximum envelope for construction development within the construction compounds (<b>Figure 18.2c, Volume 3</b> of the ES <b>[APP-098]</b>). The Applicant acknowledges that significant landscape and visual effects associated with the presence of the compound on the local landscape character and views from the A272, PRow and residential properties.</p> <p>The <b>Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCoCP) [REP4-043]</b> was amended at Deadline 3 and provided further information on screening (paragraph 4.3.5) and layout (paragraph 4.4.4). The LVIA was updated for Deadlines 4 and 5 to account of the OCoCP and Construction Access A-62 and visibility splays as per - Deadline 3 Submission - 8.61 Technical Note Construction Access Update Assessment <b>[REP3 – 055]</b>.</p> <p>This has now been agreed to by HDC</p>
	<b>Construction Effects</b>	<b>Arun District Council</b>	Concerns regarding visual effects of the landfall construction compound (Work No.8) and Climping Compound (Work No.10); the latter is substantial in size.	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-090 [REF ADC10] submitted at deadline 5.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledged that significant landscape and visual effects associated with the presence of the landfall construction compound and the Climping Compound on the local landscape character and views.</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that the Local Impact Report was submitted at Deadline 1 <b>[REP1-039]</b> and the Applicant has subsequently responded at Deadline 2 in Applicant's response to Arun District Council's Deadline 1 Submissions <b>[REP2-021]</b>.</p>
	<b>Construction Effects</b>		<p>Chapter 21 of the ES states with respect to construction noise effects that determination of the need for Section 61 consent will be determined by contractor at detailed design stage following review of construction noise assessments, if it is determined that there is 'significant deviation' from initial predictions.</p> <p>These values replicate the values set out in Table E.2 of British Standard (BS) 5228 in particular for the 0800 – 1800 time period. Proposed construction hours are stated as 0700 – 1900 hours where for the shoulder hours (0700 – 0800 and 1800 – 1900) Table E.2 suggests a trigger value of 70dB LAeq, T.</p> <p>For some locations that are close to exceeding the 65dB threshold value, the assessment outcome has been increased to reflect potential impact. This has not been done consistently and where there are predicted values that are also close to the threshold value, the outcome has not been increased.</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-090 [REF ADC17] submitted at deadline 5. The Applicant states if the method changes significantly to what has been assessed, such that where previously no significant impacts were predicted and then the amended method suggests that significant impacts will be experienced, this is where the Section 61 process would be instigated. This will require a competent person to be assessing the construction works are more defined.</p> <p>This was agreed to on an Expert to Expert Call 15/03/24</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	<b>Construction Effects</b>		There are insufficient details of the noise modelling inputs for the operation of the construction compound.	<b>Green:</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-090 [REF ADC20] submitted at deadline 5.  The Applicant acknowledged that the plant list table assumed for the operational noise modelling of the construction compounds has not been included in Appendix 21.2: Construction Plant List, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-177]. This was amended accordingly. ADC confirmed their agreement 16.01.24
6	<b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b>	<b>Arun District Council</b>	Significant concerns regarding the cable route passing beneath and near to the Climping SSSI and ecological sensitive areas. Nationally scarce invertebrates have been identified on the sand dunes of Climping beach. We note access would be restricted in the SSSI and no groundbreaking activity.  However, there remains the potential for unplanned events and localised degradation of habitat within the SSSI, which is of a concern.	<b>Green:</b> This agreed in the final SoCG REP5-090 [REF ADC12] submitted at deadline 5.  ADC is happy with clarification provided by the Applicant on concerns. The works are not taking place in close proximity to the sensitive features. Under all normal circumstances indirect effects on the SSSI such as dust deposition, pollutant losses etc. can be effectively managed. Only in the event of an unforeseen break-out of drilling fluid to the surface within the SSSI would any effects on habitats and the invertebrates they support be realised. Given the design and ways of working described in the <b>Outline Construction Method Statement [APP-255]</b> and <b>Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP4-043]</b> the risk of this occurring is very low.
	<b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b>		Biodiversity net gain (BNG) has not been assessed at the district level ADC. We would expect biodiversity net gain to be achieved within the administrative area of Arun.	<b>Green :</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-090 [REF ADC13] submitted at deadline 5. ADC was happy with the response provided by the Applicant regarding commitment to BNG. The Applicant clarified that they will be actively looking for terrestrial units in Arun.  ADC officer confirmed this agreed on 12 June based on the additional information provided at district level.
	<b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b>	<b>Horsham District Council</b>	Likely adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley Sites due to a failure to demonstrate that the development would be Water Neutral.	<b>Green :</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-091 [REF HDC11] submitted at deadline 6.  With the provision of the Updated Requirement 8(3) (DCO Rev E REP4-055) and evidence submitted at deadlines 3 and 4 alongside expert to expert meetings, HDC agrees on this matter.
	<b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b>		i) Lack of clarity on the distinction between what constitutes essential mitigation and compensation, and BNG.  ii) Biodiversity net gain has not been assessed at the district level. HDC would expect biodiversity net gain to be achieved within the administrative area of Horsham district.	<b>Green :</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-091 [REF HDC12] submitted at deadline 6  23/07/2024: Accepted as green based on the Deadline 5 submission reviews by HDC.

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Feasibility of habitat creation at Oakendene substation site.	<b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP-091 [REF HDC13] submitted at deadline 6 HDC agreed it was available to the Applicant to defer feasibility to the detailed design stage. It recognised the final SUDs design is dependent upon knowing site requirements that will not be finalised until a later stage. HDC accepted that the Applicant has made all the necessary amendments that could be done at the time.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)	Environment Agency (EA)	Benthic Ecology: Agreement on assessment Study Area. Agreement on data sources gathered for baseline considered acceptable for assessment.	<b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG [REP5-095] [REF EA05 EA06 EA07] submitted at deadline 5.  The Applicant appreciates the Environment Agency's endorsement of the chosen Study Area and the data sources used for the baseline assessment in the DCO application documents. Both have been deemed most suitable.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Benthic Ecology: Concerns of cables passing through chalk feature and permanent habitat loss.	<b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG [REP5-095] [REF EA07] submitted at deadline 5.  The Applicant considers that it has adopted an appropriate approach to minimising potential impacts to priority habitats and species in the intertidal and subtidal environment, with avoidance through informed design / micrositing and, where avoidance is not possible, minimisation of impacts through mitigation as set out within the In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [APP-239].  The Applicant has based its assessment of cable burial potential on current data, which is considered appropriate at this pre-consent stage; a full Cable Burial Risk Assessment based on the results of the pre-construction surveys will be undertaken when the final cable design parameters are determined post-consent.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Benthic Ecology: Concerns about the release of significant quantities of Bentonite during the drilling process during the offshore construction phase and the potential impacts to the newly establishing kelp beds in proximity.  Assurances were given at the last expert topic group meeting that contact had been made with the Sussex Kelp Recovery Project and discussions/consultation were ongoing. The Environment Agency would welcome further clarification on this.	<b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG [REP5-095] [REF EA08] submitted at deadline 5.  The Applicant is engaging with Sussex Kelp Recovery Project (SKRP) and SKRP is aware that the Rampion 2 DCO Application has been published on the Planning Inspectorate's website. Whilst the Applicant has not engaged with SKRP on direct impacts on the kelp beds, Chapter 9: Benthic, Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology, Volume 2 [APP-050] has assessed all algae features, including kelp, and has determined there would be no significant effects. It is therefore considered unlikely that construction works, including the potential release of bentonite during drilling activities at landfall, would result in the deterioration of relevant biological quality elements under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017, although it is also noted that the Sussex coastal water body is not assessed / classified for macroalgae.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Nature conservation assessment Study Area. Nature conservation area data gathered for baseline considered acceptable for assessment. Agreement of assessment approach / methodology.	<b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG [REP5-095] [REF EA29 EA30 EA31] submitted at deadline 5.

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Water dependent habitats and species – methodology and management of impacts.	<b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG [REP5-095] [REF EA32] submitted at deadline 5.  The Environment Agency is happy with the quantity of data collected on biodiversity elements and comfortable that concerns the Environment Agency has previously raised are being addressed.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Preconstruction surveys for water vole and Great Crested Newts	<b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG [REP5-095] [REF EA33] submitted at deadline 5.  Preconstruction surveys will be carried out for water vole and Great Crested Newts where the route intersects suitable habitat. The Environment Agency supports this given the timeframes involved in the proposal.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Agreement of fish and shellfish ecology Study Area and data gathered for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment.	<b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG [REP5-095] [REF EA34] submitted at deadline 5.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)	Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	Agreement on assessment study area. Agreement of assessment approach/methodology. Agreement on data sources gathered for baseline considered acceptable for assessment.  The MMO agrees with Cefas that the justification to scope out operational EMF, noise and accidental pollution is satisfactory.	<b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100[REF MMO19] submitted at deadline 6  The MMO agreed with the Applicant's position on these matters.  The Applicant expresses satisfaction with the MMO's approval of the study area, the data sources used for the baseline assessment within the DCO application documents, and the assessment approach/methodology. The methodology is outlined in Section 5.3 of Volume 4 of the ES, Appendix 9.3 Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm Subtidal Benthic Characterisation Survey Report. The analytical lab used, SOCOTEC, is also approved by the MMO.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Concerns of cables passing through chalk feature and permanent habitat loss.	<b>Red (Not Agreed – No Material Impact):</b> This is not agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100[REF MMO23] submitted at deadline 6  The Applicant submitted an outline Cable Specification and Installation Plan document and an outline Cable Burial Risk Assessment at Deadline 5. Updates to the Outline Scour Protection and Cable Protection Plan (OSPCPP) have added additional commitments to C-300 (committing to the cable protection with least impact). MMO state the document does not yet commit to any of the available choices, so it is not possible to comment on whether C-300 is met. Status is not agreed
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		There is information missing from Table 9- 14 and the sensitivity from smothering should be reconsidered. Please see comments in Section 4.3 of our relevant representations.  The comments should be reviewed and updated, or further justification provided.	<b>Green :</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100 [REF MMO24a] submitted at deadline 6  The Applicant responded to this at Deadline 4 in the Applicant's Comments on Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-070] and it has been covered in the Deadline 1 written response to the relevant representations [REP1-017].  The MMO agreed with the Applicant's position.



