



Rampion Offshore Wind Farm



Consultation Report – Appendix E

E.ON Climate & Renewables

Document 5.1.10

December 2012

Planning Act 2008, s37(7)

Revision A

E.ON Climate & Renewables UK Rampion Offshore Wind Limited

Project Liaison Groups – Terms of Reference

The primary aims of the PLGs are threefold:

1. to maximise the scope and reach of communications regarding the Rampion Project to a large and diverse community;
2. to utilise local knowledge, advice and experience across a broad range of interest areas;
3. to gather data, ideas and opinions from the local community.

1. No Group shall exceed 20 in number (including Chair, Secretary and two Project Team staff).
2. No more than one representative per organisation will be a permanent representative of a Group.
3. Only one named alternate per organisation can be substituted in the case of the permanent representative being unable to attend. The alternate should be made known to the Secretary.
4. Representation shall be reviewed by the Group if a representative or their alternate fails without adequate reason on medical grounds, or other force majeure accepted by the Group, to attend two consecutive regular meetings.
5. The Group may invite additional stakeholder organisations to join the Group, subject to the proposed organization having good knowledge, interest, expertise and connections in the special area of interest and subject to the Group not exceeding 20 in number.
6. Each Group will aim to have at least one representative from a stakeholder organisation located in each of the following local authority areas: Lewes District, Brighton & Hove City, Adur & Worthing Councils, Mid Sussex District, Horsham District
7. The need for a vote will be unlikely as the PLGs are not decision making bodies. However, in the unlikely event that a vote is required, it shall be by majority of the representatives present, subject to there being a quorum of X representatives who are eligible to vote. X will be one more in number than 50% of the total size of the Group, excluding the Chair, Secretary and two Project Team Staff.
8. Each Group shall have a Chair and Secretary.
9. E.ON's Rampion Project Manager and Rampion Development Manager may attend any meeting of any Group, although only the Development Manager will be counted as a permanent representative of the Group.
10. An additional representative of the Rampion Project Team with the appropriate portfolio will attend the relevant Group meeting and be counted as a permanent representative of the Group.
11. Attendance of additional E.ON staff will be allowed, subject to prior notification to the Chair, although they will not be counted as a permanent representative of the Group.
12. Each Group may invite non-representatives to attend meetings when their specialist expertise may be required, with prior agreement from the Chair and the Group. For the avoidance of doubt, such attendees shall not have voting rights.
13. The Secretary of the Group will circulate meeting agendas to all representatives at least three working days prior to each meeting. All representatives of the Group may propose items for inclusion but the final agenda is decided by the Chair.
14. The draft of the minutes will be sent out to Group representatives two weeks after the meeting with one week for comments and final approved within four weeks.
15. The agendas and minutes of each meeting may be published on the Rampion Project website, subject to any comments received.
16. Whilst Groups will provide the Project Team with valuable knowledge and expertise, representatives are there to advise rather than support and all views will remain independent. It should be noted the final decision on issues relating to the project and consultation process rests with the Rampion Project Team and E.ON colleagues.

17. All representatives must act in the best interests of the Group as a whole rather than in the individual interests of the organisation they represent.
18. Representativeness of the Group shall be automatically terminated in the event of any representative ceasing to be nominated by the organisation they represent on the Group.
19. The continuation of each Group and a review of these Terms of Reference will occur if the Rampion project is awarded consent by the IPC or in two years, whichever is the lesser. This is the Term of the Group.
20. At the end of the Term of the Group, representativeness will be reviewed by a repeat of the selection process.
21. All representatives of all Groups will be bound by the terms of a code of conduct. If representatives are in breach of the code of conduct, the Chair will issue a warning and if such behaviour continues, the Chair has the right to exclude them from the meeting. The Group will then vote if this is a temporary or permanent exclusion.
22. Representatives of Groups may not act as an official representative of E.ON in any external communication or other committee under any circumstances.
23. Representativeness of the group will be in a purely voluntary capacity.
24. The frequency of meetings will be determined by the Project Team, although as a guide, two or three meetings per year for each group are anticipated.
25. The exact dates and times of meetings will be agreed between the Project Team, the Chair and the representatives, based on delivering maximum attendance from representatives and relevance to key project milestones.
26. A limited number of additional Terms of Reference can be put forward for a particular Group, provided they do not conflict with the terms above, the role and purpose or aims and objectives, or the general intention of this document.
27. Additional Terms of Reference must be ratified by E.ON's Rampion Project Manager or the Rampion Development Manager.
28. The PLGs will be an open and transparent forum for the sharing of knowledge, information and opinions that will assist in the consideration of issues directly involved with the development proposals for the Rampion site.
29. The PLGs are intended to capture the representative views from interest groups on particular areas of the project and to meet this end, PLG representatives will be encouraged to disseminate information to other organisations and individuals who are not a representative of the group but share their particular interest.

Roles and responsibilities

The role of Chair is to chair the meeting in an impartial and inclusive manner and ensure that its business is conducted properly, in accordance with the terms of reference. The Chair will ensure that all representatives are fully involved and encouraged to contribute to discussion and decisions at the PLG.

Additionally, with support from the Development Manager and Secretary, the Chair will ensure that meetings are planned and run effectively, focus on key issues and priorities of the group and that any recommendations of the PLG are reached in an open and transparent manner.

The role of the Secretary is to formulate and distribute agendas and associated papers before the meeting, taking account of input from representatives of the group. The Secretary will take minutes during the meeting and circulate them in draft form round the group for comment, before making the necessary amendments and seeking approval for the minutes and publication on the Rampion Project website.

The Development Manager and Secretary will arrange the meetings and support the Chair.

Code of Conduct

The PLGs offer a unique opportunity for an open and transparent forum to share knowledge and information between interested parties in the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm proposals. To respect the role and purpose and the general good intentions of the PLG philosophy, all representatives are requested to observe a code of conduct. This will ensure the group is run in an orderly and professional manner, where representatives respect the views of others and are able to express themselves without fear of intimidation. An open and inclusive discussion is essential for the effective functioning of the group and disruptive behaviour will not be tolerated.

Representatives of the group who disclose sensitive information to help meet the objectives for the group and request that such information be kept in confidence, should expect all representatives of the group to respect that confidence.

Only the primary representative or their nominated alternate will be able to attend meetings.

Representatives of the Group will be advised on, and asked to observe, the Health and Safety and Fire Escape procedure at meeting venues.

If representatives break the code of conduct, the Chair may issue a warning and if such behaviour continues, the Chair has the right to exclude them from the meeting. The PLG will then vote if this is a temporary or permanent exclusion.

Rampion Offshore Wind Farm

Minutes: Business and Tourism Project Liaison Group (PLG), 14th November 2011, 6-8pm

1. Introductions - attendance:

Chair - Paula Seager - Natural PR
Secretary - Kat Ratcliffe - Natural PR

Chris Tomlinson - Rampion
Development Manager, E.ON
Vaughan Weighill - Rampion Project
Manager, E.ON

Mike Clark - University of Brighton
Mark Jones - Brighton & Hove Hotels Association
Tony Mernagh - Brighton & Hove Business forum
Nick Mosley - Brighton Tourism Alliance
Claire Onslow - Sussex Destination Managers Forum
Patrick Pica - University of Sussex
Sarah Springford - Brighton & Hove Chamber of Commerce
Tina Tilley - Worthing & Adur Chamber of Commerce & Industry
Rowan Wallis - West Sussex Sustainable Business Network

Apologies:

Martin Searle - East Sussex Federation
of Small Businesses
Maddy Carr - Tourism South East

Items 2 and 5 - brief project overview

Chris Tomlinson, Development Manager for the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm project, introduced the group to the project and explained the consultation process, which will begin towards the end of January 2012 and last 12 weeks.

Following the presentation, the chair opened up for questions. In general, feedback was positive but a concern arose with regards to the consultation/PLGs simply acting as a way to get 'ticks in boxes' to meet the requirements of the consent application process. Chris noted that although the team will have to publish a Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) setting out the consultation process, the PLGs were not compulsory and were a new and additional communication mechanism established with the aim of reaching out to a large and diverse community. E.ON hoped to assist in Rampion becoming a "good permanent neighbour" for Sussex. For example, by providing information to local companies on job opportunities (with 50-100 permanent jobs being created for operations and maintenance) and by supporting various local community projects, such as the Brighton Festival Children's Parade in 2010. The group agreed this was largely encouraging and suggested the Rampion team should concentrate on what E.ON could 'give back' to Sussex in terms of renewable energy expertise which could help existing local businesses and ventures. This was further supported by a representative of the group noting Brighton & Hove's aspiration to become an environmental centre of excellence.

There was a suggestion for a visitor centre once the wind farm was built, which while the Rampion team could not guarantee, they will be considering carefully if consent is granted as they recognise the Sussex coast is a significant tourist catchment area and the visitor centre has been a great success in Great Yarmouth, for the Scroby Sands offshore wind farm.

In terms of local employment - a key topic of conversation - the group largely agreed 50-100 jobs was a relatively low figure but were happy E.ON would be using local companies / people where possible. Chris also highlighted an initiative being coordinated by Marine South East, involving the

partnership and contributions of local authorities and county councils, for a study to identify those local companies who may be able to support the Rampion construction process.

Another issue discussed revolved around credibility in terms of one of the promotional messages that the offshore wind farm will provide energy for two thirds of all the homes in Sussex, when in fact it will not go directly to Sussex. The Rampion team maintained this was intended to give people a real world figure to highlight just how much energy it could provide, rather than misleading people into thinking the energy would go directly to Sussex only, but it would be addressed in their developing FAQs (frequently asked questions) which will be made public.

The Rampion team introduced the local MSc bursary competition they were supporting and feedback was largely positive but the University representatives and others put forward ideas on improving take-up and possibly looking at other routes, such as focusing on PhD research or an apprenticeship.

The potential benefits and drawbacks of the offshore wind farm were brought up and discussed. A number of the group expressed that the wind farm could well be seen as something positive and something for Sussex to be proud of. This was supported by the discussion on the offshore wind farm at Great Yarmouth, which has been linked to increased boat trade and tourism.

Concerns raised included noise – which the Rampion team said would not be a problem as they are actually very quiet and besides they are eight miles out to sea – as well as the visual impact. The group enquired about the views of South Downs Society on this issue and the Rampion team noted most dialogue had so far focused on the underground cabling aspect, rather than the wind turbines themselves, but communication with them and other organisations with an interest in the area was ongoing.

The group agreed the Rampion team had much to do in terms of myth-busting and educating Sussex on offshore wind. Meanwhile, Chris informed the group that he continued to take up a number of speaking opportunities at external events and meetings, and was in the process of finalising FAQs to help inform the wider community in this regard.

Action: The Rampion team should ensure accurate visuals (montages) are included in consultation exhibitions.

Items 3, 4 and 6 - role and purpose of PLGs and representatives, Terms of Reference and going forward

Chris explained that given the scale and diversity of the community they are wishing to engage and consult with, the PLG initiative was designed to help reach out to a broader network of organisations and individuals across a range of interest areas. The Rampion team identified the organisations to be represented on the PLGs from their stakeholder list of 2000+ local organisations who are well networked and represent particular interest groups. Chris highlighted that local authorities, county councils and Natural PR had all helped contribute to the identification of those best networked organisations. The objective and role of the PLG representatives is to provide a two-way information dissemination process, to filter project information back to their peers, as well as feedback comments and ideas from their interest groups back to E.ON. Through this process, E.ON is aiming to raise awareness of the offshore wind farm and the consultation process throughout Sussex.

The chair asked if the group was happy to continue attending the PLG meetings, which representatives agreed to (the next one will be recorded as part of the consultation document) and

invited feedback. The broad principles of openness, transparency and representatives having a fair chance to have their say during meetings were noted as important for the Terms of Reference.

The location of the meeting was generally agreed as central and well connected, although a couple of individuals travelling from further afield said it was not ideal for them and parking was an issue. It was agreed an hour and a half would suit people better in terms of the length of meetings. If possible, the group also said they would prefer for the meeting to be a little earlier (start time 4-5pm). Above all, the group agreed plenty of notice was the most important factor.

Actions: The Rampion team and Natural PR have put together Terms of Reference (find attached to comment), which will be agreed by the group. The date/time of meetings also needs to be addressed. PLG representatives to use Kat Ratcliffe (kat@naturalpr.biz) as the main contact for details on PLG meetings/minutes/agenda items and Chris Tomlinson (chris.tomlinson@eon.com) as the main contact for project-related enquiries.

Item 7 - review representation on PLG

The group suggested a few organisations which had been left off the PLG list but agreed the PLG membership was representative and appropriate, although turnout was quite Brighton heavy at the inaugural meeting.

Action: Rampion team to double check contacts noted are on the stakeholder list to receive Rampion newsletters and information.

Item 8 - review consultation event venues

The group considered the venue suggestions and put forward ideas, such as including the Holmbush centre in Shoreham, New Road, Brighton seafront, Churchill Square (the Brighton food festival market in April) and the Sainsbury's store in Newhaven. They recommended high footfall and ease of access should be key considerations for venue selection. The Rampion team said they were hoping to undertake a direct mail shot to local residents, as well use press releases and adverts in local newspapers / magazines / newsletters to get the word out and encourage people to attend the consultation event nearest to them. It was noted that outdoor venues would be difficult due to the time of year. One of the representatives suggested an exciting children's activity could attract people to engage with the events.

