

Deadline 6 – Representation

Our final comments on the Application and this DCO process are

Lack of consultation with local people

Here we all are at deadline 6, the whole process has been exhausting and time consuming for all affected local residents. The DCO process is very difficult for local working people to keep track and engaged and up to date, months of work and hundreds of documents, many of which are confusing and copy and pasted by the Applicant.

We do not have teams of people countering every argument, we all have other jobs which pay our mortgages and then have to comply with the DCO process in the evening or at weekends – this is an unfair way to process such a vast application that will dramatically affect our lives around Cowfold.

We are supporters of green energy, we have built Eco homes with low energy bills over the last decade, however this is the wrong project in the wrong place and only located at Oakendene as the cheapest option for the Applicant. The Applicant is trying to ride rough shod over local planning policy and local concerns and only saying that from a macro standpoint we need renewable energy. Yes we do, but not at the expense of other factors and issues we have been submitting. This arrogant attitude is evident throughout the DCO process from their stance on ecology, highways, local roads, air pollution, farmland to name a few.

The Applicant has a ‘scale’ of engagement and only interacts with the more important landowners and consultees, spending no time on resident’s concerns and local small landowners and businesses, as has been seen in the Issue Specific Hearings.

As local residents we have been trying to engage with the Applicant throughout the process, but they have not been interested in our local concerns around Cowfold / Oakendene and Kent Street. They only pay ‘lip service’ and dress up and exaggerate engagement with their emails, this has been very evident with many affected parties through the whole process – the Applicant are very professional in putting a positive spin on consultation and faux engagement.

The fact that only a handful of affected parties have signed Heads of Terms on their land by this latest deadline is surely proof enough of the lack of engagement by the Applicant, indeed leading to an experienced lawyer saying in the Hearings that in over 10 years of experience this is the worst DCO application in terms of quality that she had seen – quite a damning comment which sums up our thoughts completely.

We sincerely hope the ExA has time to listen to our issues and will weight them accordingly in the DCO process.

Kent Street Passing Places and traffic Management Plan

Local residents agree with Horsham District Council and West Sussex District Council about concerns on the overall effect on Kent Street. We agree with the ExA that it is odd that such a sensitive lane has not received a full applicant representation showing the total overall picture. Instead, the plan was provided late in the process, and it is piece meal throughout – the effect on the rural character of the lane will be devastating. Even more now since the latest Kent Street traffic survey shows the existing traffic flows to be higher, more chance for Kent Street general traffic and agricultural vehicles meeting Rampion traffic and using the passing places.

I received an email from James D’Alessandro on the 30th July 2021 when I bought my land where it was said the initial consultation with WWCC had concluded that Kent Street was not appropriate for construction access. I would like to know why this initial advice has changed. Email below for reference and point 2. This reassurance was used to give me confidence to build our family home here as I could not believe that such a small country lane would be used. Indeed, Rampion did not think about using it until very late in the DCO process and this is why the current plan is not fit for purpose.

From: [REDACTED]@rwe.com [REDACTED]@rwe.com>
Sent: 30 July 2021 18:58
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]@rwe.com; [REDACTED]@carterjonas.co.uk>
Subject: [Ext Msg] RE: Kent Street sub station objections

Dear Daniel,

Many thanks for discussing your concerns about the Rampion 2 project with us on Monday, and thank you also for summarising your questions below.

Please find below (in blue) my replies to these points:

