



**Council Officers Project Liaison Group (PLG) meeting: 11-1pm, Friday 14 November 2014**

**MINUTES**

**1. Introductions**

Chair – Paula Seager, Natural PR  
Secretary – Katherine Elton, Natural PR

Chris Tomlinson - Rampion Development Manager, E.ON  
Eleri Owen - Rampion Consents Manager, E.ON

Mark Holland – Lewes District Council (LDC)  
James Neave – West Sussex County Council (WSSCC)  
Steve Tremlett – Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC)  
Max Woodford – Lewes District Council (LDC)  
Joseph Pearson – Mid Sussex District Council

Apologies – James Appleton – Adur and Worthing Councils (A&WC)

**2. Rampion Project Update re: final project design and construction plans**

Chris Tomlinson gave attendees an illustrated presentation of the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm final design. The presentation and images can be downloaded from a link in the cover email. He stressed the final design was to be kept confidential until released to media as E.ON wanted to share the information with PLG stakeholders before it was released to the wider public.

The presentation recapped the project stages and original scope of the Rampion project. Chris gave an overview of the project's progress since the group last met in April 2013 and an indicative timeframe for construction works.

Max Woodford asked what the position was with regards to crossing the A27. Chris replied that this would be achieved through Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD). He said there were seven or eight crossings in the entire cable route construction project which would utilise HDD to mitigate environmental impact and disruption to the transport network.

Chris added that there would be a series of information events along the cable route in April so people would know what to expect during the construction period. A dedicated Public Rights of Way (PROW) PLG was also being established. Chris said the final make and model of the turbine would be announced in the coming weeks.

Max Woodford asked if E.ON could add to the current design under the current consents. He asked whether the team would be able to add more turbines after the project was up and running.

Eleri Owen said the design was optimised for the project according to seabed conditions and current technology and would require significant developments in technology to enable E.ON to add further capacity, which, in any case, would require a whole new consent application including consultation and a new environmental statement.

ST raised the issue of HGV movements through Brighton & Hove via Shoreham and whether there would be an impact on traffic movements from these. James said that the traffic increases involved would be very local but he would liaise with Steve on this.

Mark asked if any requirements related to Lewes DC. Eleri replied that there would be a Base Port Travel Plan, relating to onshore port related traffic but this was yet to be completed. Mark added that an Air Quality Management Area had been declared in Newhaven.

Steve Tremlett asked if there were any further visual representations available, particularly one which would show the view from Brighton beach. Eleri said these would be available in December.

**Action: Send visuals to Council Officers PLG**

James Neave asked for more details regarding the reduction of disruption to crossings using HDD.

**Action: Chris to check with Ian Baker.**

Max Woodford asked how information from the wind farm would be communicated to the operations base. Eleri said there would be a communications link to the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) base in Newhaven.

James Neave gave an outline of WSCC's role as lead authority for discharge of the onshore requirements with a number – ecology, landscape, archaeological and National Trail – being discharged to the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) in their area.

He said development control was via the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm Order (the Order) which contained a number of requirements. WSCC would be dealing with most Public Rights of Way (PROW) aspects apart from the National Trail. He was required to consult statutory organisations including Mid Sussex District Council, Horsham District Council and environmental agreements with Southern Water. WSCC will extend consultation to Parish Councils affected by the project. Requirements included noise, construction management, highways and PROW.

James explained there was a requirement for WSCC to make a decision or ask for an extension to discharge a requirement within a 56 day period. He said WSCC aimed to treat this like a planning application and would only negotiate an extension when clarification of amendments was required.

Max Woodford asked if members would take decisions. James replied that decisions had been delegated to the planning officers. With regards to Parish Councils, he said the brief would be not to stop development or hold up development but be a matter of dealing with prior approved development.

**3. Approved documents and measures for success**

James Neave said E.ON had been given a list of targets in relation to the construction project and measures of success. The requirements covered issues from design to approval including an outline management plan, ecology and landscape plan, traffic management plan and noise management and ensuring these were followed during construction of the substation.