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		<p>Agreement of study area and data gathered for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment.</p> <p>MMO are satisfied that fisheries would indeed be consulted with, in relation to shellfish landings.</p> <p>MMO agrees the source of literature, data and publications listed in the presentation slides are appropriate of fisheries and fish ecology for the purpose of the EIA.</p> <p>MMO agrees that no new fisheries surveys are required to inform the characterisation. However, as noted, this is caveated by adding that the MMO defers to Natural England and The Seahorse Trust regarding the need for any additional surveys for seahorses.</p> <p>MMO agree that scoping in effects of Electro Magnetic Fields (EMF) on elasmobranch and electro-sensitive fish is appropriate.</p> <p>Agree with seasonal restriction for black seabream during cable installation.</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100 [REF MMO24, MMO25, MMO26, MMO27, MMO28] submitted at deadline</p> <p>The MMO agreed with the Applicant's position.</p>
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		<p>There are discrepancies between Chapter 8 and Appendix 11.3 on the worst-case duration of monopile and jacket foundation installation.</p> <p>Discrepancies to be amended with the correct maximum duration of piling per day, so that impacts can be assessed properly and mitigated.</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100 [REF MMO31] submitted at deadline</p> <p>The MMO agreed with the Applicant's position.</p>
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		<p>Whilst the Applicant has completed a herring potential spawning habitat and Sandeel potential habitat suitability assessment. The Applicant has not followed the recommended MarineSpace (2013a) and (2013b) methodologies.</p> <p>MMO requests that the Applicant revises their habitat suitability assessments by following the MarineSpace (2013a and 2013b) methods and provides 'heat' maps of herring potential spawning habitat, and sandeel potential habitat, for the fish ecology study area as an addendum to the ES and update the conclusion from this information.</p>	<p><b>Red (ongoing point of discussion):</b> This is not agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100[REF MMO32] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The MMO acknowledges that the Applicant provided new heat maps at both Deadline 1 and Deadline 4, respectively. However, the Applicant has not followed the recommended methodologies requested.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted revised habitat suitability heatmaps for sandeel and herring at two key deadlines. Initially, these were submitted at Deadline 1, with further revisions provided at Deadline 4 in response to feedback from the MMO. In a meeting held on June 24, 2024, the MMO and the Applicant discussed an update to commitment C-265. The MMO agreed, in principle, to a modification of the piling ban for herring, contingent on the submission of revised herring heatmaps following the MarineSpace 2013 methodology at Deadline 6.</p>
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		<p>MMO does not consider a SELss of 141 dB re 1 mPa<sup>2</sup>s used for a 44cm captive seabass to be an appropriate or conservative threshold. MMO understands there was no agreement between MMO, Natural England (NE) and the Applicant on a noise threshold or proxy species for black seabream prior to submission of the</p>	<p><b>Red (not agreed – material impact):</b> This is not agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100 [REF MMO33] submitted at deadline</p> <p>The Applicant maintains their position that a threshold of 141 dB SELss is an appropriate disturbance threshold for black seabream.</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
			<p>Application. If the Applicant wants to pursue a noise threshold route the MMO would expect to see more noise modelling based on the 135 dB threshold. However, even if this is provided the MMO is unlikely to agree a threshold approach for black seabream. Further mitigation may be required.</p>	
	<p><b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b></p>		<p>The Applicant has concluded in paragraph 8.9.195 that, as the UWN contours do not directly overlap with the spawning grounds as indicated by the Coull et al. (1998) shapefile, the magnitude of a behavioural impact to spawning herring from UWN is considered to be negligible. Whilst the Coull et al. (1998) spawning maps are valuable for providing an indication of the location of herring spawning grounds based on historic data, it is more appropriate for the Applicant to draw their conclusions from overlap with areas of higher IHLS larval abundance as this is a more recent, direct measure of herring spawning intensity for this region. Further to this, Figures 8.18, 8.19 and 8.21, which present UWN for sequential pinpiling, sequential mono-piling, and simultaneous pin-piling, all indicate that the likely range of impact of TTS in fish is also anticipated to overlap the herring spawning grounds.</p> <p>Update to the conclusion should be made and further discussion on mitigation should take place.</p>	<p><b>Red (ongoing point of discussion):</b> This is not agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100 [REF MMO34] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The Applicant asserts that there will be no population-level effects on spawning herring due to the absence of overlap with the spawning ground. Any overlap of noise contours with the IHLS larval data indicates potential effects on herring larvae, which are less sensitive to underwater noise than adult herring.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to using DBBC throughout the piling campaign as a mitigation measure, which will further reduce the impact ranges of underwater noise on sensitive features like herring.</p> <p>Commitment C-265 has been updated to reflect this mitigation. The mitigated impact ranges, achieved by implementing DBBC throughout the piling campaign, have been presented in relation to the herring spawning grounds and areas of high densities of eggs and larvae. This remains an ongoing point of discussion.</p> <p>In a meeting on June 24, 2024, the MMO and the Applicant discussed updating commitment C-265. The MMO agreed in principle to a change in the piling ban for herring, contingent on the submission of revised herring heat maps following the MarineSpace 2013 methodology at Deadline 6.</p>
	<p><b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b></p>		<p>It is not clear why July has been treated separately within the Applicant's proposed mitigation zoning plan. Black seabream are at their most sensitive when undertaking spawning and guarding their nests, and as a result, the conservation objectives of the Kingmere Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) are of heightened importance during the spawning period. As we have clear evidence that black seabream continues to spawn and maintain their nests into and during July, we must consider that July is part of the spawning period.</p> <p>July should be included in the defined mitigation period for the zoning plan however as above any mitigation must have the correct modelling.</p>	<p><b>Red (not agreed – material impact):</b> This is not agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100 [REF MMO35] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The MMO maintain recommendation of a seasonal piling restriction to limit disturbance to adult spawning and nesting black sea bream during their spawning and nesting period (March to July, inclusive)</p> <p>The Applicant maintains their position, that the proposed mitigation measures in July will ensure no hindrance to the conservation objectives of the Kingmere MCZ.</p>
	<p><b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b></p>		<p>The MMO considers it necessary for a seasonal piling restriction to be implemented in order to prevent disturbance to spawning herring and their eggs and larvae at the Downs spawning ground during the spawning period of 1st November to 31st January (inclusive).</p>	<p><b>Red (ongoing point of discussion):</b> This is not agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100 [REF MMO35] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The MMO and the Applicant discussed the update to commitment C-265, the MMO agreed, in principle, that a change to the piling ban for herring would be required pending the submission of revised herring heat maps in line with the MarineSpace 2013 methodology at Deadline 6.</p>