Action: Rampion team to consider suggestions and practicalities of venue options.

Item 9 - dates and times for future meeting

The Rampion team suggested March would be most suitable for the second meeting, as this gives everyone time to absorb the information during the consultation period, as well as listen to feedback from others which can then be brought to the group. The group supported this suggestion.

Item 10 - agenda for next meeting

Natural PR to send a copy of the Rampion map with the minutes, to illustrate the wind farm site and cable route area of search. Rampion team to investigate case studies of businesses which have benefitted from E.ON's offshore wind farms to date, and bring to the next meeting. Agenda items should be sent to Kat in advance of the meeting. The meeting date will be notified in January. The attendance lists and minutes for each PLG will be in the public domain and uploaded onto the Rampion project website.

Item 11 – AOB

Chris will visit as many organisations as possible between January and March – please contact him if you would like him to present to your group / organisation.

Minutes: Business and Tourism Project Liaison Group (PLG), 24th April 2012

1. Introductions - attendance:

Chair - Paula Seager - Natural PR
Secretary - Kat Ratcliffe - Natural PR

Chris Tomlinson - Rampion
Development Manager, E.ON
Vaughan Weighill - Rampion Project
Manager, E.ON

Mark Jones - Brighton & Hove Hoteliers Association
Danni Craker (Sarah Springford substitute) – Brighton & Hove
Chamber of Commerce
Sue Korman – Brighton Tourism Alliance
Trevor Constable – Federation of Small Businesses – Surrey &
West Sussex

Apologies:

Martin Searle - East Sussex Federation
of Small Businesses
Maddy Carr - Tourism South East
Tony Mernagh - Brighton & Hove
Business forum
Caroline Wood – Coastal West Sussex
Rowan Wallis - Brighton Business
Sustainability Network

***Individuals names are written as their initials e.g. Chris Tomlinson = CT**

2. Approval of minutes

The minutes from 14th November were approved by the group.

3. Presentation on community consultation

CT reminded the group of the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm project and updated representatives on the community consultation so far. Over 4500 people had attended the 12 public exhibition events and over 1000 questionnaires received back to date.

4. Feedback from PLG representatives – on community consultation proposal, the consultation process and opinion of peers

i. General awareness

Two of the group confirmed they had attended a public exhibition.

CT invited feedback from the group on general awareness of the project amongst friends, peers, family and colleagues. One representative noted that most of the people he had spoken to were aware of the proposal minus the detail. He felt this was largely because it was still early days and expects many more to become engaged as the project progresses. The FSB representative confirmed he had included an article about the Rampion project in the FSB newsletter which goes out to 10,000 representatives.

A key issue raised was that people generally were apathetic due to the opinion that the Rampion plans were years away from becoming a reality. However, it was noted that the overall awareness of the project was good.

ii. Reaching the younger demographic

CT explained that the under 40 age group had been the hardest group to engage with and described how they had been trying to improve engagement with a Facebook page and a Brighton University consultation event (and had also tried to arrange a Sussex University event but the University could not find a suitable venue).

SK from the Tourism Alliance suggested a simple animation works well as a tool to explain the wind farm to younger generations. She noted it was important to make the benefits of the project clear in order for people to identify with the plans.

Action: CT and the Rampion team to draw up a draft Education Strategy over the Summer and invite feedback and advice during the next PLG meeting.

iii. Seafront view

MJ from the Brighton & Hove Hoteliers Association informed the group that many Brighton hoteliers with sea views were concerned that the wind farm could adversely affect the view for tourists and, longer-term, be detrimental to what is currently one of the most popular destinations in the UK. He noted that many of this stakeholder group had a strong emotional connection with the city's existing ethos and tourist status and that they had initially assumed that the wind turbines would not be visible from the shore. The association were meeting to formally discuss the project on May 5th.

A suggestion was put forward that with the city's green agenda, the wind farm could add to the opportunities for 'green tourism', however a sense of ownership for Sussex was important and the wind farm ought to be 'quirky and unique'. Also, Brighton beach featured very highly as a top attraction for the area on a recent Visit Brighton survey which should be considered.

The Rampion team clarified that there was no evidence to suggest that offshore wind farms harmed tourism in any way and that the Scroby Sands Visitors' Centre attracted 40,000 visitors a year. However, they agreed with the group that none of their existing wind farms were off a coast as densely populated as Sussex. Furthermore, CT noted that the appearance of wind turbines was subjective – there are many who like the look of them but there are those who do not. A representative suggested putting the photomontage on the seafront to invite feedback from both tourists and local residents, purely on the visual aspect of the wind farm.

A couple of representatives noted that they had seen the temporary platform being used to construct the met mast but noted that the met mast itself was not clearly visible.

Action: Rampion team to explore ways to create a sense of ownership / belonging for Sussex whilst developing the Rampion brand. Community benefits to be addressed by the Rampion team with ongoing advice from Sussex stakeholders who have local knowledge.

Action: CT to arrange a presentation to the Brighton & Hove Hoteliers Association as soon as possible so that they can feed back their thoughts before a definite decision is made.

Action: Rampion team to inform taxi drivers around Sussex as they are key ambassadors in the area.

Action: VW to respond to DC's email ASAP regarding the Rampion potential to create local jobs, during construction and operation

5. Supply chain study and port update

i. Local jobs

VW explained that E.ON seek where possible to use local content on projects it develops, and this applies to the development, construction and operational stages of the project. They were currently using a number of local firms, for example employing a local development manager for the project, using local consultants for offshore bird and sea mammal surveys, as well as a local public relations firm in helping to engage stakeholders and the media.

The project if approved and built would certainly create new jobs in the area, estimated at between 65 and 85 full time roles at an operations base either at Shoreham or Newhaven (decision yet to be made on which). E.ON's Robin Rigg project (smaller than Rampion, 60 turbines) employs 40 individuals and around three quarters of these were recruited in or around the local area of the offshore wind farm.

In terms of construction contracts and opportunities E.ON is a partner in a Supply Chain project with Marine South East, local authorities and county councils in Sussex which is aimed at identifying what suppliers exist at present in the area, what the likely requirements are for the Rampion project, and what opportunities there are likely to be to bid for contracts. A key aspect of this is to raise awareness sufficiently early of what may be needed to assist local companies in preparing to tender, which may involve adapting their products/services or even partnering with other local companies. It is also important to identify what level of contract (Tier 1 directly to E.ON, or Tier 2, 3, 4 subcontractor) each supplier could potentially slot in to, as E.ON may not necessarily be the customer for many of these contracts.

Marine South East and E.ON have been holding local events for interested contractors and the first two at Shoreham and Newhaven had gone really well with around 80 and 50 attendees respectively, with a further event planned for Chichester.

VW clarified that the UK were behind other European countries in terms of wind turbine manufacture and at present there is no UK based supplier. However, this is likely to change with four major players having signalled their interest in setting up in the UK.

Action: Representatives noted it would be really useful for the Rampion team to keep them updated with their employment requirements plus any relevant networking events so that they can inform their representatives.

Action: Rampion team to explore apprenticeship scheme options for Sussex and surrounding areas.

iv. The port decision

The Rampion team confirmed they were currently in very advanced discussions with both Shoreham and Newhaven ports to work out which of the two would be most suitable to use as the operations and maintenance base for the project. No decision had been made yet and the ports will be the first to know once this was confirmed.

v. Common queries

- Any noise? It is not expected that any noise will be audible at the coast from the wind farm during operations. It is possible that during certain construction activities (installing foundations) and weather conditions (e.g. very calm still day) might be audible from the shore at a low level. Interestingly, noise monitoring was undertaken at shore during the recent installation of the met mast which involved pile driving the foundation into the seabed – but this was not detected above the ambient background noise
- Any impact on weather? No effect on weather known, any localised effect on wind flow within the immediate vicinity of the wind turbines soon dissipated.
- Local jobs? 65-85 local jobs for operations and maintenance.

6. Outstanding action points

None – the PLG Terms of Reference had been sent to the group; the Rampion team had taken on board venue suggestions for the public exhibitions; accurate visuals (montages) had been on display at the exhibitions and the team had added the suggested contacts to the stakeholder list to receive Rampion newsletters and information.

7. PLG Terms of Reference – agreement

The Terms of Reference were agreed.

8. Date & time for future meeting

Mid September is a good milestone as the application for consent will be submitted either just before or just after a meeting in September. We can also start planning for the future. CT clarified people will be able to comment on the proposal post the May 6th community consultation in relation to the draft Environmental Statement (ES) which will be published on the Rampion website in early June (*CT to inform all PLG representatives of exact statutory consultation dates very soon).

The ES provides a technical assessment of the baseline data and the impacts, mitigations and any residual impacts of our proposal. You will be able to respond to this during the public consultation under Section 48 of the Planning Act and a notice will be placed in local papers advising you of the period during which you can submit your comments. All PLG representatives will be informed of the time period for the statutory consultation very soon.

Action: CT to meet with Tourism Alliance over the summer.

9. AOB

None

Attendance:

Chris Tomlinson -EON

Neville Horton -EON

Stephen Appleby – Brown & May Marine (FLO)

David Guy –

Bill Brock -

Tony Delahunty

Sam Brenchley

Gary Brownrigg

Charlie Brock

David Scott

Matt Leach

Gary Edwards

Kier Foster

1. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising

NH reviewed all the objectives agreed at the last meeting.

It was requested that the minutes from the previous meetings should be sent out ASAP by email or hard copy.

Action DG: Email / post the minutes from the last meeting to anyone who didn't receive them.

DS - The last meeting ended with E.ON agreeing to go away and report back on whether the fishermen will be paid for the losses that they incur if the construction goes ahead.

NH reported that in previous consented projects, if we cause loss or disruption to fishermen, we come to a mutually acceptable arrangement. However, that doesn't necessarily mean compensation. There are examples of such arrangements at other E.ON projects including v-notching, lobster hatchery to create hatchlings to a certain maturity, safety gear, training.

BB highlighted that a decision on compensation isn't required now but the fishermen are finding it difficult to believe that they will be able to continue fishing as they are now, during the wind farm construction and then operation. They need

assurances that if their livelihood is affected, there are contractual arrangements in place regarding responsibility.

SA gave an example in Thanet whereby the developer had to drift along the channels between the turbines to see if there are hook ups. If there are, the MMO condition to the license means the developer has to get rid of the hangers. BB suggested this is the kind of issue that could be incorporated into a contract. A particular concern was raised with respect to badly broken ground resulting from construction activities and the potential to cause damage to fishing gear. Particularly nets and scallop dredging gear. A request was made to see the standards that E.ON would have to adhere to in respect of broken ground caused by construction activity. NH explained that there was not a general standard or formal requirement, but if consent was achieved it would carry strict conditions covering many aspects of the wind farm. There may or may not be anything specific with respect to broken ground, this was a matter for the consenting authorities and they would decide if conditions should be applied.

Action SA: Email CFWG about reinstatement options that have been used in other projects.

DS expressed concerns for what happens if the fishing goes flat with no catches and used Hastings Bank as an example where there was a cessation on fishing certain times of the year.

The fishing industry needs to know the standard of reinstatement of the trenches, to ensure any hangers can be put right.

NH explained that E.ON apply to the MMO for a Marine license which they consider and if they award consent, this comes with conditions, many of which are standard but others which can be site specific and tailored. These have been developed as knowledge has been gained but can't be put in place until we have consent.

2. Understanding current fishing activity

BB suggested that a contract between E.ON and the fishing industry would be the most secure way of protecting the local industry, rather than fishermen relying on a condition on the MMO consent if it is ever obtained.

NH – As fishing is dependent on many natural and man made things, creating a robust cause and effect of the impact on the fishing industry specifically from the wind farm, will require a good deal of data and effort. SA highlighted the need for accurate information, with surveyors going out on boats to be able to build up an accurate picture of the practices and landings within the wind farm site. We need to

agree between ourselves what is the accurate information as false claims help no-one.

BB is keen that the baseline forms part of a contract, e.g. the true scale of industry involvement in the area, catch rates and income.

BB is also keen to learn from studies of the impact of noise, EMF and vibration from the turbines, so that changes in the baseline stock levels can be monitored once the wind farm is operating.

Action SA: Search out and provide what data he can find

NH – The data for current landings from the Rampion area isn't readily available, so E.ON could do surveys themselves. However, to remove wriggle room on cause and effect, the fishing industry may have to open their books up for audit to inform the database and make it more robust.

Claims followed from the Group that if requested, MMO will provide data regarding the fishing stocks and sales figures. SA highlighted that there are discrepancies in the MMO data and it doesn't go far enough out beyond 12nm. BB accepted that MMO data would have to be used in combination with other data, for example plotter records, GPS data and E.ON's survey.

BB wants a contract to include status quo data, agreeing that cause and effects will need to be clear, and agreeing scenarios for finding solutions if there are adverse effects on fishing caused by the wind farm.

