

Re: Rampion 2 application

To the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State,  
thank you for taking the time to read this submission.

As sound reinforcement professionals and students in psychoacoustic engineering, previous submissions were written (as an IP) on the subject of noise levels during construction and operation of which both NE and the MMO continue to raise unresolved concerns.

*Post-consent adaptive management 4. The Secretary of State notes the concerns raised by NE and the MMO throughout the Examination in relation to the efficacy of ornithological, marine mammal, fish, and benthic monitoring and mitigation.*

Due to the specific nature of Sussex Bay, its shape, sea bed composition, shallowness, proximity to shore etc, the largest pile size and other parameters could potentially create unprecedented noise levels so close to shore that all life within range (with auditory receptors) will be affected in some way by the noise levels created with the worst case scenario of a 13.5m diameter monopile.

*Post-consent monitoring of underwater noise from piling 5. The Secretary of State notes the concerns raised by NE and the MMO during the Examination in relation to uncertainties concerning the efficacy of double big bubble curtains (DBBC) as a noise abatement system.*

Mitigation such as bubble curtains and soft start may help to an extent, but how much really, so close inshore? Coastal tides may make this process largely ineffective, if so, put simply, there isn't much left in the noise mitigation toolbox to bring the levels down to a safe amount.

The MMO and NE have concerns about the efficacy of the Double Bubble Curtain as a method of mitigation, what if they cannot provide the necessary reduction in our unpredictable seas?

It's not just a bit loud, *it's years of seismic pounding.*

*Harbour Porpoise CEA 6. The Secretary of State notes the concerns raised by NE in its Risk and Issues Log in relation to the assessment of impacts on harbour porpoises.*

Bottlenose and other dolphins in the Sussex Bay have a high sensitivity to noise, can flee the soft startup hammering to an extent, we also have seals and other species that need consideration, but what about the creatures who can't get away? Can they get away in time?

Seahorses do not travel far from their habitats, are highly vulnerable, they have been proven to be in various places along the Sussex Bay. These and other protected species could suffer greatly.

The safeguards that are being proffered should the mitigation methods not reduce the noise levels to safe ones go some way to addressing the issue should it become one, but the simple fact is that at the very least the piling shocks concussing deep into the Sussex chalk bed would cause dangerous levels of noise pollution as well as whatever carbon and other releases come from the hammered and piled sea bed.

Regarding alternatives, as the greater proportion of aquatic life lives inshore, moving to a site farther away from the shore (preferably in an area of greater wind density, such as Dogger Bank) might be preferable. This could also help partially resolve the perpetual noise issues that as a policy going forward will need to be addressed.

The need for renewable energy security on schedule is understood, what has become clear after 3 years of review into this application (without referring to further issues) is how potentially destructive an industrial power plant of this size could be so close inshore to so much life.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Carlo N Marogna  
Constructive Heritage Llp  
IP 20045427  
and  
Protect Coastal Sussex  
IP 20044835

13 December 2024