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
			<p>This restriction may be subject to refinement, providing the additional UWN modelling (135dB) and further discussions on mitigation. However, at this time, the MMO considers that a seasonal piling restriction be implemented.</p>	<p>The Applicant maintains their position, that there will be no population level effects on spawning herring, as there is no overlap with the spawning grounds of piling noise at a level that will disturb spawning adults (185dB SELcum) at the recognised spawning ground and no overlap of noise at injurious levels (210dB SELcum) intersecting areas of high larval abundances. On this basis, there is no requirement for a seasonal restriction on piling at Rampion 2 for the protection of herring.</p> <p>This matter is therefore not agreed to.</p>
	<p><b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b></p>		<p>Pre- and post-construction surveys should be implemented to enhance the baseline data and to validate any predictions made in the ES on nesting habitat recoverability. These surveys should be suitably timed and use appropriate methods.</p> <p>Therefore, MMO recommends that a requirement for pre- and postconstruction monitoring of black bream nesting habitat be included in the DML to ensure that the habitat recovers and continues to support black bream nesting, and that comparisons of nest location and density pre- and post-construction can be made. This should be clearly referred to within conditions 16-18.</p>	<p><b>Red:</b></p> <p>This is not agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100 [REF MMO37] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The pre-and post-construction monitoring to be undertaken has been detailed in the <b>Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan [REP4-055]</b> . As set out in the <b>Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan [REP4-055]</b>, the Applicant has proposed to design the post-construction monitoring and any subsequent years that might be required following the acquisition of pre-construction monitoring data through consultation with the MMO and its advisors.</p> <p>The MMO recognised that there will be underwater noise monitoring at Kingmere MCZ during black seabream breeding season the proposed monitoring of the nesting sites has not been included.</p> <p>As such this matter is not agreed.</p>
	<p><b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b></p>		<p>The MMO agrees that the use of proxy species may be suitable (use of the audiogram for red seabream as a proxy for black seabream in terms of hearing ability), but requires, inter alia, additional evidence for the efficacy of noise abatement measures, further (longer term) evidence for the baseline soundscape at Kingmere MCZ, and seeks clarification on noise spectra.</p> <p>Updates are required to this document.</p>	<p><b>Red (not agreed-material impact):</b> This is not agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100 [REF MMO38a] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The Applicant has also presented the 135dB threshold (as based on a study by Hawkins et al. (2014) for the simultaneous piling scenarios (for multileg and monopile foundations) relative to the Kingmere MCZ, in Figures 5.16 and 5.17 of the <b>In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [REP4-053]</b> at Deadline 4. Note the Applicant does not support the use of the 135dB SELss disturbance threshold.</p> <p>Not agreed – Material Impact</p>
	<p><b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b></p>		<p>The MMO agrees that the general approach and methodology for the underwater noise modelling is appropriate and that the basis for noise assessment on marine receptors has drawn upon the most contemporary and authoritative criteria for marine mammals and fish. However the MMO seeks clarifications on a range of issues relating to noise criteria, propagation loss, and comparability of the data from Rampion 1 data with the proposed Rampion 2 predictions within the Appendix.</p> <p>Updates are required to this document.</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100 [REF MMO31] submitted at deadline</p> <p>The information presented within <b>Appendix 11.3 Underwater noise assessment technical report, Volume 4</b> of the ES [APP-149] is appropriate and adequate, however the Applicant will discuss each issue raised by the MMO in order to progress matters.</p> <p>This matter has now been agreed to.</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		The MMO considers the overall approach to mitigation is somewhat reasonable, however a number of issues still require further discussion. The MMO notes that the basis for the piling mitigation relies on a disturbance threshold of 141dB but that this has not yet been agreed with all Parties. Given the uncertainties regarding behavioural responses and the zoning approach, MMO recommends a conservative approach be taken by the Applicant in relation to underwater noise and recommended noise abatement measures across the entire site rather than zoning. MMO strongly recommends the Applicant commit to using noise abatement technologies which achieve the greatest amount of noise reduction.	<p><b>Red (Ongoing point of discussion):</b> This is not agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100 [REF MMO40] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The Applicant maintained that a threshold of 141 dB SELss is a reasonable precautionary threshold for Black Sea Bream as supported by Kastelein et al. (2017).</p> <p>The <b>In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [REP4-053]</b> set out multiple mitigation measures, this includes commitment C-265 which was updated from the original text:</p> <p>Applicant also presented the 135dB threshold (as based on a study by Hawkins et al. (2014) for the simultaneous piling scenarios (for multileg and monopile foundations) relative to the Kingmere MCZ, in Figures 5.16 and 5.17 of the <b>In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [REP4-053]</b> at Deadline 4. Note the Applicant does not support the use of the 135dB SELss disturbance threshold.</p> <p>MMO welcomes the inclusion of DBBC, but still rejects to zoning plan for Black Sea Bream, and does not support the threshold of 141dB.</p>
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		The MMO supports the seasonal restriction (among other commitments) to ensure Offshore Export Cable Corridor installation activities are undertaken outside the black seabream breeding period (March – July) to avoid any effects from installation works on black seabream nesting within or outside of the Kingmere MCZ (Commitment C- 273).	<p><b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP-100 [REF MMO41] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The MMO agreed with the Applicant's position.</p>
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Agreement of study area and data gathered for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment.  Agreement of assessment methodology.	<p><b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP100 [REF MMO45, MMO46] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The MMO agreed with the Applicant's position.</p>
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		In the Environmental Statement, the sensitivity of all cetaceans to PTS-onset is assessed as Low. In the PEIR, all cetaceans were originally assessed as having a 'Medium' sensitivity to PTS.  Until and unless empirical evidence can shed light on whether this opinion holds water, the precautionary principle will continue to apply. Therefore, cetaceans should be assessed as having a high sensitivity to PTS.	<p><b>Red (not agreed - no material impact):</b> This is not agreed in the final SoCG REP5-100 [REF MMO47] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The sensitivity of marine mammals to Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS) has been thoroughly evaluated in Section 3 of Appendix 11.2: Marine Mammal Quantitative Underwater Noise Impact Assessment, found in Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement (ES). As detailed in the Appendix, expert opinion, based on the most reliable evidence (refer to Booth &amp; Heinis 2018), suggests that PTS resulting from piling is unlikely to have a significant impact on the survival and reproductive capabilities of individual marine mammals. This assessment contradicts a high sensitivity score..</p>
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)	Mid Sussex District Council	The habitats to be created at the existing National Grid Bolney substation extension include the planting of additional trees and this element of the proposals should be subject to agreement/consultation with the District Council at the appropriate time.	<p><b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-092 [REF MSDC09] submitted at deadline 5.</p> <p>MSDC were happy with the Applicant's position.</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Consideration should be given to the inclusion of ecological enhancements (such as the new bat boxes at Oakendene substation) within the Terrestrial Ecology Design Principles for the substation extension.	<b>Green</b> : This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-092 [REF MSDC10] submitted at deadline 5.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)	Natural England	<p>Natural England has major concerns regarding the feasibility of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) and therefore its likely effectiveness in mitigating impacts.</p> <p>Geotechnical information needs to be provided to understand the feasibility and effectiveness of this approach.</p>	<p><b>Red:</b> Material impact – see the final SoCG, row [REF NE2] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The potential risks of HDD have been considered by the relevant chapters of the ES and are assessed as Low. The approach to minimising and effectively managing the risks of trenchless crossings is outlined in the Outline Construction Method Statement [APP-255] and the Outline Code of Construction Practice [PEPD-033]. Evidence has been provided by the way of case studies for crossing similar geological and environmental sensitivities. The Applicant has presented a range of relevant entries in the Commitments Register [APP-254] and has submitted responses on risk mitigation techniques into the Examination.</p> <p>Natural England stated that this matter would not be resolved on the grounds that the Applicant has confirmed that it will not conduct geophysical site investigation of ground conditions prior to DCO consent, and therefore needs to be shown as a disagreement.</p>
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		<p>Natural England request that the Applicant completes draft protected species licence applications.</p> <p>Natural England has highlighted that there will remain a residual risk around protected species licensing for those species where draft licence applications have not been made. It is acknowledged that this risk applies across different development projects due to the mobile nature of the species under discussion and the time between consenting and construction.</p> <p>Natural England note that pre-construction surveys for protected species are secured via commitment and the results will be used to inform detailed design and the implementation of the mitigation hierarchy (also secured via commitment).</p>	<b>Green:</b> The Applicant has agreed to submit draft protected species licence applications and has justified why it is doing so for some and not others. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE2]
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		<p>For discussions relating to Benthic, Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology there are agreements on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment study area.</li> <li>• data sources gathered for baseline considered acceptable for assessment.</li> <li>• Assessment approach/methodology.</li> </ul>	<b>Green:</b> The Applicant welcomes Natural England’s agreement of the assessment approach/methodology. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE26, NE27 and NE28]
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Habitats of Principal Importance (including but not limited to <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> , chalk, and peat and clay exposures), Annex I habitats (stony reef, bedrock reef) and black seabream nests could be affected. It is currently unclear whether the proposed mitigation will be effective.	<b>Red:</b> The Applicant considers that it has adopted an appropriate approach to minimising potential impacts to priority habitats and species in the intertidal and subtidal environment, with avoidance through informed design / micrositing and, where avoidance is not possible, minimisation of impacts through mitigation as set out within the In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [REP1-012]. The Applicant has based its assessment of cable burial potential on current data, which is considered appropriate

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
			<p>We advise that geotechnical information is collected to inform a Cable Burial Risk Assessment and is submitted into the Examination.</p> <p>Comprehensive pre-construction surveys will also need to be agreed with Natural England to inform mitigation proposals.</p>	<p>at this pre-consent stage; a full Cable Burial Risk Assessment based on the results of the pre-construction surveys (in accordance with Schedule 12, Condition 16 of the draft Development Consent Order <b>[PEPD-009]</b>) will be undertaken when the final cable design parameters are determined post-consent.</p> <p>Natural England advise that all of these habitat features will need to be listed in the final Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan. Natural England also advise that the Cable Burial Risk Assessment currently is not fit for purpose and will need significant updates following any post consent geotechnical surveys. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row <b>[REF NE29]</b></p>
	<b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b>		For Fish and Shellfish Ecology Agreement of study area and data gathered for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment.	<p><b>Green: Agreed</b></p> <p>NE noted that it would defer to MMO/Cefas on whether additional surveys were required to define the baseline for fish and shellfish ecology; Cefas confirmed agreement that adequate information had been provided for the baseline characterisation, and that additional beam and otter trawls were not necessary. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row <b>[REF NE30]</b></p>
	<b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b>		Conducting Drop Down Video surveys outside of the bream nesting season means that the survey outcomes will be limited to confirming only the presence of potential remnant nests and cannot be relied upon to determine the presence or absence of bream nesting. NE will therefore not be in a position to agree with any conclusions on absence or extent of nesting black bream based on surveys undertaken between July and August, which will be based on a lack of visible active nests.	<p><b>Red:</b> The assessment presented provides an appropriate baseline for the purposes of EIA. Any information gaps associated with the timing of the baseline survey with respect to bream nesting locations will be addressed through collection of pre-construction survey data to inform nesting areas and the consequent mitigation plan measures associated with offshore cable route design, as noted below.</p> <p>To address the potential variability in bream nest locations, the Applicant has committed to the mapping of principal densities and aggregations of black bream nesting through pre-construction survey, as set out within the Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan <b>[APP-240]</b>. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row <b>[REF NE31]</b></p>
	<b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b>		<p>Natural England does not agree with that there will be no significant risk of hindering the achievement of the conservation objectives in relation to Beachy Head West MCZ (TTS and behavioural impacts due to piling).</p> <p>Further evidence is required on the modelling impacts and the efficacy of noise abatement measures.</p>	<p><b>Red:</b> The Applicant is undertaking additional work to provide evidence for the efficacy of the noise abatement measures and this will be submitted to the Examination in due course. In addition, the Applicant has conducted an additional background underwater noise survey to provide further evidence on the adequacy of the mitigation measures proposed, this was submitted to the Examination by the procedural deadline of 16th January 2024.</p> <p>Disagreement remains regarding these remaining MCZs. Natural England continue to advise that behavioural impacts remain and disagree with the threshold put forward by the Applicant. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row <b>[REF NE32]</b></p>
	<b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b>		WCS for underwater noise modelling: NE does not agree that the points chosen to model the worst case scenario are necessarily the WCS., particularly the point to the west closest to Selsey Bill and the Hounds MCZ.	<p><b>Green:</b> The Applicant has set out the mitigated and unmitigated underwater noise behavioural impact contours relative to the Selsey Bill and the Hounds MCZ from the location closest to the MCZ on the western boundary of the Rampion 2 Order Limits. These were provided in Appendix A of <b>Applicant's Responses to Deadline 5 Submissions, Natural England Appendix E5 Fish and Shellfish (Document reference 8.98)</b>. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row <b>[REF NE33]</b></p>