1. Understanding what data is available and what may be used must be agreed before we do anything further, to ascertain what stocks are caught from the area.
2. If consent is granted, the industry knows where they were before the wind farm started.
3. Establish a mechanism to measure cause and effect (both in terms of the site itself and displacement).
4. Agree that if an adverse effect on particular fishermen, we have to come to an arrangement which may include support from E.ON in a range of different ways as highlighted by NH above.

Action SA: Come up with a methodology to provide data of fishing grounds within the Rampion site what they're catching (numbers and species) and earnings. Data sources could include landing data, logbook data, plotter details, MMO and early consultation responses. Need to agree with the fishermen how to create and use the data.

Action SA: Speak to Rob Clark from Sussex IFCA who could have a well informed view on creating a catch database and quality of the information. Initial thoughts are that we don't need any figures on costs, just a quantitative exercise about what has been caught, where, during what season.

NH expressed caution regarding 'confounding variables', how these would be recorded and how any arrangements would be made based on true cause and effect as opposed to apparent cause and effect.

Action NH: Come up with a phrase to replace 'baseline data'.

3. Consultation

CT encouraged attendance at the public exhibitions and outlines the indicative layouts as part of the draft proposals.

BB questioned whether E.ON is looking at this group being the focus of the entire consultation with the fishing industry? Concern was expressed that we need to go out to the wider fishing industry and not rely solely on the CFWG. The CFWG is representative but is not the whole industry. E.ON need to consult with the wider industry. However, it was accepted that there are difficulties as it's a fragmented industry and it's difficult to secure meetings.

The CFWG is *part* of the consultation but not the whole. We need to go wider and that is the responsibility of E.ON. DG reported that we have the best database of any that exist in the Rampion area.

GE explained that he is here to represent himself and this will cover others in his area.

SA pointed out that we have already been consulting with the fishermen and secured a 70% response rate.

NH explained that questionnaires sent out to the fishing industry are often not filled in.

DG explained that Ian Bickerstaff had requested to move the turbines away from the good fishing areas and have no compensation.

Action DG: Identify whether the consultation material has gone out to all the fishermen and if not, ensure that it does including DG posting con docs, questionnaires and envelopes to all contacts without access to email and ensuring all those on email have the link to the consultation material on the website.

4. Met mast

BB expressed a view that the way it was handled was poor, dictatorial in nature and will lead to a resurgence of confrontation.

SA responded that there were originally 16 sites that the met mast could have been placed in, but following the early consultations with approximately 50 local fishermen, it was placed in a location likely to cause least disruption to the general fishing community. For example, avoiding the 9-miler was a no-brainer. However, we wouldn't be able to please everyone as there are interests all over the site. The information provided by the fishermen to Brown and May in respect of the met mast is confidential, so the charts couldn't be shown. It was also noted that certain physical constraints had an influence on the location and a full engineering assessment and been undertaken.

5. Health & Safety

DS expressed concerns for emergency response and safety issues raised about how a helicopter can access site. NH highlighted that wind turbines can be shut down and made safe within minutes, well within the flight time of an emergency helicopter.

SA gave an example of marine hazards noting that there are 271 oil and gas installations in the North Sea and there has only been one collision by a fishing vessel, which was 15 years ago when an intoxicated captain collided with a platform.

Mitigation

Seeding methods, different methods of fishing, Eurodiesel engines, provision of diesel and engines or tackle etc.

6. Questions / queries

Q - Any experience of cable damage?

A - E.ON will survey the offshore cables every year to confirm the condition of the cables.

Q - What do we know about the likely extent of scour?

A - It's dependent on tidal flow and the seabed conditions, e.g. at Robin Rigg on sand banks, scouring is quite extensive.

Q - How far will the foundations go into the seabed?

A - 25 – 35m.

7. AOB

BB asked what assurances E.ON could give that whatever agreement we reach with the fishing industry, will be carried over to any future owner of the wind farm. NH and SA highlighted that the sale of the wind farm would be highly unlikely, but if it was sold, it would be sold to a large energy company like E.ON with similar attitudes.

Most E.ON offshore wind farms are on sand banks where there was little fishing prior to the development, but where stocks and fishing have increased.

Action SA: Send BB report or link of EMF report.

Graeme Doswell doesn't think he is best suited to sit on this group and has suggested Joe Watts. CFWG agreed Joe Watts as a new member of the group.

Action DG: Liaise with Joe Watts

BB requested a copy of the chart with positions in Lat & Long.

Action DG: Arrange with Rob Clarke (IFCA)

NH explained there will be more work next year on Geophysical surveys followed by dive or ROV exploration.

We are looking at financing trials of scallop dredgers working in wind farms.

Action SA: Complete trials.

CT handed out consultation materials to the CFWG.

CT1203

Commercial Fishing Working Group

13th September 2011

Attendance:

Chris Tomlinson -EON

Neville Horton -EON

Stephen Appleby – Brown & May Marine (FLO)

Sam Brenchley

Bill Brock

Gary Edwards

David Guy

David Scott

1. Process, rules and objectives

a) Chairman

Agreed: Neville Horton was unanimously approved as Chair of the CFWG.

b) Minutes

Agreed: The minutes will be agreed by the group and then circulated as widely as practicable.

Agreed: David Guy will be the conduit for circulating the minutes to a wider number of fishermen.

c) Representation of the CFWG

As far as we are able, the CFWG and E.ON want a fair cross-section of fishing methods across a wide geographical area, represented on the group.

Many believe the group should be larger, otherwise the work falls on few shoulders. If those invited had been able to attend, the group may be of sufficient size. Those invited who could not attend included Ian Bickerstaff, Gary & Greg Brownrigg, and Graham Doswell.

Tony Delahunty has been suggested from Selsey, in light of the displacement issue.

SA highlighted that Brian Davey was vociferous at the last meeting but BB highlighted that he and Brian speak several times a day.

Rob Clarke (Sussex IFCA) would make a good contribution to specific meetings on an invitation basis, but should not be a permanent member.

The group's view is that with the following additional members, there will be a fair representation of fishing methods and geographical spread:

Ian Bickerstaff

Greg Brownrigg

Graham Doswell

Tony Delahunty

d) Roles

Agreed: DG will lead on liaison as the middleman between E.ON and the fishing industry. Comments and concerns from fishermen outside the group can be fed through Dave who can then communicate it to SA or NH at E.ON.

e) Frequency, timing and venues for meetings

Agreed: There is no need to schedule a frequency of meetings, but to set them up dependent on the needs of fishermen, the project process and the need to provide new information.

Agreed: Both E.ON and fishermen to communicate through DG if they have a reason to call a meeting and DG then to invite the CFWG to meet.

Brighton is not considered an appropriate location for a meeting venue as car parking is expensive and difficult. Shoreham is the most central location for CFWG members. BB office is welcome, but does not have sufficient table space to allow for charts to be viewed during meetings.

Agreed: Pursue 'Rope Tackle' or the Yacht Club in Shoreham for future meetings.

Agreed: Mid afternoon is the preferred timeslot for meetings with a 3pm or 4pm start time.

f) Aims and objectives of the group

Aims

- Put in place arrangements to allow activity in the development phase, that will enable fishermen and E.ON to coexist.
- For the operating period (20-25 years), put in place arrangements that will allow fishermen and E.ON to coexist.

Nine original objectives proposed to the CFWG were agreed as follows:

1. Seek views from fishermen across a wide geographical area and from a broad range of fishing methods.
2. Offer the fishermen an opportunity to influence project related issues
3. Offer E.ON the chance to listen to suggestions and observations, to better understand the challenges of the fishing industry.
4. Provide project updates.
5. Seek to understand fishing impacts.
6. Encourage debate on key concerns and issues, for both fishermen and E.ON.
7. Seek mitigation options and solutions, to any disruption the wind farm may cause.
8. Deliver well-chaired and structured meetings, ensuring that all are heard with no party, including E.ON, or single fisherman or fishing method, allowed to dominate proceedings.
9. Produce and agree minutes of the dialogue as a basis for discussion and used to chart progress through the issues.
10. Produce and agree minutes for inclusion in the Consultation Report to the IPC.

A further four objectives were added, as follows:

11. Minimise aggravation and inconvenience to the fishing community.
12. Communicate information discussed at the CFWG meetings to a wider audience, agreeing minutes for CFWG member approval before circulating.
13. Help E.ON complete their baseline assessment.
14. To discuss compensation arrangements if required.

2. Rampion Project Update

NH explained that E.ON has completed surveying all the areas that may be used and that the results will now be used to inform engineering and design.

SA described the Rochdale approach and how it applies to Rampion, in that a number of scenarios can be considered for turbine layout and spacing.

Action E.ON: Update CFWG on the Rochdale envelope once there is more flesh on the bones.

3. Collective concerns, issues and mitigation options

The area is consistently fished, being a productive area with lots of species.

a) Wind Farm Layout

The CFWG wish to know what E.ON intend to develop on the site, the timescale for construction and operation, and how the site will be developed, e.g. burying cables.

The turbine layout will impact how much fishermen can still operate, e.g. trawlers usually work in line with the tide, so the alignment of the turbines with the predominant tide would increase operational potential for trawlers.

b) Displacement

Displacement is a key issue which will put pressure on other areas e.g. Scallop dredgers will be moving into other areas and cause problems for the smaller operators.

Displacement may increase the geographical spread of interest, e.g. it may effect Selsey Fishermen if the development pushes fishermen from the Rampion area to Littlehampton, as then the Littlehampton fishermen may move further west to Selsy.

The displacement issue is exacerbated further by the introduction of MCZs, which displace fishing and puts more pressure on boats.

c) Mitigation

The CFWG maintain that there will be tremendous losses to commercial fishing, but they want to cooperate to minimise impact, then look to the future to stop further losses once Rampion is operating.

DS said that the primary reason the fishermen are participating in the CFWG and cooperating, is to secure compensation for lost income for the fishermen. "Wherever we end up being and whatever plan E.ON produces, it will have a negative impact on the fishing industry. We need certain criteria that we will sign up to regardless of where we end up being". The fishermen want to know what compensation will be available ASAP. They will look at accounts and charts to assess who is losing what.

SA highlighted the CFWG need to look at alternative mitigations to compensation.

NH explained how E.ON has dealt with fishermen in other offshore wind farm sites. Robin Rigg and London Array don't have this range or level of fishing activity so there were very few deals done with a few trawlers.

Humber Gateway has a good case for saying it is the most productive lobster fishing industry in the UK. A number of different schemes were considered and the fishermen didn't have a preferred option during development and construction. The

final option was for a fixed annual fee based on the size of vessel (under 10m or over 10m) rather than on their catch.

BB feels that it's up to the fishermen to negotiate but his initial reaction is that the fixed annual fee approach is not fair and it should be more closely related to production, e.g. catch or turnover.

NH reaffirmed that E.ON want and need the fishermen local to the Rampion project to continue fishing without disruption, as much as is possible. It is against company ethos to damage another industry. It is inevitable that there will be disruption from time to time, but E.ON will always strive to keep this to a minimum.

BB suggested that if E.ON know Rampion is a highly fished area and have paid compensation elsewhere, then they need to agree in principle to a compensation approach.

Action NH: Discuss the compensation issue at a senior level in E.ON and respond to the next CFWG with clarity on the in-principle intention to compensate, or otherwise.

4. Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting is intended to coincide with the production of the baseline information contained in the Baseline Report. SA will make a Powerpoint presentation of the Report to the CFWG and expects this to be in around 3 months.

5. AOB

None

CT11093

Rampion Offshore Wind Farm

Minutes: Community Project Liaison Group (PLG), 15th November 2011, 6-8pm

1. Introductions – attendance:

Chair – Sue Trimmingham – Natural PR
Secretary – Kat Ratcliffe – Natural PR

Chris Tomlinson – Rampion Development Manager, E.ON
Vaughan Weighill – Rampion Project Manager, E.ON

Frazer Coomber - SpeakUp forum
Colin Hunt - Lancing Parish Council
Stephen Meah-Sims - Newhaven Town Council
Simon Newell - Brighton & Hove Strategic Partnership
Alan Sargent - Peacehaven Town Council

Apologies:

Clare Chester - West Sussex County Council
Stella Newman - Telscombe Town Council
Jenny Pilgrim - Worthing Community Partnership
Cllr Elizabeth Taylor - Henfield Parish Council
Debbie Thomas – Bolney Parish Council
Jane Mackney – East Sussex Strategic Partnership
Tony Jackson – Henfield Community Partnership
Cllr John Livings – Telscombe Town Council
F Jones – Twineham Parish Council
Steve Coberman – Upper Beeding Parish Council
Siobhan Walker – West Sussex County Council
V Morris – Woodmancote Parish Council
Claire Hunt – waves ahead, Adur & Worthing Local Strategic Partnership

Items 2 and 5 - brief project overview and feedback

Chris Tomlinson, Development Manager for the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm project, introduced the group to the project and explained the consultation process, which will begin towards the end of January 2012 and last 12 weeks.

Following the presentation, the chair opened up for questions. The Rampion team clarified that the substation they are intending to use to connect their electricity to the grid is at Twineham near Bolney.

Social media was suggested as a way to engage with people who may otherwise be harder to reach. Chris said he had considered this but had concerns about sufficient resources to respond to every message on the project via Twitter or Facebook. It was suggested social media should at least be used to promote the consultation events.

