

**From:** [clerk@washingtonparish.org.uk](mailto:clerk@washingtonparish.org.uk)  
**To:** [Rampion2](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** IP Ref RAM2-AFP1738 - comments from Washington Parish Council  
**Date:** 13 January 2025 11:54:28  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[IP Ref RAM2-AFP1738 - Comments from Washington PC - Rampion.docx](#)

---

Dear Sir,

Please see attached comments from Washington Parish Council to the invitation to comment on submissions to your consultation letter of 25<sup>th</sup> November last.

This email is copied to:

Andrew Griffith MP (Arundel and South Downs Constituency), Cllr Paul Marshall (West Sussex County Council Member for the Storrington Division), Horsham District Council Members for the Storrington and Washington Ward: Cllr Emma Beard, Cllr Joan Grech and Cllr Claudia Fisher; and Washington Parish Council Chair Cllr Steve Buddell and Vice-Chair Tony Lisher.

A copy of the Council's comments has been shared with the Agent of the Applicant, Rampion Extension Development RWE.

Kind regards

Zoe Savill

Clerk to Washington Parish Council

PO BOX 2286

Pulborough

RH20 9BT



Office hours: Mon-Thurs 9am-5pm

[www.washingtonparish.org.uk](http://www.washingtonparish.org.uk)



--

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be legally privileged and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient any use, disclosure, copying or forwarding of this email and/or its attachments is unauthorised. Neither should you place any reliance on it. If you have received this email in error, please notify the Washington Parish Clerk immediately by email or telephone 0777 6771921. Please also destroy and delete the message from your computer. Washington Parish Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.

# WASHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL



Clerk to the Council.  
Washington Parish Council PO Box 2286  
PULBOROUGH RH20 9BT  
Tel: 0777 6771921  
Email: [clerk@washingtonparish.org.uk](mailto:clerk@washingtonparish.org.uk)  
Website: [www.washingtonparish.org.uk](http://www.washingtonparish.org.uk)

---

Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> January 2024

Letter by Email to the Secretary of State (SoS)

**Re: Interested Party Reference number: RAM2-AFP173. Invitation from the SoC to comment on the information provided in response to the consultation letter dated 25 November 2024.**

Washington Parish Council comments as follows:

## **Alternative routes for the onshore cable**

The Parish Council (Interested Party Ref 20042011), remains concerned that our principle objection to the choice of cable route through Washington Village, as expressed by residents at a public meeting in September 2021 is being ignored. Residents asked the Rampion 2 Project Team, through the Parish Council, to look again at the original proposed route or alternatives which would avoid the village because of the serious environmental, social and adverse economic impact it will have on the community. We are of the opinion that this has not been robustly explored or addressed by the Applicant, or in this examination.

## **Part 1 Section 15 reference to Heads of Terms with Affected Persons in relation to the compulsory acquisition of land by voluntary means.**

Throughout, the Parish Council, an Interested Party (*IP Ref 20042008 Plot Numbers 22/8 and 22/9 in the Applicant's Book of Reference [APP-026]*), has tried to reach a voluntary agreement with the Applicant and their agent, as required, on access to the cable route through the Washington Recreation Ground/Allotment Land. This is without prejudice to its objection to the route through Washington Village. The Parish Council manages this land as a Trustee of the Washington Recreation Ground Charity and must meet the legal obligations of its governing document.

There has been no progress on constructive engagement because the Applicant, Rampion Extension Development Ltd (RED), will not lift their cap on meeting our reasonable fees in full so that we can formally instruct our approved agent to advise and negotiate terms. There is an assumption by the Applicant on the Land Tracker that we have instructed our agent, but this is not so.

Throughout our numerous correspondences to the Applicant via their agent, we have made the reasons clear why we cannot engage our agent. At a Teams meeting with representatives for the Applicant and their previous agent, Carter Jonas, in May this year, specifically to address the fees issue, we reiterated concerns about our ability to recover fees incurred if the project does not progress in the short term. It was explained to them

that unlike other landowners, the Parish Council is unique in that it cannot incur costs which may not be recoverable when our funding is from the public purse.

We understood that they were in agreement, in principal, that we needed to know that we can recover all fees the moment our agent commences work. At the Teams meeting, we advised that our fees would be considerable given the complexity of the work and the charity requirements, and would be far in excess of the fees cap and the extension. Despite chasing for a response, it was not until 19<sup>th</sup> September that their agent advised that they could not give a legal undertaking on the fees.


The Parish Council fears it may be severely disadvantaged by its financial inability to instruct our agent to advise on the terms, and engage meaningfully in the examination process of the DCO application regarding land access for the cable route. We submitted initial comments to the Heads of Terms by email to the Applicant's previous agent on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023. But it was not until 19<sup>th</sup> December this year that we had responses to these from the new agent.

Amongst the responses, the agent advised that their client would agree to an updated cap if our agent requests an extension in advance, but they cannot do this *"until the initial cap has been used"* and they *"can see some progress on matters"*.

At the Washington Parish Council Meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> January last, the Council discussed the responses to our comments, and the above, and agreed that without a legal undertaking on the fees, an email from Rampion or their agent on payment, including any extensions, is not contractually binding and therefore worth nothing. We cannot meaningfully engage further without it.

We hope that the necessary steps are taken to safeguarding the interests of our community, and that this letter gives a more balanced view of the difficulties we have experienced in the required land access negotiations. There is no justification for residents of our small community being required to pick up a large bill so that it can deal with a property matter which is entirely of benefit to a commercial entity

Yours Sincerely,



Zoe Savill

Clerk, for and on behalf of Washington Parish Council