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		WCS for underwater noise modelling : NE does not agree that the points chosen to model the worst case scenario are necessarily the WCS. The issue remains unresolved for Kingmere MCZ..	<b>Red:</b> This remains unresolved for Kingmere MCZ. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE33a]
			Black seabream ( <i>Spondylisoma cantharus</i> ) in Kingmere Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) - impacts of piling on underwater noise levels.	<b>Red:</b> NE does not agree with that there will be no significant risk of hindering the achievement of the conservation objectives of Kingmere MCZ due to TTS and behavioural impacts due to piling noise.  Piling activities from 1st March to 31st July inclusive have the potential to hinder the conservation objectives of Kingmere MCZ for black seabream, and therefore a full seasonal restriction is needed. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE34]
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		MEEB for Black Bream in the Kingmere MCZ	<b>Red:</b> The Applicant held a meeting with NE on the 28/06/2024 to discuss underwater noise issues and MEEB and the Without Prejudice Measures of Equivalent Environment Benefit (MEEB) Review for Kingmere Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) [REP4]078] has been updated for Deadline 6.))This issue remains unresolved, as NE are unable to advise that the information presented in the MEEB plan is sufficient. We continue to advise the only way to ensure the conservation objectives of the Kingmere MCZ are not hindered is to adhere to a full piling restriction of 1st March to 31st July inclusive. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE35]
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Black seabream as a feature of Kingmere MCZ, Natural England does not support a behavioural threshold being derived for black seabream from studies using proxy species or research using playback sound or based on captive fish (rather than in the wild).  Natural England does not agree with the use of the thresholds proposed by Rampion 2 for black seabream disturbance.	<b>Red:</b> The Applicant has submitted disturbance impact ranges as defined using the 135dB threshold (the use of which the Applicant does not support), in the <b>In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [REP4-053]</b> . See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE36]
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Noise mitigation techniques	The Applicant held a meeting with NE on the 28/07/2024 to discuss underwater noise issues. NE still had concerns on the efficacy of the mitigation measures proposed and provided further advice at Deadline 5.  NE continue to advise that their advice of Deadline 5 stands and that it is imperative that trialling of DBBC outside of sensitive period is essential. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE37]
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		The agreement of study area and data gathered for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment and agreement of assessment methodology for Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology	<b>Green:</b> All matters have been agreed. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE58 and NE59]

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Ornithology - Great Black-Backed Gull – monitoring and mitigation	<b>Red:</b> The Applicant maintains that a significant effect at EIA level, is not predicted to occur. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE60]
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Ornithology - study area and data gathered for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment.	<b>Red:</b> The Applicant maintains that a significant effect at EIA level, is not predicted to occur. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE61]
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)	South National Authority Downs Park	Significant concern that the conclusion ‘no significant effects have been identified on terrestrial ecology features’ is based on insufficient survey data, ecological assessment and mitigation proposals. SDNPA therefore disagree with this conclusion.	<b>Red:</b> This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA34] submitted at deadline 6.  Insufficient terrestrial ecology data and ecological assessment methodology is only retained as a point of disagreement by the SDNPA. The Applicant has concluded discussions with Arun District Council, Horsham District Council and West Sussex County Council where the scope and scale of the field surveys is considered to be appropriate for informing the assessment. The Applicant is awaiting letters of no impediment for water vole and hazel dormouse following the submission of draft licence applications to Natural England.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Insufficient evidence has been provided to support the conclusion of no likely significant impact of HDD drilling on chalk streams and chalk grassland habitats, as well as the impact on users of the public rights of way network and open access land.	<b>Red:</b> This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA34] submitted at deadline 6. HDD is a mitigation that has been used routinely for linear projects (electrical transmission cables and pipelines (e.g., gas, oil and water) for both large infrastructure and smaller scale applications. HDD has been used frequently to cross a range of sensitive ecological features including designated sites, ancient woodland, rivers and other priority habitats. For example, an HDD crossing of 550m through chalk substrate, with a sizeable change in elevation (80 to 90m difference) was successfully completed at Dunstable Downs on the Kensworth to Rugby Pipeline project for CEMEX in 2008 (including crossing part of Dunstable and Whipsnade Downs SSSI). It is also notable that HDD within chalk substrate was carried out successfully on the route of the transmission cable for the Rampion 1 OWF. The approach to minimising and effectively managing the risks of trenchless crossings is outlined in the Outline Construction Method Statement [APP-255] and the Outline Code of Construction Practice [APP-224].  An extensive response has been provided to SDPNA and SDNPA have confirmed this cannot be agreed to.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Insufficient evidence provided to demonstrate 25 metre stand-off & HDD 6 metres underneath ancient woodland ground level will not cause the loss or deterioration of this irreplaceable habitat by damaging roots, damaging or compacting soils, increasing levels of air and light pollution, noise and vibration, changing the water table or drainage, damaging functional habitat connections or affecting the function of the woodland edge. Insufficient evidence is provided to support the conclusion of low frac-out risk.	<b>Red:</b> This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA36] submitted at deadline 6. The 6m rooting depth is based on Forestry Commission (2005) ‘ <i>The influence of soils and species on tree root depth</i> ’. This states that it is uncommon for roots to penetrate more than 2m and 80-90% of roots are found within the top 60cm of the soil profile. It goes on to state that 90 –99% of a tree’s total root length is within the upper 1m of soil, and that data from wind throws in the October 1987 storm showed no trees with roots below 3m and only 5% had rooting depths greater than 2m. Therefore, the 6m minimum drill depth was chosen to comfortably avoid contact with roots and allow at least 2 to 4m of soil between the roots and path of the drill. The Forestry Commission were directly consulted on this proposed measure and did not object to it during a bilateral meeting with the Applicant.