Another suggestion was for the Rampion team to contact organisations individually to find out how they would like to be involved and how best to communicate with them, as different groups may well have different preferences. The Rampion team said they were already contacting organisations individually with this in mind. Representatives, including Simon Newell and Alan Sargent, offered to help by working with others to filter information into hard to reach groups.

The topic of where the cables will cross land at the coastline was brought up by a representative of the group and the Rampion team said they are currently investigating different options. Vaughan noted it is an extremely dense area in population terms so considerations and assessments are ongoing before they reach a decision. The chosen landing points will be on display during the consultation period.

The process of laying the cables underground was discussed and the Rampion team assured the group they would be minimising disruption as much as possible. Questions arose concerning whether the wind turbines would be visible from the shore. The Rampion team said they would be on a clear day but should appear quite small, as the turbines would be located between 8 and 14 miles offshore.

A number of group representatives were interested to know the general consensus of those living near current offshore wind farms regarding their appearance. The Rampion team said residents could be fearful of change, however, research had shown these residents typically became more supportive once the wind farms were up and running, with many becoming advocates of renewable energy.

Group representatives asked if they could have an impact on project-based decisions. The Rampion team said there would be a meaningful consultation process and they would respond to any feedback or criticism. Technology-based aspects of the project such as the design and model of turbines and foundations may be difficult to alter. However, other details such as the scheduling and accessibility during construction could potentially be influenced. The reasons why some decisions cannot be influenced will be made clear through the public consultation.

It was suggested that keeping the local population informed throughout the whole process is fundamental to building a positive relationship with the community and the Rampion team confirmed this will remain their objective as the project progresses.

Items 3 and 4 - role and purpose of PLGs and representatives

Chris explained that given the scale and diversity of the community they are wishing to engage and consult with, the PLG initiative was designed to help reach out to a broader network of organisations and individuals across a range of interest areas. The Rampion team identified the organisations to be represented on the PLGs from their stakeholder list of 2000+ local organisations who are well networked and represent particular interest groups. Chris highlighted that local authorities, county councils and Natural PR had all helped contribute to the identification of those best networked organisations. The objective and role of the PLG representatives is to provide a two-way information dissemination process, to filter project information back to their peers, as well as feedback comments and ideas from their interest groups back to E.ON. Through this process, E.ON is aiming to raise awareness of the offshore wind farm and the consultation process throughout Sussex.

The chair asked if the group was happy to continue attending the PLG meetings, which representatives agreed to (the next one will be recorded as part of the consultation document) and invited feedback. The broad principles of openness, transparency and representatives having a fair chance to have their say during meetings were noted as important for the Terms of Reference.

Representatives asked for clarification that the Rampion team are not asking them to effectively do their consultation work for them. Chris said the PLG would not replace the Rampion team talking directly to councils and other organisations about specific issues and concerns but it would be useful if they could help raise awareness, even if this was just through informal word of mouth. In return,

the Rampion team would listen, respond and potentially act upon any feedback they received from the group on behalf of individuals in their networks.

The group agreed an excellent channel of communication would be to utilise the parish council newsletters, which are delivered to every door in various areas, for example the 'Peacehaven Times'.

Item 6 - PLGs going forward

The importance of having clear contacts for the project was discussed and Chris said he would be the main contact for the project and Kat for anything PLG related, such as minutes, meeting logistics and agenda items. Arrangements for the next meetings were then discussed, with representatives noting that Tuesday is not ideal as a lot of parish councils meet then and Brighton and Hove City Council meets on a Thursday. However, the group agreed they could be fairly flexible and the most important thing is notice. The location of the meeting was relatively straightforward for representatives to get to.

It was asked whether representatives could send substitutes and Chris confirmed this would be acceptable, providing they could feedback to others and that each representative organisation is restricted to just one named substitute, otherwise the group will lose its cohesion and continuity.

The group also asked if they could see the minutes from other groups and a list of representatives in each PLG. The attendance lists and minutes for each PLG group will be in the public domain and uploaded onto the Rampion project website.

Actions: Rampion team and Natural PR have put together Terms of Reference (attached for comment), which will need to be agreed by the group.

PLG representatives to use Kat Ratcliffe (kat@naturalpr.biz) as the main contact for details on PLG meetings/minutes/agenda and Chris Tomlinson (chris.tomlinson@eon.com) as the main contact for project-related enquiries.

Kat to send out lists of all the PLG representatives with the minutes.

Item 7 - review representation on PLG

The Peacehaven parish council representative said he was happy to feedback to Telscombe. Seaford Town Council was noted as missing from the list and Chris said they are already in contact with Seaford but may revisit this with regards to inviting them to the PLG.

Item 8 - review consultation event venues

The group considered the venue suggestions and put forward ideas, such as needing both footfall and accessibility. One representative strongly suggested just one event in one location would not be sufficient for Brighton and Hove considering the population (approx 250,000). The Rampion team said they would look into this but may not have the resources to do multiple events in the city. As a compromise it was suggested that 'tasters' could be put up in various locations with a scaled-down version of the exhibition (information stands) containing the main details. This could stimulate awareness and would not need to be manned.

Actions: Rampion team to consider suggestions and practicalities of venue options.

Post meeting note: The Rampion Team have agreed to an additional event in Peacehaven and an event in Hove.

Item 9 - dates and times for future meeting

The Rampion team suggested March would be most suitable for the second meeting as this gives everyone time to absorb the information during the consultation period, as well as listen to feedback from others which can then be brought to the group. The group supported this suggestion.

Item 10 - agenda for next meeting

Agenda items should be sent to Kat in advance of the meeting. The meeting date will be notified in January.

Item 11 - AOB

Chris will visit as many organisations as possible between January and March – contact him if you would like him to present to your group / organisation.

Alan Sargent offered to put forward project information for the Peacehaven parish council newsletter.

Actions: Rampion team to send over content / images in time to make the parish council newsletters before consultation begins.

Minutes: Community Project Liaison Group (PLG), 23rd April 2012

1. Introductions - attendance:

Chair – Sue Trimmingham – Natural PR
Secretary – Kat Ratcliffe – Natural PR

Chris Tomlinson – Rampion Development
Manager, E.ON
Vaughan Weighill – Rampion Project Manager,
E.ON

Claire Hunt – Waves Ahead Local Strategic
Partnership
Cat Fletcher – Brighton & Hove Community &
Voluntary Sector Forum
Alan Sargent – Peacehaven Town Council
Annie Hirst – Twineham Parish Council

Apologies:

Colin Hunt - Lancing Parish Council
Stephen Meah-Sims - Newhaven Town Council
Clare Chester - West Sussex County Council
Cllr Elizabeth Taylor - Henfield Parish Council
Tony Jackson – Henfield Community Partnership

2. Approval of minutes

The minutes from 15th November were approved by the group.

3. Presentation on draft proposal and community consultation

CT reminded the group of the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm project and updated representatives on the community consultation so far. Over 4500 people had attended the 12 public exhibition events and over 1000 questionnaires received back to date.

4. Feedback from PLG representatives – on community consultation proposal, the consultation process and opinion of peers

i. General feedback

CT invited feedback from the group on the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm project. Representatives noted key interests in the local community were employment opportunities and the maintenance base location. In general, the group noted feedback had been positive, with good awareness (flyers had been circulated to 390,000 households across Sussex), and high attendance at the public exhibitions.

The Community & Voluntary Sector Forum representative informed the team that she had spoken to a number of people who were concerned about the cable route going through the South Downs National Park.

VW acknowledged that this was an issue raised by a number of groups and that one of the messages E.ON were taking back was the need to explain in more detail the rationale behind the route identified and the reasons why connection cannot be made nearer the coast or a more direct route taken through the National Park.

A criticism of the spotlights used for the exhibition boards not being of an energy efficient type was noted. CT explained that the lighting was from the exhibition hire company and that E.ON had provided this feedback to the company.

Action: Ensure environmentally friendly spotlights are used for future Rampion exhibitions.

In terms of decommissioning, CT confirmed that E.ON were legally obliged to make sure the wind farm was completely removed at the end of its lifetime. This would be secured both via planning conditions and Crown Estate requirements as the landlord, typically backed up by bank guarantees or bonds that are put in place so that decommissioning can take place (even if the operator ceases to trade). It was also clarified that the wind farm could well last longer than 20-25 years, as specified in the consultation document, through refurbishing components. However, by this point it may make sense to replace the turbines with newer models, which would require updated planning permissions if they differed substantially to the machines being replaced.

ii. Project cost and community benefits

CT confirmed E.ON was paying for 100% of the cost of the project and would recoup the investment from retail of the electricity.

The group asked whether Section 106 obligations, and community benefits will apply for this project. CT noted that Section 106 agreements are a means of mitigating impacts from the project and often delivering community benefits and are quite likely to be discussed with consultees as part of the application. In terms of community benefits, E.ON has always provided some form of benefit to towns/villages near existing offshore wind farms, as part of its good neighbour policy, for instance a £1m fund for communities near its Robin Rigg wind farm. It is difficult to make any decisions yet, especially as Sussex is a large and diverse community but E.ON are keen to hear ideas from across this broader community which could potentially be considered in due course.

The group agreed the Community PLG could be really helpful for advising on potential community benefits in the future.

Action: Community benefits (including section 106) to be discussed as project progresses with assistance from Community PLG.

iii. Bolney substation

AH from Twineham Parish Council fed back to the Rampion team that there were a lot of concerns amongst the parish about the location of the new substation and the associated construction work / disruption it could cause. She also highlighted that the area of search was not well screened by trees. Therefore, it was likely people living along Bob Lane would have a clear view of the new substation. It was noted that if E.ON plan to plant more trees to help with screening, semi-mature trees would be more effective as new trees could take up to 20 years to grow tall enough to hide the substation. VW confirmed that E.ON were going to write directly to residents within the vicinity of the proposed development and offer meetings to discuss this further before a decision on the final siting of the substation is made.

Local residents had already faced a significant amount of traffic with a recent development and were therefore feeling sensitive towards the Rampion project. VW clarified that E.ON will work to minimise the amount of disruption which construction of the substation will cause, and has noted

concerns raised about the particular access route and issues which need to be addressed, for instance ensuring contractors use a wheel wash to prevent mud being left on the roads.

The group agreed that there needs to be a process in place whereby the relevant parish councils and so forth are informed as soon as a key decision has been made, for example Twineham Parish Council ought to be quickly notified once the substation location has been confirmed.

CT said he was grateful of the feedback which was all useful, and reiterated that the team would mitigate against both the visual impact and access during and post construction where possible.

Action: Rampion team need to investigate the search area for the Bolney substation further (including from different viewpoints), respond to feedback from residents in the area and keep stakeholders updated.

Action: Rampion team to inform relevant contacts and councils when key decisions are made that will / could affect the local area.

Action: Twineham Parish Council to be informed of key decisions on new substation before media.

Action: Giles Sibun to arrange meetings with residents and / or landowners who may be affected by any of the onshore aspects of the project and wish to discuss the plans further.

iv. Questionnaire responses

Representatives asked whether the Rampion team were analysing the community consultation questionnaires as they went. CT clarified they would begin analysing questionnaires once all the data has been inputted, following the close of the consultation on May 6th.

According to a number of the representatives, a key questionnaire query from their peers was likely to be why E.ON had not been able to use / build a substation closer to the shore. CT clarified that the local distribution system (which includes Southern Cross, to which Shoreham power station connects, and Fishersgate substations) did not have the capacity to receive the amount of electricity the Rampion wind farm would generate (700MW). E.ON would have preferred a connection route which was shorter, cheaper and easier to consent had there been a credible alternative to the current proposed connection solution.

Representatives congratulated E.ON on the overall community consultation effort in terms of getting the messages out and promoting the public exhibitions. They noted that the high turnout at the exhibitions reflected this.

v. Employment opportunities

The Rampion team were currently liaising with Marine South East and were holding events (so far in Shoreham and Newhaven, with another planned for Chichester) to map out which companies were out there locally and where they could potentially slot into the supply chain. E.ON was keen to use UK content as much as possible throughout the project.

It was asked whether the Rampion team had considered a full economic impact assessment. VW clarified that this was work in progress and will be included in the socio economic impact chapter of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

It was agreed by a number of the group that Newhaven as a community had felt a little let down by the recent incinerator development as the company concerned had not used local resources (B&Bs, hotels, trade firms etc). It was therefore important for the Rampion team to use local where possible in order to build a positive relationship with the town.

The group also enquired about apprenticeship schemes and suggested a partnership with City College could be beneficial for local youths keen to gain practical work experience whilst studying. VW and CT agreed this should be looked into and confirmed that the team were currently running a bursary competition at both Brighton and Sussex Universities.

Action: Rampion team to explore apprenticeship scheme options and partnership working with City College and report back to the group at the next meeting. Also, keep stakeholders updated with employment opportunities.

vi. Statutory consultation

Representatives raised concerns about whether six weeks was long enough for all the various groups to collect feedback from their representatives and put together a response. CT confirmed there were 40 statutory organisations included and that the team had been engaging with them throughout the last two years and would continue to do so. VW clarified that they had already increased the period from the statutory minimum of 28 days to six weeks but were willing to consider feedback on extending this period.