1. Lucy from Jonas was going to get in touch and send over previous license agreements for my perusal and any information regarding your drawing showing cable runs under my land
[Lucy will shortly be sending you a Survey Licence to consider.](#)
2. Jenn was going to send over information and discussions reference meeting with Highways England for access of A272 for the new site. I guess being a Public Body this would be accessible by a freedom of information request but it would be kind if you could send instead
[I have discussed this point with the project Engineering Manager, and he has informed me that initial approaches have been made to West Sussex County Council. In January 2021, the Council responded to the Rampion 2 informal consultation process to the effect that Kent Street is not deemed appropriate for temporary construction access and an access directly off the A272 is acceptable in principle. Please let me know if you would like further details of our consideration of traffic management for the project.](#)
3. Did you have any indicative layouts of the sub station design and access arrangements for both sites with temporary setting down areas during construction and completed permanent areas
[I have also discussed this point with our Engineering Manager, and he has informed me that we have not yet produced indicative layouts of the substation sites, or their respective temporary compound areas. As we learn more about the ecology and ground conditions at the substation sites, and the equipment that we need to install, we will be able to draw-up potential site layouts.](#)
4. When could have a local surgery in August please as Sept would be too late - I can arrange with all local home owners along Kent Street
[We will be arranging “neighbourhood surgeries” on the 2nd, 3rd & 4th September, which will be opportunities for local residents to meet with us and discuss the project. Alternatively, we could arrange to meet with local home owners earlier \(perhaps the week of 24th August\) if this would work better.](#)

I hope that the above information is helpful, and please let me know if you have any questions about it.

Best Regards,

James.

James D'Alessandro
Commercial Manager

@rwe.com

We have helped Cowfold V Rampion produce a survey of the passing places proposed on Kent Street.

This survey shows that the latest drawings of the widths and sizes of these places is not accurately depicted on the Applicant plans.

As you can see from the drawing below and the dark rectangles on the right hand side, the actual parking places are much larger and destructive than the Applicant's current vectors and measurements which do not accurately depict the real effects along Kent Street.

Our detailed survey shows photos and cones of the passing places, our conclusions are

- Passing places larger than shown on plans as need to be 3m wide and same size of a rectangle, not as per vectors on current plan
- 3 x completely new passing places on the west of Kent Street, worst side for views into the substation site
- Kent Street only thought about towards the end of the process as DCO boundary tight to the east of Kent Street hence not able to use existing passing places on the east
- Increased destruction of hedges and trees not currently accounted for in proposals due to buildability and widths of passing places, at least 4 more mature oaks tree root protection areas to be affected
- Overall buildability of these passing places, widths needed for diggers to build 3m wide passing area. As with any digging or foundation work they would need at least 3m wide perimeter around the passing place to be able to construct the new road, lay pipes etc. This would take the area destroyed into the hedge line of Kent Street east, leaving open views into the substation site. Also pipes over ditches and current fall for water to streams, build- up of road over pipe to take heavy lorries – complex construction, would Kent Street need to be closed just to build passing places?
- Overall negative affect on rural character of the lane to be increased from current proposals



DO NOT SCALE

NOTES:
1. ALL VEHICLES ARE TRACKED AT A DESIGN SPEED OF 50KPH

KEY:
 DCD LIMITS
 HIGHWAY BOUNDARY
 PASSING PLACE VISIBILITY

VEHICLE TRACKING KEY:
 VEHICLE WHEELS

VEHICLE BODY:
 BOX VAN NORTHBOUND MOVEMENT
 BOX VAN SOUTHBOUND MOVEMENT
 LOW LOADER ENTRY MOVEMENT
 LOW LOADER EXIT MOVEMENT

VEHICLE PROFILE:

 Max Legal Length (K) Articulated Vehicle (10.5m)
 Overall Length 16.500m
 Overall Width 2.500m
 Max Body Ground Clearance 4.411m
 Max Track Width 2.500m
 Lock to Lock Time 8.00s
 Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius 8.000m

Broadsia SL2 (articulated) based on V7 Low Boy
 Overall Length 25.150m
 Overall Width 2.500m
 Overall Body Height 3.150m
 Max Body Ground Clearance 4.200m
 Max Track Width 2.500m
 Lock to Lock Time 8.00s
 Max Steering Angle (Virtual) 30.00°