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
				<p>The 25m stand-off is in excess on UK Government guidance on ancient woodland (Natural England and Forestry Commission, 2022) which recommends a minimum buffer of 15m. The additional 10m was added to ensure indirect effects such as run-off and disturbance (noise and light) could be managed. Individual commitments are in place to manage dust, noise, pollutants and light (commitments C-24, C-26, C-76, and C-105 in the Commitments Register [APP-254]). The Applicant considers this a sufficient, and precautionary, distance from ancient woodland in light of the range of commitments to be imposed. It is also worth noting that launch / retrieval of the drill on all crossings where ancient woodland or veteran trees are present occur within agricultural fields and therefore compaction and direct effects on a woodland edge ecotone will not occur.</p> <p>SDNPA have confirmed this cannot be agreed to</p>
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Lack of consideration of effects on Dark Skies in assessment of landscape and visual impact and on sensitive ecological features. Trenchless crossings are in the most vulnerable ecological locations by definition (excepting roads) and are located within a dark skies landscape. As HDD areas will be lit at night during active drilling operations, it is critical that artificial light spill and glare is avoided around sensitive features (woodland/scrub/boundary vegetation/hedges/treelines). A standard construction lighting approach set out in the OCCP is not sufficient.	<p><b>Green:</b> Effects of lighting are considered in Appendix 18.2 Viewpoint Analysis, Volume 4 of the ES [REP4-033] and Appendix 18.4 Visual Assessment, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-170].</p> <p>Assessment takes a 'worst case' approach to the visibility of lights, as described in the project description, with the assumption that if the landfall site and / or HDD compounds are visible any associated lighting will also be visible regardless of mitigation. The detailed lighting assessment of each HDD location is not feasible at this stage of the project. SDNPA have now agreed to this as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA38] submitted at deadline 6.</p>
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)	Sussex Fisheries Conservation Authority	<p>Inshore and</p> <p>Agreement of study area and data gathered for the baseline is considered acceptable for assessment.</p> <p>No further site-specific fish and shellfish surveys studies required now as consensus has been reached and Sussex IFCA defer to other statutory authorities.</p> <p>Seabass have now been included in the UWN assessment in the Fish and Shellfish ecology ES chapter.</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-105 [REF SIFCA01] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>Agreement has been reached on all these topics.</p>
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		There is a high level of uncertainty regarding the proposed development, due to the extended use of the Rochdale Envelope. This makes it challenging to pass meaningful comments on mitigation measures for installation techniques. Therefore, there is little certainty of the actual environmental impacts of the project and how the developer will mitigate these impacts. Chapter 8: Fish and Shellfish Ecology Through the ETG process, Sussex IFCA stressed that site-specific fish and shellfish surveys were considered more appropriate than solely relying on desk-based studies to inform the baseline assessment. Sussex	<p><b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-105 [REF SIFCA08] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The assessment of the maximum design scenario (MDS) for each receptor establishes the maximum potential adverse impact and as a result impacts of greater adverse significance would not arise should any other development scenario (as described in: <b>Chapter 4; The Proposed Development [APP-045]</b>) to that assessed be taken forward in the final scheme design. Appropriate mitigation has been designed for significant effects identified as potentially arising from the assessment of the MDS, which are secured within relevant parts of the DCO.</p> <p>This was confirmed as agreed to at Page Turn Meeting (02/07/24)</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
			<p>IFCA remain concerned about the lack of up-to-date site-based survey data and the age of the baseline datasets utilised.</p>	
	<b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b>		<p>Sussex IFCA have had serious concerns regarding the likelihood of significant impacts to black seabream during the construction, operation, and maintenance of Rampion 2. The proposed mitigation from sedimentation and noise generation has alleviated some of these concerns however, pre-construction site-specific surveys are needed to inform micro-siting of all elements of construction to minimise the environmental impact. The Authority would also welcome clarity around how the Applicant will be held accountable on any commitments made at this stage in the process.</p> <p>The Authority has concerns about the impact of underwater noise in relation to disturbance of black seabream and would like to see a commitment to noise abatement technology during the nesting season. The threshold for disturbance of breeding black seabream is unknown, therefore we suggest a baseline of background noise occurring during a successful nesting season is used to inform a suitable target for noise abatement mitigation to achieve.</p>	<p><b>Red:</b> This was not agreed to in the final SoCG REP5-105 [REF SIFCA05] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The Applicant did seek to reassure SxIFCA that multiple measures to mitigate against significant impacts to black seabream have been proposed during the nesting period. The Applicant committed to the use of DBBC throughout the piling campaign (C-265). Additional work was undertaken to provide a comparison of the environmental conditions at the Proposed Development with other projects where Noise Abatement Systems (NAS) have been deployed. The outputs of this work were detailed in <b>Information to support efficacy of noise mitigation / abatement techniques with respect to site conditions at Rampion 2 Offshore Windfarm</b> [REP4-067]. These outputs of this work were used to inform the mitigation measures detailed in the <b>In Principle Sensitive Features Mitigation Plan [REP4-053]</b>. The report was produced by the Institute of Technical and Applied Physics who have considerable experience monitoring noise abatement measures in Germany, which had a defined limit value for impulsive underwater noise since 2011.</p> <p>However this was not deemed sufficient by SxIFCA and the matter was not agreed.</p>
	<b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b>		<p>The impacts from underwater noise to herring is still a serious concern to Sussex IFCA. Herring are deemed highly sensitive, due to a combination of their restricted habitat requirements (they spawn directly onto the seabed) and their sensitivity to underwater sound over large distances. The Authority recommends a seasonal piling restriction to limit disturbance to spawning populations during the spawning season (November-January) or methods such as bubble curtains.</p> <p>The Authority welcomes the opportunity to submit further comments during the examination of the application and wishes to support RWE in determining the scope of the conditional mitigation, the temporal and spatial restrictions together with monitoring requirements of the marine licence. It is important that developments like Rampion 2 should not compromise the Sussex IFCA's ability to maintain and promote sustainable fisheries and protection of the marine environment within the region.</p>	<p><b>Amber:</b> SxIFCA has decided to align its stance with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO). In a meeting held on 24/06/24, the MMO and the Applicant discussed an update to commitment C-265. The MMO agreed, in principle, that a modification to the herring piling ban would be necessary. This change is contingent upon the submission of updated herring heat maps, which should adhere to the MarineSpace 2013 methodology, by Deadline 6. This is an ongoing point of discussion.</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)	West Sussex County Council	Ecological impacts of temporary habitat loss and inherent risk of poor reinstatement (failure with tree planting, hedgerow 'notching' and other habitat restoration) are greater than assumed.	<b>Green:</b> This agreed in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC34] submitted at deadline 6.  Following written feedback and discussions with WSCC the Applicant has added further detail, clarification and certainty to the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [APP-232] and the Outline Code of Construction Practice and <b>Annex B</b> (Arboricultural Impact Plan) of the <b>Appendix 22.16: Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES [APP-194] during the course of the examination. This has enabled agreement.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Through being delivered off-site, and by a third party, there are concerns that BNG will not achieve the intended nature conservation benefits, and in the expected timeframe.	<b>Green:</b> This agreed in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC35] submitted at deadline 6.  The Applicant has agreed to WSCC's request that Section 5.4 (Securing BNG) of the <b>Appendix 22.15: Biodiversity Gain Information, Volume 4</b> of the ES [APP-193] is amended to include further details of the Stage Specific BNG Strategies (using text from the Applicant's Responses to ExAQ2 Table 2-6 Ref. BNG 2.4 [REP5-119]). Together with recent updates to the BNG Information document at Deadline 5, and the revised wording of Requirement 14 put forward by the Applicant at Deadline 5, WSCC is now content for this matter to move to agreed.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Advance habitat creation, to be implemented before and during the early stages of construction.	<b>Green:</b> This agreed in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC36] submitted at deadline 6.  The Applicant's revisions of <b>Appendix 22.15: Biodiversity Gain Information, Volume 4</b> of the ES [APP-193] submitted at Deadline 5 and the revised wording of Requirement 14 put forward by the Applicant at Deadline 5, have enabled WSCC to agree this matter.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		There is insufficient detail in the OLEMP regarding advance planting, habitat reinstatement, planting specifications and programme, and maintenance and monitoring specifications.	<b>Green:</b> This agreed in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC37] submitted at deadline 6.  The Applicant updated the OLEMP at Deadline 5 addressing the remaining concerns raised at WSCC's Deadline 4 submission [REP4-086]. This matter is therefore agreed.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Unknown impact/reasoning on arboricultural features.	<b>Green:</b> This agreed in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC38] submitted at deadline 6.  <b>Annex B</b> (Arboricultural Impact Plan) of the <b>Appendix 22.16: Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Volume 4</b> of the ES [APP-194] was updated at <b>Deadline 4 [REP4-037]</b> to identify temporary and permanent access points and further updated at Deadline 5 to improve the clarity of the document. The Applicant has responded to feedback provided by WSCC on the AIA, further questions were answered by the Applicant through the

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
				course of the Examination and meetings on the SOCG resolved all outstanding issues related to this matter.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Loss of significant arboricultural features.	<b>Green:</b> This agreed in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC39] submitted at deadline 6.  At deadline 5 it was agreed that - the Applicant has demonstrated the calculation losses to the satisfaction of WSCC.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Loss of potential woodland within the County.	<b>Green:</b> all impacts on land allocated to large scale woodland planting has been assessed. It is noted that losses to newly planted woodland to the east of Kent Street (planted following application) has been minimised by the extension of an existing trenchless crossing. This is a new design amendment was introduced at Deadline 5.  WSCC reflected on the proposed design change and the significantly reduced scale of the woodland plantation within land east of Kent Street (funded by The Queen's Green Canopy and planted in memory of the late Queen Elizabeth II) and agreed on the position.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Removal or damage caused to hedgerows including those determined as 'important'.	<b>Green:</b> This agreed in the final SoCG REP5-094[REF WSCC41] submitted at deadline 6.  The Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [REP5-125] provides a clear schedule of hedgerows considered under the definition of Important by the Applicant. The Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerows Plan [APP-013] shows important hedgerows that are identified in Chapter 22: Terrestrial Ecology and Nature Conservation, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-063] and Chapter 25 Historic Environment, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-066]. This has led to some confusion as a consolidated list of important hedgerows was not provided in a single location. The Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerows Plan and Outline Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [REP5-125] have also been reviewed and a small number of discrepancies identified. These have been corrected.
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Unsuitable methods of notching. Negligent aftercare and commitment to care requirements during movement of hedgerows. Unknow suitability of method for the hedgerows proposed for this technique.	<b>Green:</b> This agreed in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC42] submitted at deadline 6.  Agreed based on the additional information regarding translocated hedgerows within the OLEMP [REP5-072];
	Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)		Essential planting rates stated not being secured as a requirement within the DCO.  Further Comments: WSCC generally support the tree protection measures and essential replacement planting strategy set out within the environmental mitigation section of the arboricultural impact	<b>Green:</b> The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [APP-232] has been amended to incorporate the replacement planting rates stated within the AIA and better define a planting strategy. The Applicant welcomed that WSCC noted their support the tree planting methodology itself in a bilateral meeting on 13.12.23.