Action: Rampion team to consider feedback on extending statutory consultation period and report back (*CT to inform all PLG representatives of exact statutory consultation dates very soon).

5. How to reach hard to reach groups

CT explained that they had been finding it difficult to attract and engage the younger demographic (under 40s). This was probably fairly common with most community consultations but the team were keen to do what they could to reach out to this group:

- An education strategy will be planned this summer to target schools in the area
- Brighton University consultation event planned for April 26th at Cockcroft (promoted via Facebook, posters, internal email to all staff and students)
- E.ON sponsoring the Children's Parade (May 5th) and will have a stand where they can talk to parents and their children about the project

i. Education strategy

The group agreed it made sense to build on those who were already successfully engaging with children and young people in Sussex.

Action: The Brighton & Hove Community & Voluntary Sector Forum representative will send CT contact details for Dr Dan Dannaha (Environmental Schools Network) who may be able to advise on the Education Strategy. CT should also contact the Job Centre and Dorothy Stringer School for useful information.

ii. Communication channels

The Rampion team were asked whether they were attending the Eco Technology Fair in June – CT confirmed they had been invited to exhibit but were prioritising the consultation for now and it falls a little late for the community consultation. However, CT is in contact with the organisers and is considering how to take part, if not this year then next year.

The Rampion team confirmed that people will still be able to comment on the project, particularly the EIA, following the community consultation deadline (May 6th) via email or letter but there would not be an official questionnaire.

Action: Rampion team must make clear what opportunities people have to comment on the plans and clarify the difference between the community and statutory consultations.

Representatives raised social media as a topic and CT confirmed that they had a Facebook page (<http://www.facebook.com/rampionwindfarm>) and had been updating it daily. The group also enquired about using shopping centres as a place to attract a high number of people but CT explained that this was not always the right demographic (i.e. local people who live in the area) as reflected during the Public Information Event held in Brighton's Churchill Square in 2011.

6. Outstanding action points

None - the PLG Terms of Reference had been sent to the group; the Rampion team had taken on board venue suggestions for the public exhibitions; introduced an additional public exhibition in Hove, and targeted all the parish council newsletters.

7. PLG Terms of Reference – agreement

The Terms of Reference were agreed.

8. Date and time of next meeting

Mid September is a good milestone as the application for consent will be submitted either just before or just after a meeting in September. We can also start planning for the future. CT clarified people will be able to comment on the proposal post the May 6th community consultation in relation to the draft Environmental Statement (ES) which will be published on the Rampion website in early June (*CT to inform all PLG representatives of exact statutory consultation dates very soon).

The ES provides a technical assessment of the baseline data and the impacts, mitigations and any residual impacts of our proposal. You will be able to respond to this during the public consultation under Section 48 of the Planning Act and a notice will be placed in local papers advising you of the period during which you can submit your comments. All PLG representatives will be informed of the time period for the statutory consultation very soon.

Action: CT to email stakeholders a brief update (headlines) at particular key moments throughout the project – e.g. when statutory consultation has started and finished.

Action: Notify representatives at least four weeks prior to next meeting.

9. AOB

None

Minutes: Council Officers Project Liaison Group (PLG), 18th April 2012

1. Introductions - attendance:

Chair – Sue Trimmingham – Natural PR
Secretary – Kat Ratcliffe – Natural PR

Chris Tomlinson – Rampion Development
Manager, E.ON
Eleri Owen – Rampion Consent Manager, E.ON

Alan Buck – Brighton & Hove City Council
Thurstan Crockett – Brighton & Hove City Council
Ellen Reith – East Sussex County Council
Lucy Knott – Lewes District Council
Tim Bartlett – Lewes District Council
David Cranmer – South Downs National Park
Authority
Emma Parnaby – Horsham District Council

Apologies:

Vera Gajic – East Sussex County Council
Andrew Marsh – Mid Sussex Council

***Individuals names are written as their initials e.g. Chris Tomlinson = CT**

2. Presentation on draft proposal and community consultation

CT reminded the group of the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm project and updated representatives on the community consultation so far. Over 4500 people had attended the 12 public exhibition events and over 1000 questionnaires received back to date.

3. Feedback from PLG representatives – on community consultation proposal, the consultation process and opinion of peers

i. Access to the South Downs National Park

It was suggested that the Rampion team should contact the National Grid to find out how they got on with recent development work on pylons in the South Downs. It could be useful to explore the lessons learned regarding getting messages out to stakeholders during construction, such as walkers who need to know where diversions are in place and for how long. Sufficient signage (along with a clear explanation) was noted as important. Local pubs and car parks were suggested as useful hubs to put up posters / maps along with contact information.

Action: CT contact National Grid (as above) and consider using car parks and pubs as information hubs.

ii. The port decision

CT clarified that the decision on whether to use Shoreham or Newhaven port as the operations and maintenance base for the project could still take some time but they would not keep both options open unnecessarily and would let stakeholders know as soon as a decision had been made, which could be as early as this summer.

Action: CT / VW to get back to stakeholders over next month (May) with an approximate decision date.

iii. Community benefits

Whether or not a visitor centre would be built was raised by a representative and CT clarified that he could not confirm any community benefits until consent had been given. He explained that they were going to have to think carefully about where to put a visitor centre if this was agreed as an option because of the size of the community and the wide geographical area involved. They may have to come up with something relatively unique. A couple of representatives noted their support for a visitor centre of some sort.

Action: David Cranmer to forward news article on National Policy Statements review to EO.

iv. The cable route

Concerns regarding the chosen cable route were raised. Representatives noted that, as alternative options were not highlighted in the plans, it did not look like there had been much of a process behind the decision or room for amendments. EO clarified that the process behind the chosen cable route had been incredibly extensive, from minimising environmental impacts to building relationships with land owners.

EO noted that she appreciated there was not a great deal of detail in the community consultation document. However, this was intentional so as to make it user friendly for the entire community. Detailed and technical information would be presented in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

A couple of representatives noted that there were people within various local groups who were concerned about the connection at Bolney.

Action: EO to ensure sufficient details on why the connection had to be at Bolney is included in the EIA.

Action: Rampion team to use David Cranmer as central point of contact for SDNPA.

v. General feedback

According to representatives, feedback in general had been mixed with a relatively even split for and against the project. Common concerns were based around:

- Wind turbines not working effectively
- Access for boats / fishing
- Impact on wildlife

Concerns regarding shadow flicker had also been recorded (where an image appears inside a property from a turbine whilst the sun is low in the sky). EO confirmed that each of these topics would be discussed separately and in detail within the EIA, but that shadow flicker has not previously been raised in relation to existing offshore wind farms (due to the distance from dwellings) but would look into this.

Action: EO to raise possibility of shadow flicker with consultants

In Brighton & Hove, the feedback had been overwhelmingly positive according to the TC and AB from Brighton & Hove Council.

Worries of noise had also been raised and CT clarified that there would be no noise from the wind turbines once they were up and running as they were too far out to sea. However, they would be monitoring noise levels throughout the project, including during construction. In terms of fish, EO clarified that the bases of the turbines were likely to act as a reef and attract fish. Again, more detail on the potential impacts would be provided in the EIA.

4. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) overview

EO explained the Rochdale envelope approach to the group. In summary, E.ON was consulting on the worst case scenarios for all aspects of the Rampion project.

The statutory and community consultations were clarified, including the timescales of each (community: 12 weeks, statutory: 6 weeks). EO confirmed that stakeholders would be able to comment on the plans during the statutory consultation via email and letter. It was also clarified that engagement would be ongoing and individuals would be able to continue discussions on any outstanding issues post-submission if necessary. However, the aim for the Rampion team was to create statements of common ground and to get as much agreed as possible prior to submitting the application.

Action: EO email presentation to KR to send out to group along with minutes.

5. Outstanding action points

None – this is the first formal Council Officers PLG meeting.

6. PLG Terms of Reference – agreement

Action: KR to send ToR out to all Council Officers and sign off if no response.

7. Date and time of next meeting

It was agreed it would be useful to meet earlier than planned to assist with the EIA response. Around three weeks into the six week statutory consultation period was agreed upon. Note: avoid Queens Jubilee.

Action: EO to invite RSK environmental consultants to next meeting.

8. AOB

EO confirmed that the EIA would be ready around May 14th and local authorities would be formally notified. EO also assured the group that councils and so forth could put in a draft response and amend later if they did not have sufficient time.

A suggestion was put forward to the Rampion team to run a set of seminars to explain and assist with the statutory consultation.

Action: Rampion team to ensure representatives are made aware of section 42 consultation, clarify the timescale and how they can respond. (*Draft ES will be available early June; CT to inform all PLG representatives of exact statutory consultation dates very soon).

DC of the SDNPA explained that they were currently under some pressure from their representatives to do their own consultation on the project. He explained there are many people who do not realise that the SDNPA are a governing body and do not own the land but they had been receiving a significant number of enquiries from people assuming they were the consulting body.

Action: SDNPA to redirect enquiries to CT if unable to answer.

EP from Horsham District Council suggested that the Rampion brand was important, especially in Brighton & Hove, in order to encourage Sussex to get behind the project. The wind farm should be marketed as 'unique' and 'quirky'.

Minutes: Council Officers Project Liaison Group (PLG), 17 July 2012

1. Introductions - attendance:

Chair – Paula Seager – Natural PR
Secretary – Kat Ratcliffe – Natural PR
Chris Tomlinson – Rampion Development
Manager, E.ON
Eleri Owen – Rampion Consents Manager,
E.ON
Mike Harris - Planning Inspectorate (PINS)

Jaine Huntley – West Sussex County Council
Chris Jones – Adur and Worthing Councils
Katie Rasdall – Brighton & Hove City Council
Catherine Howe – Horsham District Council
Tim Bartlett – Lewes District Council
Celia Austin – Mid Sussex Council
Susan Bragg – West Sussex County Council
David Cranmer – South Downs National Park Authority

Apologies:

James Appleton - Adur and Worthing Councils
Vera Gajic - East Sussex County Council
Ellen Reith - East Sussex County Council
Lindsay Frost – Lewes District Council
Andrew Marsh – Mid Sussex Council
Thurstan Crockett – Brighton & Hove City Council

***Individuals names are written as their initials e.g. Chris Tomlinson = CT**

1&2. Presentation on application process by Mike Harris, Case Manager, National Infrastructure Directorate (PINS), followed by a Q&A with PLG representatives

i. The application process

MH noted he would only be present during the first part of the meeting and presented an overview of the role of PINS and how local authorities fit into the process. He also clarified the Rochdale envelope approach, which addresses the ‘worst case scenario’, and confirmed this was especially applicable for wind farm projects as there were many unknown elements, such as ground / sea conditions and technological advances to be considered. Timings were also clarified (see presentation slides). Please note: DCO stands for Development Consent Order.

ii. Responses from local authorities

DC asked whether PINS were looking for a purely technical response from local authorities or whether subjective / political views were also allowed. MH clarified that they should report the local impacts, whatever they may be. It was most important that PINS have all the information available in order to make an accurate examination. Local authorities should focus on reporting the local impacts so that they can be mitigated against.

It was asked by a couple of representatives how best to prevent duplication from local authorities with the consultation responses the Rampion team will send to PINS and the local impact study. MH clarified the local impact study should be a lot tighter and specific to the impacts on the local authority’s area but it was likely there would be some crossover of issues.

Action: MH to send link (NI advice note 1) to KR to distribute to PLG.

MH confirmed that the Rampion project was half way through sections 42 and 48 (statutory and wider public consultations). During a discussion on timing, DC highlighted some concerns regarding the turnover for the 'adequacy of consultation statement'.

DC also asked whether the section 42 response, which would take a great deal of work in itself, could be refined and used as a basis for the local impact report, containing more finalised viewpoints on local impacts and issues. MH noted as far as he was aware this was not the norm but there was no set format either, so it was ultimately up to them.

TB asked whether Mike had experienced other similar projects with multiple local authorities. MH confirmed he had recently worked on a port scheme which was similar in terms of crossing local authority boundaries and clarified the authority classification process (As, Bs (main), Cs and Ds). Other clarifications made included confirmation of who has to front the cost of the examination process (the developer, i.e. EON) and the importance of pre-application in terms of getting most of the work done in the early stages to avoid any 'surprises' later on.

Action: If any representatives have any further questions please email Mike Harris on Mike.Harris@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk

Action: MH to send meeting note and link to NPR to circulate to PLG.

Action: CT to find out whether the Rampion team can share all local authority PLG consultation responses with the group to assist them with their local impact reports.

EO clarified that the team were hoping to submit their Consent Application, including a Draft DCO, final Environmental Statement (ES) and consultation report to PINS in Mid October, unless there were significant changes to the proposals which would require further consultation.

Action: Rampion team to provide local authorities with a warning on the submission date in plenty of time to help with management resources.

3. Presentation on Environmental Statement by Eleri Owen, Consents Manager, Rampion Offshore Wind Farm, E.ON

i. Consultation recap and current status

EO re-capped on the consultation process to date. It was clarified that the online version of the draft Environmental Statement (ES) did not include the appendices yet but they were working on this. However, the DVD included all appendices.