He said WSCC was responsible for up to 30 of these plans and the council had been working with James Eaton of E.ON on methods for the construction and environmental management plan which the council

required as a first priority. The council had identified 12 stages for the onshore developments along the cable route, which sectioned out various aspects such as the substation and Brooklands crossing. He explained this approach was similar to that of a normal planning application and would result in the various issues for each site e.g. noise, crossings, traffic management being set out as a 'package' and a reduced number of submissions. James added that the council was also considering arranging a 'Contractors' Day'.

James said that relationships with the District Councils would have to be forged, as these councils would potentially act as the enforcing authorities and would be required to serve any enforcement notices. He added that E.ON would be setting up a 24/7 hotline as a direct point of contact to the contractors, which could potentially provide solutions to issues quicker than serving an enforcement notice.

James said monitoring would take place over a two-year period of construction but most of these elements would be discharged out. He added that WSCC requirements did not apply to the O&M base plans, which were entirely separate and under LDC's remit.

Contractor compounds were likely to require their own planning permission as these were likely to be away from the main cable route.

Eleri Owen said that in terms of measures of success, these were available in article 40 of the Order, which was available on the PINS website. <http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/Document/2612560>

**Action: Any member wanting the relevant article can request CDs.**

Eleri added there were 14 conditions related to offshore construction, which required marine licences and the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) was the relevant authority in this case.

#### **4. Community benefits & Visitor Centre**

Chris said E.ON was committed to establishing a fund to benefit the community living around the substation. He said any project(s) supported by the fund would be the choice of the community surrounding the substation but would have some high level criteria, e.g. for the benefit of the broad community, not individuals, while not compromising the integrity or reputation of E.ON and/or the Rampion project. It would be funded with a capital one off payment or staggered payments over 10 years. He said the community would also have to run a consultation process to ensure community support for the project(s).

Chris said that the community benefit fund and the establishment of a Visitor Centre for the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm, a voluntary capital project, went 'above and beyond' what was required from E.ON. There would be no competitive bid process but authorities were free to suggest locations where the Visitor Centre might be located.

E.ON would be seeking to maximise benefit for Sussex residents while attracting the largest number of visitors to the Visitor Centre. Suggested locations would, among other things, have to satisfy the following criteria:

- accessible via public transport, walking and cycling
- high footfall from a wide demographic
- views over the sea and wind farm

Steve Tremlett asked for details of the timescale for the Visitor Centre project. Chris replied that it was hoped that the final decision on the investment would be taken in March/April around the same time as final investment decision.

Chris added that there was also the possibility of installing pop up exhibitions areas or boards with information on the project in other areas away from the Visitor Centre.

## **5. Local Business**

Chris said a Supply Chain Steering Group was formed, a partnership of Marine South East, E.ON and local authority partners, with the objective to seek to maximise local content from Rampion. Information was available at [www.sussexwindenergy.org.uk](http://www.sussexwindenergy.org.uk) which includes a database of local suppliers. The format of the directory is currently being simplified.

He outlined opportunities for development of the workforce and wider community. E.ON has already committed to a range of initiatives to support the new university technical college, UTC@harbourside in Newhaven and committed to two apprenticeships per year for the first three years of the project.

Mark asked if the apprenticeships would be partnered with UTC or the universities.

**Action: Chris to follow up re whether apprenticeships will be partnered with educational institutions and if so, which universities**

## **6. Next steps**

Paula Seager asked whether members felt the group was a suitable forum for updates and whether they thought it was beneficial going forward. Members agreed that the PLGs should be continued and the next meeting will be in April, prior to commencement of construction.

Chris said it would be useful to have planning representatives from all of the local authorities on the cable route at the meeting as well as those leading on economic development.

James Neave said from a WSCC point of view, the interests were both planning requirements and community benefits and he felt the group should be widened to include District Council enforcement officers. He said getting the relevant people on board before the four-year construction period would help speed up the discussion process.

CT suggested a meeting to be held in the next few months. Less frequency was needed for members attending the group with interests within the economic development aspects.

**Action: Officers to identify right person within each authority to work with James Neave on requirements and processes.**

James Neave said the benefits to the packaging approach would be that 3-4 requirements could be discussed at the same time. He added he had work to do identifying the right people who would be involved with the project going forward.

**Action: Over Autumn and winter – E.ON to invite people from the different planning teams and state the benefits to attending these meetings within the invitation.**