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
			assessment (AIA). Stage-specific landscape and ecological management plans (LEMP) will require the delivery of arboricultural method statements, tree protection plans and landscaping plans; however, WSCC request the outline landscape and ecological management plan and outline code of construction practice are amended to secure the delivery of the LEMP (and relevant contents mentioned above) in accordance with the submitted AIA.	
	<b>Ecology (Offshore and Onshore)</b>		Enhancement of existing features were expected as mitigation.	<p><b>Green:</b> This agreed in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC44] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>WSCC have agreed the position based on the following reasoning:</p> <p>WSCC acknowledges that the principal enhancement for trees and hedgerows across the Project will derive from planting as proposed within the BNG Information, the provision to allow small scale local enhancements within the oLEMP (outside of the BNG delivery) has also been recognised. In addition, the S106 funding relating to trees and hedgerows (which has been agreed in principle with both parties) will contribute towards the enhancement of affected trees and hedgerows near or within highways and rights of ways.</p>
7	<b>Historic Environment</b>	<b>West Sussex County Council</b>	The level of effect upon the settings of above-ground heritage assets particularly, but not limited to the setting of Oakendene Manor.	<p><b>Red</b> This is a non-material disagreement in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC59] submitted at deadline 5.</p> <p>It should be noted that the additional viewpoint photography sought by WSCC was provided by the Applicant, and enabled WSCC to agree with the Applicant's assessment of medium magnitude of change resulting in less than substantial harm.</p> <p>Therefore the Applicant's assessment is endorsed by both WSCC and the local planning authority, Horsham District Council.</p>
	<b>Historic Environment</b>		Lack of archaeological field evaluation.	<p><b>Green:</b> This agreed for much of the onshore works area in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC56] and a non-material disagreement for areas of high archaeological potential [WSCC 57] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The Applicant has drafted and agreed amendments to Commitment C-225, Requirement 19 and the OOWSI with WSCC. Following the updates to these at Deadline 5, WSCC was satisfied with the scope and methodology of mitigation measures set out within the OOWSI. Concerns remained over the lack of field evaluation, especially in areas which where only subject to geophysical survey at the post-submission stage, and where anomalies indicative of significant archaeological features have been identified. Nevertheless, the mitigation measures set out within the OOWSI was deemed to be sufficient to avoid harm or to reduce it to acceptable levels.</p>
	<b>Historic Environment</b>		WSCC has a significant concern about option LACR-01d taken forward by the Applicant. The archaeological	<p><b>Red:</b> This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC55] submitted at deadline 6</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
			sensitivity of this section of the route is exceptionally high.	<p>WSCC recognised the Applicant's efforts to avoid or minimise harm to nationally significant heritage assets.</p> <p>The agreed amendments to C-225 and dDCO Requirement 19 (to be submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 6), as well as updates to the OOWSI (see WSCC61) resulted in a meaningful reduction in the magnitude of risk to nationally significant heritage. This is because its preservation in situ will be secured where appropriate and proportionate by the relevant commitments and control documents.</p> <p>Nevertheless, WSCC deemed that the Project still carried a risk of harm to nationally significant heritage assets within this area, in the event that they are assessed as not suitable for preservation in situ, or that the range of design and engineering solutions proposed by the Applicant may not be feasible. WSCC therefore believes that a degree of risk and harm therefore remained.</p> <p>Therefore the matter was not agreed to</p>
	<b>Historic Environment</b>	<b>Mid Sussex District Council</b>	The proposed extension to the existing substation will have a degree of less than substantial harm in respect of the special interest of identified heritage assets. Consideration should be given to further planting around the site to mitigate any negative impact on views from the PROW to the east, and Bob Lane to the south.	<b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-092 [REF MSDC05] submitted at deadline 5. Mid Sussex District Council stated that they agreed with that interpretation of the Applicant's position.
	<b>Historic Environment</b>		Mid Sussex District Council consider that the site of the proposed substation extension has some limited positive contribution to the setting of each of these heritage assets (Twineham Court Farmhouse and Coombe House). As such it is considered that the height of the Bolney substation extension will have an impact on the currently positive contribution this part of the site makes to the setting of these heritage assets.	<b>Red:</b> This is a non-material disagreement in the final SoCG REP5-092 [REF MSDC06] submitted at deadline 5. The Applicant has assessed that the proposed works would not be visible from either heritage asset, with a low level impact to the setting of Twineham Court Farmhouse and impacts on Coombe House were scoped out of assessment. It is agreed that screening provided for in the LEMP would mitigate impacts.
	<b>Historic Environment</b>	<b>South National Authority Downs Park</b>	The risk to areas of known highly significant archaeology have not been appropriately weighted, investigated and assessed through the selection process for the cable corridor or the final assessment of the proposed development.	<b>Red:</b> This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA40] submitted at deadline 6. The Applicant consider that the Historic Environment assessment is in accordance with policy and sufficient for informed decision making. The assessment presented in <b>Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2 of the ES [REP4-024]</b> is based on a worst-case scenario. The Applicant considers that further investigation would not change the outcome of the assessment. The onshore cable route selection process took into consideration the potential for archaeological remains of high heritage significance to be present across all alternative routes, as evidenced by available baseline data and reflected in the archaeological notification areas. This was balanced against other criteria as described in <b>Chapter 3 Alternatives, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-044]</b> .
	<b>Historic Environment</b>		Lack of consideration of historic landscape character in assessment. Likely missing effects cannot be considered to inform appropriate mitigation strategy.	<b>Red :</b> This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA41] submitted at deadline 6. The Applicant notes that the assessment considers that where there is a particular, Historic Landscape Character (HLC), key characteristic, or element / feature, this is