Action: EO chase-up inclusion of appendices in web version of draft ES.

Action: Representatives to email EO or CT if further information is needed, for example if specific data is required.

EO also clarified that following the current consultation, the Rampion team would finalise the ES and submit the Final ES, the consultation report and Draft DCO to PINS.

TB noted there was clarity needed regarding noise impacts, especially for divers, snorkelers and so forth. The information provided suggested there could be an impact up to 40km away but more clarity and detail was required to ensure sea users were safe and how to mitigate against any risks.

EO confirmed that they were seriously considering and examining the impact on divers and other sea users of a similar nature and were consulting on the worst case scenario (Rochdale envelope) and that this was on-going. She also confirmed that noise was recognised as a potential impact on divers and other sea users and that was part of the reason the met mast piling date was moved from the original planned bank holiday weekend when more people were likely to be diving and surfing etc. Communication is also key, hence the three circulation emails to let as many relevant people and groups know as possible. CT apologised for any cross postings but it was generally accepted that it was better to have notification two or three times, than not at all.

ii. Community consultation responses

EO clarified that a lot of the responses had been supportive but there had also been a number of valid concerns raised related to both general wind farm concerns and more site-specific issues (see presentation slides).

A representative asked how E.ON were planning to use local content (a common concern) and CT explained they had already been using local companies where possible, such as Natural PR, and were currently supporting a supply chain study led by Marine South East and in partnership with local authorities and county councils. The objective of the study is to raise awareness of Rampion construction contracts with as many local companies as possible, to give them the opportunity to bid for contracts with Tier 1 companies.

Action: EO to ensure a local content section is included in the final version of the ES.

4. Feedback and questions from PLG members

TB raised a concern about putting visitors off the South Coast during the wind farm construction. He noted this could have serious repercussions if people's trips were disturbed or dampened as a result of the construction; it could then take a while for confidence in that particular town / area to be restored. CT registered this feedback and also highlighted that work would not necessarily need to be carried out across the entire offshore wind farm site for the duration of the construction period. EO also noted that the impact on tourism was very difficult to quantify and most responses are based on perceived impacts rather than empirical evidence.

EO confirmed that a visitors centre(s) was highly likely and that E.ON take community benefits very seriously, but at this point it was too early to confirm anything.

Action: Local authorities near cable route to contact EO to arrange meeting to discuss DCO provisions.

Action: Local authorities to try to let EO know which individual is responsible for working on the DCO.

SB asked whether they would be able to comment on the application post acceptance and the team explained that PINS would write to all the local authorities to ask what their thoughts were on the development (section 43). If the plans were accepted, E.ON would also have to advertise widely in newspapers and so forth. Key groups / organisations would be able to register with PINS as an 'interested party'.

Action: EO to send KR the presentation slides to distribute to PLG.

Action: If any of the representatives have any specific issues please get in touch with EO as soon as possible before 8 August deadline to arrange a meeting.

In their Scoping response, Adur and Brighton & Hove City Council suggested Shoreham Harbour redevelopment was considered as a cumulative impact, but it's not mentioned in the draft ES.

Action: EO check and report back.

TB raised the topic of onshore noise and informed the group of some experience he had had with elderly people living on Telescombe Cliffs who can pick up lower frequencies of noise than most people under a specific set of ambient conditions. He had received a few concerns on this and wanted to be able to reassure anyone worried that they would not be affected by any noise on the shore, low frequencies or otherwise. He went on to highlight ETSU R-97 (the wind energy noise assessment guide) was drafted for smaller onshore turbines, whereas Rampion would have very large turbines. TB imagined it's not a real problem but an issue of perception.

TB raised a concern about whether it would be too late by the time they found out the exact noise produced during the wind farm / cable route construction (piling was a particular concern). EO assured the group that provisions would be submitted alongside the DCO which would include a section on noise within the 'statement of engagement'.

Action: EO clarified that, although it would be extremely unlikely that there would be an impact from noise when the turbines were operating (as they have already undertaken ambient noise measurements), she would flag up this issue with their noise experts and report back during the next meeting to clarify.

5. Approval of minutes from last PLG meeting

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

Action: KR to circulate PLG email addresses to the group when sending out the minutes.

6. Outstanding action points from last meeting

Using pubs as 'hubs' for information on the cable route and so forth – on-going

O&M Port decision – CT announced this was due in August

Provide sufficient detail on cable route in draft ES – There are a number of chapters addressing the cable route in the draft ES but if any representatives wish to discuss this further, please contact CT or EO who can also liaise with RSK

Shadow Flicker – EO had flagged this up with RSK and virtually no risk was confirmed due to the distance from shore

7. What happens next

This was already covered during the meeting. CT and EO emphasised the consultation deadline: **Wednesday 8th August 2012.**

8. PLG Terms of Reference – agreement

Agreed

9. Date and time of next meeting

It was agreed it would be useful to next meet end October / early November. This gives PLG representatives time to digest the information within the final proposals, final ES and consultation report.

Action: The PLG representatives asked whether the Rampion team could put together a CD containing all section 42 consultation responses to share with the group. EO to check and report back.

10. AOB

None

Rampion Offshore Wind Farm

Minutes: Environment Project Liaison Group (PLG), 16th November 2011, 2-4pm

1. Introductions - attendance:

Chair - Paula Seager - Natural PR
Secretary - Kat Ratcliffe - Natural PR

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

Steve Ankers - South Downs Society
Dave Burges - RSPB Sussex
Emily Cox - Greenpeace Brighton & Hove
Stuart Meier - CPRE Sussex
Erin Pettifer - Sussex Wildlife Trust
Brenda Pollack - Friends of the Earth South East
Brianna Reeve - Shoreham District Ornithological Society
David Smith - Mid Sussex Sustainability Partnership & Mid Sussex Partnership
Chris Todd - Brighton & Hove City Sustainability Partnership & Secretary of the
South Downs Network

Apologies:

Kristen Guida - Climate South East
Mr Thorpe - South Downs Society
Alison Walters - South East Forum for
Sustainability

Items 2 and 5 - brief project overview and feedback

Chris Tomlinson, Development Manager for the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm project, introduced the group to the project and explained the consultation process, which will begin towards the end of January 2012 and last 12 weeks.

Following the presentation, the chair opened up for questions. A couple of clarifications were required regarding accessing the presentation slides and the number of homes the wind farm would provide electricity for: 430,000 on average, which is two thirds of the domestic needs of Sussex. The discussion then led on to the visual impact of the project and what would be seen from the shore. The Rampion team confirmed that the turbines would be seen in the distance on a clear day, 8 – 14 miles offshore.

A number of representatives wished for the process of undergrounding the cables both on- and offshore to be clarified. Eleri and Chris explained this and noted that it is intended to construct a new substation next to the existing substation at Bolney, off Wineham Lane, and E.ON has an agreement with the National Grid to connect here. It would have been far more convenient for E.ON to connect the power nearer the coast but this simply was not possible. The trench widths / depths were then clarified – four sets of cables would be undergrounded in a 15m wide trench, with a 40m corridor width required (for an access track and excavated material) during construction.

Queries were raised on how the wind farm could impact on large mammals and marine life in the sea. Eleri clarified that a wide range of ongoing environmental surveys were underway. The wind turbine foundations may act as an artificial reef and attract more marine life. Based on their experience with other such projects, the Rampion team had minimal concerns post-construction as to harming marine life. During construction there were however potential problems, namely the

noise of the machines, particularly during pile driving if large monopiles are to be used, and the use of certain vessels which could cause injuries. Ongoing work looking at mitigating any risks to marine life was vital and bird / mammal surveys formed a key part of this work. A group representative suggested seals should be included as potentially at risk. The Rampion team said they were unlikely to use monopile foundation technology for all the turbines as research had shown other foundation types would be required for the turbines in deeper water. Offshore cables are buried to variable depths, which are dependent on the seabed ground conditions and the need to protect the cable from vessels operating in the area. The cooling of the cables was also clarified, accounted for by the insulation material surrounding the cable and the spacing between cables.

A number of people raised concerns about birds and Eleri explained that detailed surveys had been ongoing on a monthly basis for almost two years. E.ON is also in various discussions with RSPB and Natural England amongst other relevant organisations and has recently upped the frequency of surveys to twice monthly, during the spring and autumn months. They had also been studying onshore records and were beginning to put together reports from their baseline data on numerous issues, including collisions. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will highlight areas to avoid for the cabling route. Both Sussex and Shoreham ornithological societies were suggested by group representatives as being able to provide a wealth of data.

The met mast was queried and Chris confirmed that the plan was for it to be erected around eight miles off the coast, in late spring 2012. The discussion then turned back to the cabling route and how E.ON were planning to avoid major conservation areas and domestic households. Eleri clarified that they were undertaking full ecology surveys to identify a preferred cable route / areas of concern. The team said they were in discussions with landowners to find the most suitable and least damaging route possible. A representative mentioned the mapping of 'tranquillity areas' and Eleri said she would check this was included in the EIA.

The type of cabling was brought up and the Rampion team clarified that it was the type already used for transporting electricity. They could provide more details on the technical aspects of the cabling (cooling and materials etc) as requested. The issue of cable security was brought up in terms of the access pits and how safe the cabling would be and the Rampion team assured the group this was already a priority.

In terms of wider benefits for the Sussex community, a number of the group asked whether it would be possible to simultaneously remove other visual intrusions by undergrounding other cables currently visible. The Rampion team said this was not an option as it would be considered as an entirely separate project by the planning authority, it would constitute a major infrastructure project in itself and it was owned and operated by another company. They would however, do their utmost to ensure anything touched during the trenching process was returned to its previous condition (hedges etc) if not improved; environmental and land mitigation was a top priority.

Bats were noted by Eleri as being one of their concerns for Sussex and were currently being studied in detail. Butterfly conservation was highlighted as important and Eleri agreed to double check it was being included in the data. Furthermore, the team clarified that the ecological survey would identify ecological networks in terms of both woodland and grassland. Acid grass was mentioned by a representative as important and suggested Eleri should check this was being considered in the EIA.

The EIA (including non-technical summary) was currently in draft form whilst finalising the cable route and other aspects of the project but would be made available when finished.

A number of the group asked where the cabling would be landing on the coast, however the Rampion team were unable to provide the finalised plans yet. The route will be revealed in January along with reasoning for why each part of the route has been chosen.

Actions: Kat to email presentation slides out alongside minutes. Eleri to check butterfly conservation, acid grass assessment and mapping of 'tranquillity areas' are included in EIA.

3. Role and purpose of PLGs and representatives

Chris explained that given the scale and diversity of the community they are wishing to engage and consult with, the PLG initiative was designed to help reach out to a broader network of organisations and individuals across a range of interest areas. The Rampion team identified the organisations to be represented on the PLGs from their stakeholder list of 2000+ local organisations who are well networked and represent particular interest groups. Chris highlighted that local authorities, county councils and Natural PR had all helped contribute to the identification of those best networked organisations. The objective and role of the PLG representatives is to provide a two-way information dissemination process, to filter project information back to their peers, as well as feedback comments and ideas from their interest groups back to E.ON. Through this process, E.ON is aiming to raise awareness of the offshore wind farm and the consultation process throughout Sussex.

The chair asked if the group was happy to continue attending the PLG meetings, which representatives agreed to (the next one of five in total will be recorded as part of the consultation document) and invited feedback. Chris clarified this was not a substitute to formally consulting the community but was an integral part of the process, offering an additional form of communication rather than a substitute.

Action: Chris to send out list of environmental groups for representatives to check contact details.

4. Terms of Reference

Broad principles of openness, transparency and representatives having a fair chance to have their say during meetings, were noted as important for the Terms of Reference.

A couple of representatives noted they were present on behalf of organisations but did not wish to be recorded as formally representing the organisation.

A section on contributing to the group 'without prejudice' was suggested for inclusion.

Action: Rampion team and Natural PR have put together Terms of Reference (find attached to comment) which must be agreed by the group.

6. The PLGs going forward

The group were keen to know who was attending each group and what they were discussing, which should be agreed in the agenda and minutes. Chris suggested a drop-down menu from the new Rampion website specifically for the PLGs which could contain this information as well as details on future meetings.

The attendance lists and minutes for each PLG group will be in the public domain and uploaded onto the Rampion project website.

The time, day and location of the PLG meeting was agreed as suitable and there were no suggestions made for changing this.

PLG representatives to use Kat Ratcliffe (kat@naturalpr.biz) as the main contact for details on PLG meetings/agenda/minutes and Chris Tomlinson (chris.tomlinson@eon.com) as the main contact for project-related enquiries. Kat to send out group representative lists with the minutes.

7. Review representation on PLG

The group suggested a few organisations which might be appropriate to add to the PLG list, namely the Sussex Botanical Recording Society, the Federation of Sussex Amenity Societies and Action in Rural Sussex. Another suggestion was to ensure the Universities were well-informed via links with group representatives who had research connections.

Action: Chris/Kat to check those mentioned are included in stakeholder list to receive information and newsletters and consult if appropriate.