63 Southlands Pond Track South 16.8m PROPOSED LOCATION OF CONSTRUCTION ACCESS AREA, THIS ACCESS COULD BE USED AS PASSING PLACE OPPORTUNITY 2 15.5m 3 15.5m 4 14.3m Pond Pond Pond SCALE 1:1000		GP LB PROPOSED WIDENING OF WESTERN SIDE OF KENT STREET AT JUNCTION WILL IMPROVE ABILITY FOR LARGE VEHICLES TO PASS ONE ANOTHER GP LB PROPOSED WIDENING OF CARRIAGEWAY TO PROVIDE FORMAL PASSING PLACE THROUGH INSTALLATION OF REINFORCED SURFACING Southlands SCALE 1:500 2 INTRODUCE NEW PASSING PLACE ON EASTERN SIDE OF KENT STREET - POSITION DESIGN TO BE CONFIRMED FOLLOWING DETAILED DESIGN STAGE 3 INTRODUCE NEW PASSING PLACE ON WESTERN SIDE OF KENT STREET - POSITION DESIGN TO BE CONFIRMED FOLLOWING DETAILED DESIGN STAGE CURRENTLY AN INFORMAL PASSING PLACE ON EASTERN SIDE OF KENT STREET WHICH IS BEING USED. 4 INTRODUCE NEW PASSING PLACE ON WESTERN SIDE OF KENT STREET - POSITION DESIGN TO BE CONFIRMED FOLLOWING DETAILED DESIGN STAGE CURRENTLY AN INFORMAL PASSING PLACE ON EASTERN SIDE OF KENT STREET WHICH IS BEING USED. Pond Pond Pond SCALE 1:500 SCALE 1:500	
62 - FOR INFORMATION Designer Name 2 Designer Name Designer Name 0078362.ctb 11.44.03.2020 09:17:00 vsp.ahp		RAMPION EXTENSION DEVELOPMENT LIMITED ROUND 3 EXTENSION RAMPION II KENT STREET - PASSING PLACES AND SWEEP PATH ANALYSIS (ARTICULATED VEHICLE) SCALE 1:500	

ALL TECHNICAL APPROVALS HAVE BEEN OBTAINED FROM THE RELEVANT LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND CONTRACTORS SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD THAT ALL DIMENSIONS ARE GIVEN AS PRELIMINARY AND NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION. SHOULD THE CONTRACTOR AND / OR EMPLOYER COMMENCE WORK PRIOR TO APPROVAL BEING GRANTED, IT IS ENTIRELY AT THEIR OWN RISK.

DATE BY: AD BROWN
 CHECKED: GCB
 APPROVED: CAW
 PROJECT: 62280651
 DRAWING: AVI
 SCALE: 1:500
 SHEET: 62280651-WSP-XX-XX-DR-TP-0100-019
 P01
 © WSP UK Ltd

Also, the latest Rampion traffic management Plan for Kent Street has suddenly produced new traffic figures from a Survey in May which Rampion previously said had failed and could not be produced.

This survey has no details or a full report, just a few lines of unsubstantiated text and numbers. Rampion seem to be saying there is now more traffic along Kent Street from their last submission, indeed this new survey shows more than 4 x the traffic numbers of the Enso Traffic Survey earlier in the year on Kent Street (refused battery site application by Horsham DC/23/2110).

The number of HGVs on this report is also more than any other road at 24%, this seems unlikely as I live on the lane and do not see many lorries, mostly cars and small tractors. More traffic means more reliance on passing places which causes more destruction.

Cowfold V Rampion have calculated that Rampion are now saying that Kent Street has 40% more traffic than Wineham Lane and 5 x the number of HGVs – very unlikely. Again, why has so little respect been shown to residents of Kent Street and why have Rampion not produced a full traffic survey earlier in the process.

We would ask for Rampion to release this new full Traffic Report to the ExA and explain why this survey was completed so late in the process and why did they say it failed previously but is now ok to only produce a few figures from it.

Horsham Planning Application DC/23/2110) – application refusal July 2024

This planning application by Enso Energy for a battery storage site in a field south of the substation was recently refused by Horsham DC. The most important reason for refusal was on the grounds of landscaping and the negative affect on the countryside

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

We would respectfully ask the ExA to read this refusal by Horsham DC and their landscape comments and views analysis, as it is very interesting how they value the local landscape around Oakendene and the surrounding fields.

This is an example of Rampion bulldozing local planning policies where normally permission would not be given for a much larger destructive substation and submitting a DCO in the name of a climate emergency. We do need renewable energy but in the right places and with the right connections.