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
				<p>included within the LCA assessment. The HLC is part of the data / key characteristics that make up the overall LCA unit, which is then assessed.</p> <p>Reference to the baseline historic landscape character is made in relation to each LCA, as indicated in Tables 18.18-20 of Chapter 18: Landscape and Visual impact, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-059].</p> <p>HLC is identified as a historic environment receptor and assessed within <b>Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2</b> of the ES [REP4-024] (updated at deadline 4).</p> <p>The Commitment Register [REP4-057] addresses historic landscape which is included as part of the SDNP SQ in Commitment 66 and generally across the scheme in commitment C-81.</p>
	<b>Historic Environment</b>	<b>Historic England</b>	Inadequate onshore archaeological baseline assessment and evaluation.	<p><b>Green</b> : This is now agreed as shown in the final SoCG submitted at Deadline 6 [REF HE01].</p> <p>The Applicant consider that the Historic Environment assessment is in accordance with policy and sufficient for informed decision making. The assessment presented in <b>Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2 of the ES [REP4-024]</b> is based on a worst-case scenario. The Applicant considers that further investigation would not change the outcome of the assessment.</p> <p>While HE do not agree, they consider that the Commitment register and Onshore OWSI identify the steps to be taken in addressing this post determination. More detailed SSWSI will also enable more detailed review of individual areas and sites. Consequently, the overall position is agreed.</p>
	<b>Historic Environment</b>		Inaccurate assessment of magnitude of impact and significance of effect.	<p><b>Red:</b> This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG [REF HE02] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement Chapter 25: Historic environment, Volume 2 [APP-066] provides an assessment of effects in the absence of further mitigation. An agreed scheme of archaeological investigation, recording and dissemination, following any mitigation by detailed design, would still result in loss or truncation of archaeological remains but the archaeological interest would be preserved by record before the loss occurs.</p>
	<b>Historic Environment</b>	<b>Arun District Council</b>	The impact on Listed buildings at No's 45-47 South Terrace, locally listed buildings at 4, 8-95 South Terrace & 16 Granville Road and South Terrace Area of Character.	<p><b>Green:</b> This agreed in the final SoCG REP5-090 [REF ADC24] submitted at deadline 5.</p> <p>Applicant addressed these concerns in Deadline 2 response in Applicant's response to Arun District Council's Deadline 1 Submissions [REP2-021].</p> <p>The Applicant provided a response at deadline 4 to ADC's reply to the ExA written questions submitted at deadline 3 [REP3-067].</p> <p>ADC officer agreed following the provision of the additional information</p>
<b>8</b>	<b>Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects</b>	<b>South National Authority Downs Park</b>	Significant concern that the geographic extent of effects on landscape character is underestimated and therefore effects are downplayed.	<p><b>Red:</b> This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA14] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The Applicant does not agree that the geographic extent of effects on landscape character has been underestimated.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced a number of additional viewpoint illustrations at the request of SDNPA and other consultees. None challenge the geographical extent of significant</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
				<p>landscape / visual effects previously assessed and they do not provide evidence of 'under-assessment'.</p> <p>Not Agreed- Material Impact</p>
	<b>Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects</b>		Limited consideration of perceptual qualities in assessment. This is likely to have resulted in missing effects and therefore has not sufficiently informed an appropriate mitigation strategy.	<p><b>Red</b> – This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA15] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The Applicant has carried out further assessment by way of an additional technical note providing further assessment on the special qualities of the SDNP submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-024] and this has been updated at Deadline 4 [REP4-064]. The LVIA has been updated also to ensure a consistent assessment. The scope and methodology have been drawn from consultee requests for further assessment and provide a proportionate and reasonable approach to this assessment that accords with GLVIA3. Whilst SDNPA may not agree with the conclusions the completion of this item should prompt the status of this point of discussion to be changed to 'Green' and 'Agreed'.</p> <p>SDNPA have disagreed and the point of discussion is not Agreed to</p> <p>Not Agreed- Material Impact</p>
	<b>Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects</b>		Significant concerns over assessment of construction effects, which are assessed as 'negligible to zero' on South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Area (LCA) I3 Arun to Adur Scarp Down. It is difficult to see how this conclusion has been reached given the construction immediately abuts this LCA above and below scarp, as well as going under. Scarp area is open access land.	<p><b>Red:</b> The construction effects on this LCA have been assessed as "Negligible to Zero" in Appendix 18.3: Landscape Assessment, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-169]. This is mainly because the project description defines that this section of the onshore cable corridor will be underground during the construction due to the use of trenchless crossing techniques. Therefore, there can be no direct significant effect on this LCA. It is therefore not agreed that Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impacts, Volume 2 [APP-059] / Commitment Register [APP-254] needs amendment in respect of these areas.</p> <p>Not Agreed – No Material Impact</p>
	<b>Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects</b>		It is not clear how views have been selected and assessed in respect of the effect on landscape character, including tranquillity.	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA20] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The viewpoint selection process is set out on pages 78-79 of Chapter 18: Landscape and visual impacts, Volume 2 [APP-059].</p> <p>SDNPA have agreed to this based on Deadline 5 Submission</p>
	<b>Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects</b>		<p>At the Third Statutory Consultation Exercise (Further Supplementary Information Report – 2023) the SDNPA advised micro-siting of viewpoints be undertaken in consultation with Stakeholders.</p> <p>This has not taken place and viewpoint locations have not been agreed.</p>	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA21] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>Following the ongoing discussion and the submission of the additional and amended viewpoints, SDNPA agree clarity has been provided and the correct viewpoint locations have been confirmed</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		Sequential testing viewpoints do not adequately reflect the continuous views as a visual receptor moves along the South Downs Way available that will be affected by the proposals. The SDNPA therefore considered the impacts on receptors have been underestimated.	<p><b>Red</b> : This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REFSDNPA24] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The use of sequential viewpoints along the South Downs Way to support and illustrate the LVIA was set out at PEIR and Scoping and was not disputed. Use of kinetic viewpoints was not raised during consultation. The Applicant does not accept that the visual effects on views from the South Downs Way as experienced by people on this route is underestimated. The assessment has been based on a combination of desk and site-based assessment. It is therefore not agreed that additional kinetic viewpoints are needed or that the LVIA presented in Chapter 18: Landscape and Visual Impact, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-059] or the Commitment Register [APP-254] needs amendment.</p> <p>Not agreed – Material Impact</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		Significant concerns over likely success of proposed hedge notching. The examples cited for use of the technique in the Lake District and Norfolk Broads are not likely to have encountered the challenges of dry, free draining chalk soils. No proven testing undertaken to evidence proposals. If this would not work, the landscape, ecological and visual impact would be significant. Clarity required to explain why 6m width notching technique cannot be used for all hedges regardless of importance.	<p><b>Red</b>: This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA27] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The Proposed Development differs from many projects in that the Applicant has sought to minimise extent of the gap in hedgerows by considering what is feasible and proportionate for each individual hedgerow crossing. In response to Relevant Representations the text for C-115 has been amended to ensure it is easier to understand. Detail has been added to OLEMP[ REP4-047] concerning monitoring and remedial action to be taken regarding newly planted or translocated vegetation.</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		Despite significant Proposed Whole Development Effects being identified in section 18.2, these appear to be omitted in Chapter 18, therefore we disagree with the conclusions in terms of the effect of the proposed development, both during construction and once operational.	<p><b>Red</b>: This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA26] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that ‘Whole Project’ effects are identified and assessed in Appendix 18.2: Viewpoint Analysis, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-168] and they are also assessed in relation to the onshore cable in Appendices 18.3: Landscape Assessment, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-169] and 18.4: Visual Assessment, Volume 4 of the ES [APP-170]. Chapter 18: Landscape and Visual Impact, Volume 2 of the ES [APP-059] refers to ‘Whole Project’ effects in respect of the Oakendene Substation and the Existing National Grid Bolney Substation Extension and provides a summary in relation to the onshore cable in paragraphs 18.11.31, 41, and 59. The ‘Whole Project’ effects combine the SLVIA and LVIA and the onshore elements are mitigated. Further mitigation and compensation measures are not considered by the Applicant to be necessary in respect of onshore, although as noted in response to SDA-03, the Applicant will continue to engage with SDNPA on this matter and discuss options for compensatory measures.</p> <p>SDNPA have not agreed to this.</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		The SDNPA considers the impact of the onshore export cable on the National Park to be unacceptable without sufficient mitigation and compensation secured through the dDCO and an S106 Agreement.	<p><b>Green</b>: This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA05] submitted at deadline 6. The S106 agreement has been accepted.</p> <p>Nonetheless – note that the SOCG also records the disagreement (<b>Red</b>) where the SDNPA maintains disagreement on various aspects of the LVIA assessment scope and methodology and the EIA outcomes in SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA05].</p>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		The SDNPA considers the impact of the wind turbine array on the National Park to be unacceptable without sufficient mitigation and compensation secured through the dDCO and an S106 Agreement..	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA05] submitted at deadline 6.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider it necessary to and is not able to reduce the array size further.</p> <p>Nonetheless – note that the SOCG also records the disagreement (<b>Red</b>) where the SDNPA maintains disagreement on various aspects of the SLVIA assessment scope and methodology and the EIA outcomes in SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA05].</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects	Natural England	The Development will have Significant landscape impacts on SDNP due to onshore cable installation. Natural England advises that due to the substantial lack of credible and detailed evidence in relation to the mitigation proposed, the assessment of effects as set out in the LVIA cannot be relied upon, and that there will be significant residual adverse landscape and visual effects on the SDNP and on its special qualities, setting or integrity. Further information needs to be provided to evidence that the proposed mitigation measures are feasible and effective.	<p><b>Red:</b> The LVIA concludes that the short duration, reversibility and limited effect on landscape elements (during operation) would not lead to an effect on the integrity of the SDNP.</p> <p>The progress the Applicant has made in clarifying mitigation and adaptive management measures has been noted by Natural England. However, Natural England continue to hold concerns regarding C-115 and continue to dispute the effectiveness of notching hedgerows. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE1]</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		<p>Agreement of the following SLVIA topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methodology</li> <li>• Viewpoint Locations</li> <li>• Worse Case Scenario</li> </ul>	<p><b>Green:</b> Agreement has been reached on these topics. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE20 NE21 NE22]</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		SLVIA Seascape impacts on the South Downs National Park (SDNP), including the Sussex Heritage Coast (SHC)	<p><b>Red:</b> The Development will have Significant seascape impacts on the SDNP, including the SHC. Natural England does not agree that the Rampion 2 Design Principles fulfil the requirement for good design. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE23]</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		SLVIA Seascape impacts on the Isle of Wight Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (IoWAONB)	<p><b>Red:</b> Natural England considers that the Applicants conclusions cannot be drawn as the Applicant has not provided a formal assessment of effects on Special Quality 5 of the IoWAONB 'dark starlit skies'. See the final SoCG to be submitted at deadline 6, row [REF NE24]</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		SLVIA Seascape impacts on the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (CHAONB)	<p><b>Red:</b> Further assessment of the westward expansion is required when considering the effects on the seascape setting of the CHAONB.[NE25]</p>



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects	West Sussex County Council	SLVIA viewpoints, SLVIA worst-case scenario, SLVIA Assessment – PEIR, SLVIA assessment conclusions on significant effects and a lack of night-time view assessment for West Sussex receptors outside of the International Dark Sky Reserve (IDSR).	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC09] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The Applicant and West Sussex Council have reached agreement on these topics.</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		SLVIA assessment professional judgement - It is recognised that some elements are matters of professional judgement, however, in some cases it is considered that these may have been downplayed, specifically with regards to receptors along the West Sussex coastline.	<p><b>Red:</b> This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC11] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>WSCC did not agree this matter. The Applicant noted some difference in professional judgement but that WSCC agreed with the concluding findings of the assessment on the significance of effects</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		<p>Confirmation a worse case Maximum Design Scenario has been assessed.</p> <p>The Maximum Design Scenario has balanced the number of turbines between both Zone 6 and the western Extension Area. If the DCO does not secure the location or placement of these, has the worst case been assessed for the receptors of West Sussex.</p>	<p><b>Green</b> This has been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC14] submitted at deadline 6:</p> <p>WSCC confirmed that this can move to green on the basis of having reviewed the written responses.</p>
			Concerns about the layout and extent of offshore wind turbines and the securement of a Project with lesser impacts to receptors in West Sussex.	<p><b>Red :</b> This has been not agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC15] submitted at deadline 6:</p> <p>The spatial extent of the Rampion 2 array area had been reduced and designed according to a set of SLVIA specific design principles (ES Chapter 15, Section 15.7) <b>[APP-056]</b> which provide embedded environmental measures by reducing the magnitude of effects and minimising harm on the perceived seascape qualities and views, focusing particularly on the SDNP. Opportunities to reduce effects through further design principles specific to West Sussex are limited by the technical, economic and functional requirements of the Project to produce renewable energy, as well as other environmental factors. The Applicant submitted a Seascape, Landscape and Visual Design Principles Clarification Note' at Deadline 1 (SLVIA Maximum Design Scenario and Visual Design Principles Clarification Note <b>[REP1-037]</b>), which provides further commentary on these SLVIA specific design principles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The Applicant noted to WSCC that in relation to the concerns related to these impacts on the special qualities of the National Park (with which WSCC overlaps) - Compensation discussions via S-106 are underway.</li> <li>▶ WSCC noted in response that regardless the significant impacts on the coastal plain and wider areas, outside of the National Park persist. This therefore remains red.</li> </ul>