8. Review consultation event venues

The group considered the venues suggested for the public consultation events, including a Mid Sussex venue (Haywards Heath; Burgess Hill; East Grinstead), and the Royal Oak in Wineham. It was agreed Wineham and Twineham were important due to the location of Bolney substation and a representative mentioned they may already be sensitive to further development due to a recent proposal for a new waste incinerator in the area.

Action: Rampion team to consider suggestions and practicalities of venue options.

9. Dates and times for future meeting

The Rampion team suggested March would be most suitable for the second meeting, as this gives everyone time to absorb the information on show during the consultation period, as well as listen to feedback from others which can then be brought to the group. The group supported this suggestion.

10. Agenda for next meeting

Agenda items should be sent to Kat in advance of the meeting. The meeting date will be notified in January.

11. AOB

Chris will try and visit as many venues as possible in the consultation period between January and March – contact him if you would like him to present to your group / organisation.

Polegate wind farm was mentioned by Brenda Pollack, who encouraged individuals to contact her for more information and / or to support the project.

Minutes: Environment Project Liaison Group (PLG), 19th April 2012

1. Introductions - attendance:

Chair - Paula Seager - Natural PR
Secretary - Kat Ratcliffe - Natural PR

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

Brenda Pollack - Friends of the Earth South East
Stuart Meier - CPRE Sussex
Jacky Woolcock - Friends of Shoreham Beach
Jessie Treverton (Emily Cox substitute) - Greenpeace Brighton & Hove
David Smith - Mid Sussex Sustainability Partnership & Mid Sussex Partnership
Dave Burges - RSPB Sussex
Erin Pettifer - Sussex Wildlife Trust
Chris Gebbie – Sussex Heritage Trust
Chris Todd – Brighton & Hove City Sustainability Partnership

Apologies:

Steve Ankers - South Downs Society
John Whiting – Ouse Adur Rivers Trust

***Individuals names are written as their initials e.g. Chris Tomlinson = CT**

2. Approval of minutes

The minutes from 16th November were approved by the group.

3. Presentation on draft proposal and community consultation

CT reminded the group of the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm project and updated representatives on the community consultation so far. Over 4500 people had attended the 12 public exhibition events and over 1000 questionnaires received back to date.

4. Feedback from PLG representatives – on community consultation proposal, the consultation process and opinion of peers

i. General feedback

Representatives of the group asked CT whether the feedback so far had generally been supportive and CT confirmed that the overall feedback had been positive but they had faced legitimate concerns from representatives of the community. Examples of concerns:

- Wind power technology issues, e.g. noise, birds, intermittency, costs
- The justification for the cable route and the length throughout the National Park (see section 4v.)
- The proportion of UK / local content during construction
- Visual impact of wind turbines on the sea view (noted as subjective)

CT explained that the team had had to re-visit the general area of wind power to justify and explain its effectiveness to many people who had attended the exhibitions. This could be linked to wind power being relatively new to Sussex.

ii. Questionnaire responses

In terms of questionnaires, EO confirmed it was a fairly even split at the moment. This was based on a small sample with hundreds more to be read. It was encouraging that a significant number of supporters had submitted questionnaires as research showed those against a project are more likely to register their feedback during a consultation.

The group asked exactly what impact the questionnaire responses could have / how they would come to decisions on the final plans. For example, how would they decide on the number of turbines to use, and EO clarified they were consulting on the worst case scenarios across the project and that questionnaire responses, especially local knowledge, would play a part in finalising their plans. It was also noted that the Rampion team had been feeding responses to RSK (the consultants putting together the EIA) along the way, for example bat migration over the English Channel and seaweed on Worthing beach.

iii. PLG meeting suggestions

It was suggested that linking the project liaison groups more closely could help with feedback for the Rampion project.

Action: KR to send web links for meeting minutes to group. CT to check Gerald Legg (Booth Natural History Museum) and Rob Clark (Sussex IFCA) are on the stakeholder list being suggested as well-networked and knowledgeable.

iv. Statutory consultation

The group asked for clarification on the upcoming statutory consultation (section 48) and EO confirmed it would last 6 weeks. The group agreed they would prefer for this to be extended to allow them enough time to receive feedback from representatives and put together a response. EO said they had already extended it from the statutory 4 weeks to 6 weeks but this would be looked in to. She also reassured the group that the team had been consulting with statutory bodies, such as Natural England, considerably and that stakeholder engagement would be ongoing. Furthermore, if there were significant changes to be made to the plans following the statutory consultation then they would need to re-consult at a later date.

Action: CT / EO come back to the group on exact timeframe for statutory consultation.

A representative of the group challenged the cable route – arguing that the team had assumed there would not be objections. EO clarified that a huge amount of work had gone in to the chosen cable route and that alternatives, along with reasons for not pursuing them, would be presented in the EIA (available early June; *CT to inform all PLG representatives of exact statutory consultation dates very soon). She also assured the group that a great deal of detail would be included in the EIA – much

more so than the CCD which had been created with a user-friendly aim for people to easily digest the information during the community consultation.

v. Feedback from peers / colleagues / friends etc

Four representatives of the group had attended at least one public exhibition.

SM from CPRE noted that the aesthetics of the wind turbines was the most common concern amongst people he had spoken to, particularly in terms of the wind farm looking cluttered (largely due to the way the turbines were lined up). He suggested a hexagonal grid would work better than the current format as this would help to visually randomise the turbines.

Action: EO to find out whether moiré effect has been considered and put forward hexagonal grid layout idea. CPRE to include hexagonal format suggestion when submitting consultation questionnaire.

In response to questions on the potential impact on birds, EO confirmed that this was very site-specific, depending for example, on the species occurring in the area and turbine size. The RSPB representative agreed, and noted that impacts on birds can include collision or avoidance, but these too are often species-specific. It was noted that detailed analysis of bird survey data is needed to evaluate the nature, scale and likely impact of the proposed wind farm on bird species that may be affected, if the proposed wind farm is constructed. E.ON and RSPB noted they will be meeting to discuss this.

According to BP of FOE, the biggest concern for their representatives was the onshore cable route. Other representatives agreed that it was disappointing to see such a large proportion of the route going through the South Downs National Park. CT clarified that Shoreham Power Station had never been a practical option as it did not have the capacity for the amount of electricity the wind farm would generate, hence Bolney had been selected on the transmission grid which is designed to carry higher voltages from major power generating stations such as Rampion. EO confirmed that the EIA would explain the cable route decision in a lot more detail. She also assured the group that any environmental impacts or disruption in relation to the cable route would be temporary and they would mitigate where possible. CT noted that they would be undergrounding the cable in stages to help minimise disruption to communities near the cable route.

Action: EO to pass on suggestion to consider directional drilling under key areas of the national park including hedgerows and field boundaries (raised by SM of CPRE)

5. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) update

EO updated the group on the EIA. She explained the Rochdale envelope approach to the group. In summary, E.ON was consulting on the worst case scenarios for all aspects of the Rampion project.

i. Feedback from the group

The Sussex Heritage Trust representative asked the team whether they had come across the suggestion that E.ON should demolish the cement works and overhead pylons which were hugely

unpopular in Sussex as a compromise. CT clarified these would be completely separate and significant infrastructure projects in themselves requiring a completely separate consultation and owned by third parties, so it was impractical.

CT clarified the landfall aspect of the project, noting that there would be no permanent structure built where the cable comes ashore. Once construction is complete, the only visible objects will be the substations (Bolney and two offshore) and the wind turbines.

Action: EO / CT to provide photographs of existing offshore underground cable routes related to their wind farm projects to give the group some idea of the recovery of hedgerows and so forth, bearing in mind this is very dependent on soil conditions.

Further clarifications included:

i) the area of search for the new substation at Bolney - CT explained meetings are being set up with those residents who live in the vicinity of the proposed substation area of search

ii) the answer to onshore noise concerns from the wind turbines – CT explained that there would not be any noise onshore once the wind farm was operational and that noise during construction was currently being investigated.

Action: EO / CT to inform stakeholders whether there may be onshore noise during construction of the wind turbines once investigation is complete.

A couple of representatives raised concerns as to the longer term impacts on fish and sea mammals in relation to ongoing lower levels of noise from the wind turbines and asked whether anything was being done to monitor this.

Action: EO to raise long term monitoring enquiry with team and keep offshore environment stakeholders updated.

Representatives of the group were keen for clarification on the upcoming statutory consultation. EO noted that the team were keen to resolve as many issues as possible before submitting the application. They hope to address / overcome concerns and develop 'statements of common ground' with key bodies.

Action: KR to send out link to IPS website which contains useful guidance on the process and explains the various aspects of the consultation in more detail:

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/planninginspectorate>

Another concern representatives had come across was the decommissioning of the site and whether it would actually be there longer than the 20-25 years indicated in consultation materials. CT clarified that largely due to stresses on the structures and the amount of moving parts, there would come a point in the future when the turbines and would either be:

1. Replaced with newer models – if the site is still required to meet the UK's energy needs (this would require a new consent application and a new consultation)

OR

2. The entire wind farm would be taken down and completely removed.

ii. **Potential community benefits**

The group agreed it was important for E.ON to give something back to the community of Sussex and the idea of a visitors centre was put forward. One of the aims of such a centre could be to educate people on more general renewable energy issues and help raise awareness of offshore wind power. CT explained that it was too early on to confirm details on community benefits but this was something the Rampion team would appreciate input on at a later stage. He also clarified that as Sussex was such a large community spread across a wide geographical area (especially compared to previous offshore wind farms they had built), they will need to think very carefully before making decisions on issues such as the location(s) of a visitor centre(s).

6. Outstanding actions

None - the PLG Terms of Reference had been sent to the group; the Rampion team had taken on board venue suggestions for the public exhibitions; KR had emailed presentation slides to those who had requested them, along with environmental PLG list for representatives to check contact details; EO had raised butterfly conservation, acid grass assessment and mapping of 'tranquillity areas' with consultants, and CT had added suggested contacts to the stakeholder list to receive information and newsletters.

7. Terms of Reference

Two representatives asked more about the voting and chairing process (amendments tbc).

Action: Chair to further discuss with those who raised the points.

8. Date and time of future meeting

It was agreed by the group that it would be helpful for them to meet half way through the statutory consultation (early June) so the Rampion team could answer queries that may have arisen.

*Post meeting note – as the consultation start date has been put back, the intention is for this meeting to be held on Tuesday July 17.

Action: NPR to arrange meeting and get date in diaries (avoid half-term + meeting length should be extended to 3 hours). EO to invite environmental consultants (RSK) to next meeting.

Action: EO / CT to ensure Non-Technical Summary of EIA is widely available in public buildings and easily downloadable from Rampion website.

9. AOB

None

Minutes: Environment Project Liaison Group (PLG), 17 July 2012

1. Introductions - attendance:

Chair - Paula Seager - Natural PR
Secretary - Kat Ratcliffe - Natural PR

Chris Tomlinson - Rampion
Development Manager, E.ON
Victoria Gilbey & Katie Barlow – RSK
Environmental Consultants

Brenda Pollack - Friends of the Earth South East
Stuart Meier - CPRE Sussex and Sussex Wildlife Trust
David Smith - Mid Sussex Sustainability Partnership & MSx Partnership
Bob Platt – Ooze Adur Rivers Trust
Dave Burges - RSPB Sussex
Brianna Reeve – Shoreham District Ornithological Society
David Cranmer – South Downs National Park Authority
Chris Todd – Brighton & Hove City Sustainability Partnership
Steve Ankers - South Downs Society
David Howey – Sussex Ornithological Society

Apologies:

John Whiting – Ouse Adur Rivers Trust
Emily Cox - Greenpeace Brighton & Hove
Jacky Woolcock - Friends of Shoreham Beach
Erin Pettifer - Sussex Wildlife Trust
Chris Gebbie – Sussex Heritage Trust

***Individuals names are written as their initials e.g. Chris Tomlinson = CT**

1. Presentation on draft Environmental Statement by Chris Tomlinson

CT recapped on the Community consultation and confirmed that the statutory and public consultations were currently underway (about half way through) with the deadline approaching on August 8th. He noted that all consultation responses needed to be received in writing.

CT clarified it would take 8-10 months to offset the carbon output created during the construction of the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm.

Action: KR to record any offshore related questions during the meeting to be taken back to the offshore RSK experts as the two present were onshore managers.

2. Feedback and questions from PLG members

i. The draft Environmental Statement (ES)

SM noted that he (and others) felt there was not sufficient detail included the draft ES, especially with regards to black bream and seahorses. He also noted that Erin (unable to attend) had some

concerns on the impact of noise on the Herring breeding season (they are sensitive to noise 60km away) and avoiding chalk habitat.

SWT also noted a lack of detail and said they would like more information on the cable route, including detailed habitat maps and benthic surveys. They believe there has been heavy reliance on grab samples. As the offshore cable route has not been fixed they will want further information.

Action: Representatives to contact EO to organise meeting if required.

Action: EO / RSK to provide more information to CPRE on Black bream and seahorses and detailed habitat maps / benthic surveys to Sussex Wildlife Trust.

ii. Rochdale envelope

BP raised the Rochdale envelope approach and asked if they would be receiving all the consultation information before the application is processed. **Post meeting note – the detailed offshore wind turbine layout will not be finalised before the application is submitted.**

iii. Consultation responses

DB explained that the RSPB's consultation response would comprise of three main headings: methodology, analysis and impacts. He also asked when / whether the PLG representatives would be able to see how others, especially statutory bodies, had responded during the current statutory and public consultation. DC supported this by asking whether the Rampion team would be publishing responses prior to the end of the consultation period to avoid duplication.

