

**From:** Connie Davies [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 January 2025 10:47  
**To:** Rampion2  
**Subject:** Concerns Regarding Rampion 2 Substation Plans

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good morning,

I hope this email finds you well.

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Rampion substation at the Oakendene site, particularly in light of new evidence and significant concerns regarding the reliability of Rampion's surveys and assessments.

### **Recognition of Cratemans Meadows as a Priority Habitat**

The recent inclusion of Cratemans Meadows in Natural England's Priority Habitat Inventory underscores the critical importance of this area as endangered habitat. While it may not have the formal status of a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), experts have deemed it superior to some SSSI sites. Given the UK's loss of 97% of wildflower meadows since World War II, it is imperative to avoid further destruction.

Despite this, Rampion's surveys have dismissed Cratemans as "poor semi-improved grassland," undermining its ecological significance. This raises serious doubts about the accuracy of not only their surveys at Cratemans but also their wider ecological assessments.

### **Key Concerns Across Surveys and Assessments**

#### **1. Ecological Impact:**

Rampion's flawed surveys fail to account for red-listed species, such as nightingales and skylarks, and have downplayed the ecological importance of ancient trees, hedgerows, and scrubland. These habitats are irreplaceable within the 25–30-year lifespan of the substation, and the proposed mitigation measures appear overly optimistic and unreliable.

#### **2. Traffic and Flooding Impacts:**

Rampion's assessments underestimate the impact of heavy vehicle traffic on the A272, Kent Street, and the Air Quality Management Area in Cowfold. Additionally, their initial lack of awareness about flooding at Oakendene, despite photographic evidence provided by residents, undermines confidence in their ability to manage these risks.

#### **3. Landscape and Visual Effects:**

The visual and landscape impacts on the A272, Kent Street, and surrounding areas, including Taintfield Wood and the lake, have been selectively minimized by Rampion. Local residents consistently report that these impacts will be far greater than Rampion claims.

#### **4. Alternatives:**

Rampion's justification for choosing this site appears retrofitted to suit their preferences, without proper consideration of the harm caused. If the baseline data is unreliable, how can Rampion demonstrate that less damaging alternatives were adequately assessed?

### **Balancing Benefits and Harms**

The decision-making process requires Rampion to demonstrate that the national benefits outweigh the harms. However, their attempts to downplay ecological value, minimize risks, and inflate mitigation capabilities suggest a deliberate effort to obscure the true extent of the harm caused by this project. In a country already among the most nature-depleted in the world, it is unacceptable to destroy critical habitats unnecessarily.

**Call for Review**

Given these significant concerns, I urge the Planning Inspectorate to conduct a thorough review of Rampion's surveys and reassess the substation plans, particularly the Oakendene site. It is clear that the harms far outweigh any claimed benefits, and viable, less damaging alternatives must be prioritised.

I trust that this critical decision will reflect the urgent need to protect our natural environment and ensure sustainable planning for future generations.

Kind regards,

Connie Davies

PI Number : 20042828