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		The Application downplays the potential visual and landscape impacts of construction activities, with too strong a reliance on it being short term, and reinstatement being phased/carried out as soon as possible (with reference to Commitments C7 and C19).	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC16] submitted at deadline 6:</p> <p>The LVIA has assessed the maximum or 'worst case' related to the onshore cable construction works (active haul road with cable trenching / laying) and that level of effect is recorded for the assessment. In describing the nature of the effect, the LVIA recognises that the onshore development will be subject to phases of development and progressive restoration – so the effects would reduce during the construction period according to the phasing. Therefore, significant effects are not 'downplayed'.</p> <p>WSCC is satisfied that the LVIA has considered a worst-case scenario for the duration of construction related impacts and therefore this position is agreed</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		Viewpoint locations (and associated visualisations) at Oakendene substation, cable route and compounds are lacking, and/or not representative of worst-case impacts.	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC17] submitted at deadline 6:</p> <p>WSCC welcomed the work on photomontages and consideration of additional viewpoints that are now considered more reflective of likely impacts (including significant impacts).</p> <p>It was discussed that footpath 1786 west of industrial estate not provided by the Applicant – but the effect has been assessed and covered by another viewpoint. The Applicant also confirmed the access to Oakendene West compound has been assessed in high level of detail – confirming that the VRP presents the accurate worst case (which is relatively minimal hedgerow removal). Nonetheless assessed as significant.</p> <p>WSCC confirmed they were happy that methodology concerns about reliance on specific viewpoint locations has been addressed.</p> <p>The matter is now considered agreed.</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		There is a need to provide a full assessment/quantification of all landscape visual receptors impacted which will be wide ranging as indicated by Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTVs), and to recognise that selected viewpoints are only indicative of impacts for a limited proportion of receptors affected.	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC18] submitted at deadline 6</p> <p>The LVIA in Chapter 18: Landscape and visual assessment, Volume 2 [APP-059] provides a full assessment of landscape and visual receptors if read as a whole with all of the Appendices (Appendix 18.1 Landscape and visual impact assessment methodology, Volume 4 [APP-167] to Appendix 18.6: Viewpoint directory, Volume 4 [APP-172]). This is regardless of whether there is a viewpoint to illustrate this or not, i.e., the Applicant has not limited the LVIA to only those receptors at the viewpoints.</p> <p>WSCC considered that whilst some individual receptors will not be captured by the assessment that the Applicant's methodology is proportionate and accepted.</p> <p>The matter is now considered agreed.</p>
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		The RVAA is not fit for purpose, with an unclear methodology and conclusions drawn which lack objectivity. Recognises that it is possible that other residential properties not included in the RVAA may be significantly affected but has only considered those	<p><b>Green:</b> This has been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC19] submitted at deadline 6</p>



Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
			'most affected' – Contrary to that suggested this is not consideration of a 'worst case' scenario. Concern about lack of views from upper floors, and not clear how conclusions of RVAA (in terms of the magnitude of visual impacts) has been factored into the LVIA. Impacts on visual receptors underplayed.	WSCC note an updated RVAA has been provided by the Applicant, presenting a clearer methodology better aligned to the relevant technical guidance, this matter was therefore agreed
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		Lack of detail/clarity in the Design and Access Statement. At present design principles (which it is assumed will be tied to detailed design and 'requirements') are not presented in a clear manner relevant to each topic, or confusingly overlap. No engagement on these principles has been undertaken or clarity on any independent design review. Design elements within the outline landscape plan need securing and further developing.	<b>Green:</b> This has been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-094 [REF WSCC20] submitted at deadline 6  WSCC welcomed updates made to the DAS and consider that design principles are now presented sufficiently clearly, which will be of benefit to the relevant discharging authority and in general terms presents a strategy that seeks to minimise landscape and visual impacts. This matter is therefore agreed..
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects	Mid Sussex District Council	Queries were raised regarding the National Grid Bolney Substation Extension Landscape Mitigation Management Plan and reducing the loss of vegetation.	<b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-092 [REF MSDC02] submitted at deadline 5.  Mid Sussex District Council was happy with the Applicant's position on all landscape issues.
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects	Horsham District Council	Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) and the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment methodology.	<b>Green:</b> This is now agreed as shown in the final SoCG submitted at Deadline 6.  HDC reviewed the OLEMP Rev D issued at Deadline 5. It is considered that the Requirements and Commitments and allied suite of outline control documents including the OLEMP REV D at Deadline 5 are now, as an overall package, sufficient to provide for i) delivery of advanced and existing hedgerow management arrangements, ii) 'advanced' planting', and for iii) mitigation measures as early as possible are secured.
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects		Concerns regarding the substantial size of the compounds and limited detail to their use and length of time in operational use.	<b>Green:</b> This is now agreed as shown in the final SoCG submitted at Deadline 6.  Agreed based on Applicant's position post Deadline 5. HDC confirms that the amendments to the LVIA at Deadline 5 provided a clearer rational and overall provided a good understanding of the expected landscape and visual impacts.
	Landscape, Visual and Seascape Effects	Arun District Council	The spatial extent is greater than Rampion 1 and ADC continues to have significant concerns regarding the scale relative to the proximity to the coastline and the resulting significant visual effects.	<b>Red</b> This not agreed to in the final SoCG REP5-090 [REF ADC09] submitted at deadline 5.  The Applicant has reduced the offshore array extent and quantum in the course of the project's development, as explained in sections 3.2 of ES Chapter 3 Alternatives [APP-044]. The array area at Scoping was 315 km <sup>2</sup> , which was progressively reduced in extent from the east and west to 160 km <sup>2</sup> following Scoping and PEIR consultation feedback. The number of turbines has also been reduced in accordance with consultation feedback, from 116 to a maximum of 90.

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
				The Applicant does not consider it necessary to and is not able to reduce the array size further.
9	Traffic and Access	West Sussex County Council	Concern about the number temporary accesses particularly onto rural roads and the A283.	<p><b>Green</b> : This is now agreed as shown in the final SoCG submitted at Deadline 6.</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that Temporary construction accesses will be designed in accordance with Standards for Highways (2023) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) guidance and to meet relevant West Sussex County Council requirements where appropriate.</p> <p>Road Safety Audits have been approved by WSCC for all accesses for which these were requested.</p> <p>Agreed at expert to expert meeting on 02/07/24 that number of accesses was justified.</p>
	Traffic and Access		Locations are identified as requiring access via single track roads. No mitigation or management measures are detailed.	<p><b>Green</b>: This is now agreed as shown in the final SoCG submitted at Deadline 6.</p> <p>This was agreed following the further revision of the <a href="#">Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</a> provided as part deadline 5 submissions. This included Traffic Management Strategies for Kent Street and Michelgrove.appended. Whilst WSCC seek to retain some flexibility regarding traffic management measures (especially for A-28 where temporary traffic signals are indicated to be required for a number of weeks), the OTCMP rev F is otherwise acceptable.</p>
	Traffic and Access	Horsham District Council	The key concern is that the Construction Traffic Management Plan does not account for emissions of the on-road and off-road construction traffic.	<p><b>Green</b>: This is now agreed as shown in the final SoCG submitted at Deadline 6.</p> <p>The CTMP was updated to account for emissions of the on-road and off-road construction traffic.</p> <p>HDC confirmed their agreement</p>
	Traffic and Access		The amount of temporary accesses, this was an point previously questioned by West Sussex County Council. The Applicant should seek to reduce the number of accesses or justify the need and purpose for those accesses shown.	<p><b>Green</b>: This is now agreed as shown in the final SoCG submitted at Deadline 6.</p> <p>HDC agreed to this point following clarification during examination that West Sussex County Council leads on highway matters pertaining to the need for temporary accesses, the highway specifications of visibility splays, and scoping of road safety audits, reflective of its remit as Local Highway Authority.</p>
	Traffic and Access		Locations are identified as requiring access via single track roads. No mitigation or management measures are detailed.	<p><b>Green</b>: This is now agreed as shown in the final SoCG submitted at Deadline 6.</p> <p>HDC agreed to this point following clarification during examination that West Sussex County Council was the lead on highway matters pertaining to Michelgrove Lane and highway condition surveys, reflective of its remit as Local Highway Authority.</p>
Traffic and Access	Arun District Council	Concerns regarding the potential noise effects of heavy good vehicles (HGV) movements on existing quiet residential road. There is a lack of data provided to support assumptions.	<p><b>Green</b>: This agreed in the final SoCG REP5-090 [REF ADC22] submitted at deadline 5.</p> <p>The Applicant has stated there is no construction traffic proposed for Benjamin Gray Drive. The nearest construction access point is approximately 100 m from the closest residential dwelling on Benjamin Gray Drive. The A259 is also approximately 100 m from</p>	

Ref	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issues	Summary of Progress
				the closest residential dwelling on Benjamin Gray Drive. Consequently, noise effects from construction traffic using this access point will be negligible. Agreed following Expert to Expert call 15/03/24
	Traffic and Access	Mid Sussex District Council	The environmental effects of the construction traffic impact, Appropriate mitigation through a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan, the use of the existing access onto Wineham Lane for the construction/operational phases of the substation extension and the principle of Low Carbon Energy Schemes provided that any adverse local impacts, including cumulative impacts, can be made acceptable.	<b>Green:</b> This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-092 [REF MSDC13] submitted at deadline 5. Mid Sussex District Council was happy with the Applicant's position regarding traffic and access topics.
	Traffic and Access	South Downs National Authority	The SDNPA has concerns regarding the impact on the local highway network during construction for both the onshore and offshore aspects of development, and the Public Rights of Way Network within the National Park.	<b>Red:</b> This has not been agreed to as shown in the final SoCG REP5-093 [REF SDNPA44] submitted at deadline 6.  The Applicant has submitted an update to the <b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP4-045]</b> at Deadline 4 for consideration by SDNPA. This included updates to visibility splay requirements for construction access junctions and updates to the proposed traffic management strategy for Kent Street and Michelgrove Lane. These measures have been agreed with the local highway authority (WSCC) and strategic highway authority (NH).  SDNPA still believe their concerns stand. <b>Not Agreed- Material Impact</b>
	Traffic and Access	National Highways	Concerns were raised regarding the Proposed Development's Compliance with DfT Policy C1/22.	This is agreed in the final SoCG REP5-098 [REF NH16] submitted at deadline 6 <b>Green:</b> The main transport effects are considered temporary during construction period. National Highways were satisfied that sufficient is being done by the Applicant to ensure compliance with C1/22.

