

From: Rodney Brown [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 December 2024 13:17
To: Energy Infrastructure Planning Team
Subject: Reference: EN010117 Letter to Rampion 2 DCO Statutory Consultees

To: Department of Energy Security & Net Zero (ESNZ)
Energy Infrastructure Planning Team

For the attention of: John Wheadon
Head of Energy Infrastructure Planning Delivery

Reference: EN010117
Your Letter to Rampion 2 DCO Statutory Consultees
Dated 25 Nov 2024

From F.J.R.Brown registered as Interested Party No. 20044329 in EN010117 Development Consent Order (DCO) process

Dear Mr. Wheadon,

While you are engaged in the process of examining the huge amount of documentation surrounding this Wind Energy Proposal, I would like to point out two inter-related issues that I and others have previously flagged in submissions and at Public Sessions of the Examination, that should have rendered the proposal unsuitable for this location, without needing to consider other negative issues like the poor economic return when compared to other locations that have a much greater wind density and connection potential, or the numerous types of environmental damage specific to the South Downs chalk hills and seabed, or the consequential losses to the Tourism and Leisure industry that is such an important component of the economy of this coastal area.

I refer to the adverse effects on both Landscape and Seascape. In particular the degradation of a National Park and of a most important and increasingly iconic Heritage Coast that has overtaken the White Cliffs of Dover as an emblematic National Symbol.

And this is not simply an issue that offends the sensibilities of a few local people, it is counter to, and in breach of, the European Convention on Landscapes of which the United Kingdom is a signatory.

Recent Figures show that Windfarms in this location are only producing on average 34% of the rated output whereas relocating to the Dogger Bank, which in addition to having a far greater Wind Power Density has none of the significant downsides of the Sussex Bay location and is where the promoters of this Scheme already have an interest, would result in a doubling of the output for a scheme of this size.

The simple economics of that should be sufficient to demonstrate that the overall intention to reach Net Zero in the shortest time and the lowest cost would be best served by deploying this resource to the North Sea.

Please consider the importance of this in your review of the proposal, and consider that not only is there great potential loss to the enjoyment and actual benefits of several future generations at a

county, regional and national level, that this scheme will not help deliver Net Zero either as quickly or as affordably as the available alternative in the North Sea would.

Yours sincerely,
Rodney Brown