Oakendene Industrial site and Manor House

We still believe the lack of consultation amongst small businesses at this site and in Cowfold are still being vastly underplayed.

The effects on the many small SMEs in the industrial site will be enormous as has been mentioned by residents throughout this DCO.

The views and negative effects on the Listed Oakendene Manor are still a large issue, the Applicant saying that there will not be 'substantial harm'. Both the house and its setting will be dramatically altered, and we agree with the analysis of Horsham DC who see more harm.

Many local people, including myself and my family, take the Public Footpath off Kent Street and walk west taking in the views Northwards towards the manor house and its grounds and walk towards the lake south of the house. This magnificent view will be completely lost. A large loss of amenity to local people.

Rep 05-013 – Rampion Document detailing communication with Daniel & Emily Ball

We are not sure why we deserve a complete document about ourselves, I would guess from the probing questions of the ExA and the large number of criticisms about the lack of consultation and communication throughout the DCO process.

Again, as we have seen through-out the DCO with many other interested parties this document is a master class in positive spin.

Where communication is useful to the Applicant they give details, where my emails have been critical, and they have just summarised as 'email sent' etc etc. Another example reference conversations with Jenn Bryden. They say I have had emails and conversations with this lady, I do not believe I have had individual discussions with her or had email conversations with her. I only received one email from her giving details for a teams meeting with James D'Alessandro.

Rampion seem to think an email is meaningful consultation and communication, but this is not so, they have lied to me on use of Kent Street as an access way and they have continually only interacted with us when it suits them to say they have done so.

We believe they have failed in their efforts to come to an agreement with us in any meaningful way.

King's speech July 2024

The new Government is supporting renewables and promoting onshore wind as well as offshore wind.

There needs to be a joined-up strategy making sure the whole country is served well and that we have the right amount of projects coming forward in the best places. Already there has been a large increase in developers withholding agreements to connect to the grid, with possibly more generation in the pipeline than we need. This shows that the margins for offshore wind are large and attractive to foreign companies. We need to make sure local people do not lose out in this rush and the cheapest sites are not chosen by large corporations for their benefit and bottom line.

If margins and profits are large so must be the cost of such projects to make sure local populations are affected as little as possible and compensated for their loss.

The same thoughts can be applied to wind farm infrastructure as we have seen historically with the UK water companies.

The water companies were part of our national infrastructure before, but were bought by sovereign wealth funds from the Middle East and International pension funds - the country did not benefit from this infrastructure ownership change - quite the opposite as money and funds poured out of the country via dividends and bonuses - the same will happen for new green infrastructure - in both cases the UK and the working man is left to pick up the pieces and costs at the end of the project, as with water as with green energy.

██████████ who heads renewable energy provider Ecotricity recently said that 80% off all offshore wind is owned by foreign companies which provide little benefit to our country.

It should be noted that at a debate in parliament on rural affairs last week Steve Reed MP The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs states at the conclusion of the debate:

"Nature underpins all the Government's missions. Without nature, there is no economy, no health, no food and no society. Nature is at crisis point. The Tories left Britain one of the most nature-depleted countries on Earth. A third of our bird and mammal species face extinction. Record levels of sewage are poisoning our rivers, lakes and seas. This catastrophe cannot be reversed overnight, but we have already turned the corner. This week we introduced our water special measures Bill to strengthen regulation and reverse the tide of sewage that is killing our waterways. Water bosses will no longer reward themselves with multimillion-pound bonuses—which the Tories allowed—while they oversee record levels of water pollution. If they refuse to clean up their toxic filth, they will face criminal charges. Last week, water companies signed up to my initial package of reforms, including ringfencing funding for vital infrastructure investment. If that money is not spent as it is intended to be, companies will refund their customers. It will no longer be diverted for bonuses or dividends, as the Tories allowed it to be.

This Government are committed to the legally binding environmental targets set under the Environment Act 2021—targets that the Tories missed, but that this Government will meet by working in a new partnership with the nature non-governmental organisations".

Renewable energy is a must BUT we must choose the least environmentally damaging locations for projects if we are to all benefit from green energy. We said it from the onset and we repeat at the end.....Oakendene is not the right place.