CT clarified that all the organisations were free to liaise with one another and discuss their consultation responses. **Post meeting note – the Rampion team will be publishing all responses they receive in the Consultation Report.**

RSK confirmed meetings with all statutory organisations, such as Natural England, were ongoing. CTd asked who we are consulting on the offshore cable route. CT confirmed NE, IFCA and MMO.

KB reported that to date, all scoping responses and comments received from statutory consultees (eg. during meetings held) are summarised in the draft ES and their final responses will be addressed in the final ES.

DC clarified they were more concerned with the period following the consultation deadline (post August 8). CT and DB explained that ultimately it was most important that PINS should see all the information possible first. However broad the initial set of responses, PINS would pick out key themes and their report would evolve from there.

DC asked CT whether the Rampion team could circulate the consultation responses on CD after the eight week deadline and BP noted it would be helpful to have a list of all the PLG representatives email addresses plus the statutory consultees.

Action: CT to check with EO regarding sharing consultation responses (including statutory organisations) on CD plus statutory consultee email addresses.

Action EO: Advise whether we can send NE contact detailed out to the PLG

Action: KR to circulate email list with PLG.

DC confirmed that the draft version of their consultation response would be available online from August 2nd.

iv. Potential impacts on the South Downs

SA raised the issue that a number of people had been surprised that, according to the draft ES, Brighton seafront was identified as the most sensitive coastal viewpoint, especially as the South Downs were far less developed. On behalf of the South Downs Society, he noted the main concerns were based on the risks of increased noise and a detrimental impact on the view from the National Park. CT confirmed that you would be able to see the wind turbine blades moving whilst on land, depending on the weather conditions. SA confirmed that the differing turbine height options did not seem to affect the opinions of his members but he felt that fewer larger turbines were less impactful.

Whether or not the lights would be seen from shore was also discussed and the cable route (and associated disturbance) was noted as the primary cause of concern for members.

SA shared a concern that the cable route though the South Downs has only been noted as 'major to moderate' in the overall impacts within the draft ES, with only one 'major' listed (the impact on Brighton seafront).

DC explained that there seems to be more weight given to a number of smaller individual designated sites, rather than a view of the overall landscape issue, e.g. impact on the National Park.

SDNPA will be commenting on instructing an engineering firm to review the feasibility around the Tottington Mount section and other parts of the route, looking at how construction would take place. DC will feed back to the group.

BR highlighted concerns about views from the Downs.

v. Alternative options

DS raised the hexagonal suggestion which had been brought up in the previous meeting and asked whether this had been considered. CT confirmed it was too early to decide on the exact design of the wind farm layout but that this had been mentioned to the engineers and would be properly investigated at a later date.

Chris Todd (CTd) raised concerns regarding the alternative options chapter of the ES, noting that he did not find it as useful as hoped. Concerns included poor graphics (too few photomontages showing the difference between large and small turbines) and no maps and layouts of alternative routes. There was also a lack of clarity on why the South Downs National Park had been chosen for the cable route or how it had been considered in the various assessments. He confirmed that he strongly supported the development and was incredibly supportive of the Rampion project on the whole, but felt strongly that the impact on the National Park and the Heritage Coast had not been sufficiently considered.

According to CTd, in particular, the Heritage Coast (HC) was treasured for its lack of development (“one of the last undeveloped coasts in the UK”) and was popular with tourists for this reason. Yet, Brighton seafront comes out as more important / of greater concern in the draft ES. He noted that there needed to be more discussion on mitigation / compensation to the HC e.g. moving a dozen turbines away from the view from the HC to reduce the range of visibility by around 20%. CTd’s main point was that the impact on the HC seemed to have been dismissed. BR, SM and SA supported this assertion – noting that although they support wind energy and wind farms, there are many people who would rather see wind turbines constructed off a more developed area of coastline, to the west of Brighton.

CTd questioned why the horizontal directional drilling technique is not being proposed under the South Downs Way, as is proposed for the cycle route. The SDW is also classed as a national cycle route and is the second most popular national trail in the country.

CT acknowledged and thanked CTd for his feedback.

Action: CT to offer a meeting with CTd, EO and RSK to discuss issues raised.

vi. Potential impacts on wildlife

BR raised a concern about the Adur Valley given the disturbance of the land during construction. The Ornithological Society recognise the land will be made good, but plant life such as butterflies and ground nesting birds will be impacted, due to the width of the actual work undertaken. BR also raised the issue of a relatively new Little Egret breeding population in the Shoreham area (confirmed breeding in 2011 and 2012) with over 16 young birds being within yards of the cable route. Timing was noted as especially important for these birds in terms of breeding sensitivities and so forth. CT confirmed it was too early to determine the construction schedule but assured the group that all species of birds and other wildlife would be taken into account and mitigation options would be employed.

The RSK representatives confirmed this nesting site had been visited and was included in the ES but would be investigated further, (A post meeting check clarified that the nesting site is approximately 250m from the proposed cable route) however, that more up to date nesting data from this year would be helpful for the assessment. Note - April through to August is the most crucial time

Action: RSK to liaise with Brianne for a copy of the most up to date nesting data.

vii. Crossing water

BP raised the issue of crossing streams, noting that it was not clear from the draft ES how E.ON was going to deal with fish passages (water quality is fundamental) and that timing was important, as with birds.

RSK assured the group that each water crossing would be taken separately with a compulsory site-specific assessment (approval was always needed from the Environmental Agency) related to fish and any other wildlife / environmental issues. They would endeavour to carefully return any soil back where it came from, for example on a bank. Please note – water crossings are covered in the hydrology section of the draft ES.

viii. Hedgerows

SM then brought up hedgerows, noting that in the area concerned there were 38 important hedgerows, as defined under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, particularly based in the lower weald. Although he appreciated any disturbance would be temporary, he did not feel enough was being done to pinpoint the most important and mitigate against any potential damage.

RSK confirmed that hedgerows had been on the agenda for a long time and had been identified and classified according to the Hedgerow Regulations and in terms of their ecological importance for species including bats, dormice, invertebrates, etc. The topic of 'translocation' was raised and RSK noted that the effectiveness of this method is subject to debate and its feasibility would depend on a number of factors and it would not necessarily be appropriate for some parts of the route. The consultants clarified that some sections of hedgerow would be instated quicker than others depending on the construction schedule.

Action: RSK to confirm the issue of translocation has been looked at thoroughly

ix. Meaningfulness of consultation

A couple of representatives asked whether there would be any more surveys going ahead on the environmental impact related to the National Park and RSK confirmed this would not be the case. DC noted a concern regarding the meaningfulness of the consultation in relation to the depth of investigation that had been undertaken within the National Park. RSK and CT referred to the draft ES, in particular the appendices, which contain a huge amount of information and data which they hoped would reflect the work that had gone in to assessing the area.

DC continued that the two month gap between the consultation and application seemed relatively short, although he appreciated this has already been extended in response to previous feedback. He also said he would have liked to have seen the National Park discussed earlier in the draft ES.

CT assured the group that an engineering consultancy had thoroughly assessed the area, including the Tottington Mount site, in terms of feasibility and any potential impacts of construction. RSK referred to the ES appendices, clarifying that a specialist had undertaken the Tottington Mount study and that mitigation would be ongoing. DC said that they were also undertaking a separate engineer study within the national park and would publish the survey once complete.

Action: DC and any other representatives who share concerns re: gaps in the ES related to environmental impacts to contact CT to arrange meeting with RSK.

x. Waste

CTd asked what E.ON would be doing with any waste dug up whilst undergrounding the cable and RSK noted that the vast majority of soil would be re-used and put back, with any excess used where possible in the park – removal from the site was only a last resort (geology and ground section of the draft ES). KB explained that there would be a site materials management plan put in place. She also confirmed that turf from the haul road would be reinstated.

xi. Bob Lane

A couple of representatives noted their surprise at Bob Lane being highlighted as a possible access route to the substation as it is narrow and locally important. It would also require the removal of two hedges. The whole northern part of Wineham Lane was strengthened for the existing substation so they suggest Wineham Lane should be used as the access to the new substation.

RSK clarified that the final decision on access would very much depend on the final location of the substation. CT confirmed they had already held a number of meetings with local residents in order to further understand any potential local impacts.

Action: Rampion team to continue looking at access and concerns re: Bob Lane and mitigate accordingly whilst keeping stakeholders informed of any key decisions.

xii. Community benefits

BP brought up the topic of community benefits and asked whether they were expected in relation to offshore wind farms in the same way as they were with onshore wind farms. She asked when E.ON would be able to begin talks on potential benefits to Sussex and said she felt a single visitors' centre would not necessarily be enough, particularly as the Rampion project was so huge, almost incorporating two projects within one – the onshore and the offshore. She suggested a benefit(s) which incorporated both a community and ecological benefit(s) would be ideal.

CT assured the group that E.ON had supported community benefit projects at all its on- and offshore wind farms, to date and was likely to do so for Rampion. However, it's early days and when the time is right, very careful consideration would be required given the large and diverse community covering a large geographical area. Discussions would be required with the community, PLG representatives and other stakeholders. He expected this to be a focus for next year but confirmed they could not commit to anything if and until the project had received consent.

KR confirmed that the Community PLG minutes (community benefits a key theme for this group) were on the Rampion website along with the other minutes from all PLG groups.

3. Agree minutes from last PLG meeting

The minutes from 19th April were agreed.

4. Outstanding actions

CT confirmed there was no audible noise recorded from the shore during piling of the meteorological mast.

Action: Add Gerald Legg to stakeholder list (source contact information from Emily Cox).

Action: RSK to source photographs of soil conditions (before-after construction) and hedgerows to share with group.

5. PLG Terms of Reference - agreement

The suggestion to remove the voting section was agreed by the group. The Terms of Reference were then approved.

6. Update on what happens next

The consultation deadline is the next key milestone: 8 August 2012. The Rampion team will then pull together all the consultation responses and comments. The Development Consent Order application will be submitted in mid – end October

8. Dates and times for future meetings

End October / early November was suggested as the ideal time to meet next following the DOC application with the associated Consultation Report and final ES. This will give representatives a chance to look at the final proposals and supporting documents properly and digest the information. However, CT encouraged representatives to get in touch if they wanted to arrange a meeting beforehand on any specific issues. Organisations could also combine if they had similar issues to discuss.

9. AOB

None

Rampion Offshore Wind Farm

Minutes: Sea Users Project Liaison Group (PLG), 16th November 2011, 6-8pm

Item 1 – introductions and attendance:

Chair - Sue Trimmingham – Natural PR
Secretary – Kat Ratcliffe – Natural PR

Chris Tomlinson – Rampion
Development Manager, E.ON
Neville Horton – Senior Offshore
Project Developer, E.ON

John Boyce – Brighton Marina Berth Holders' Association / Yacht Club

Mike Croker – Lancing Sailing Club

Phillip Currie – Newhaven Marina Limited

John Davy – Brighton Marina Harbour Master

Nigel Cooper – Newhaven Yacht Club

Mike Tubb – RNLI Newhaven Lifeboat Station

Darren McDonagh – BIZAK (diving body) South East

Jim Prior – Worthing divers

Roger Cohen – RNLI Brighton Lifeboat Station

Jim Gates – Shoreham Sailing Club

Noel West – Brighton Marina Boatman's Association

Keith Phelps – RNLI Shoreham Lifeboat Station

Lawrence Woodhams – Sussex Yacht Club

Alan Brothers – Southern Division National Federation of Sea Anglers (NFSA)

Apologies:

Newhaven Scuba Centre
Jim Skinner - Newhaven & Seaford
Sailing Club
Chris Lane – Adur Centre Sailing Club

Items 2 and 5 - brief project overview and feedback

Chris Tomlinson, Development Manager for the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm project, introduced the group to the project and explained the consultation process, which will begin towards the end of January 2012 and last 12 weeks.

Following the presentation, the chair opened up for questions. Representatives asked for clarification on the width of the cable trench (15m wide and 40m needed during construction) and asked about the National Park's response to this. The Rampion team said the National Park had welcomed underground cabling and are in discussions about the details of the cable route including the restoration plan. The team also clarified the voltage of the cables both on- and offshore. One representative asked whether the electric fields given off by the cabling under the sea could affect fish and other marine life. Neville said there had been two studies in this area but both had been inconclusive and required further research.

Representatives noted there are a number of shipwrecks known off the Sussex coast which are enjoyed by divers in particular. Neville showed a chart of wrecks to the group, which pinpointed all the known wrecks in the area. Projects of this nature aim to avoid any wreck by a minimum of 300m. The Rampion team understand maintaining access to these sites is important and it is in their interest to avoid wrecks, as it would make things more difficult during construction.

The issue of exclusion zones around the wind turbines was brought up by representatives of the group and Neville clarified there would be a 50m exclusion zone around each turbine (a statutory safety requirement). He agreed policing this exclusion was difficult but the requirement was advised to sea users for reasons of navigational safety. It was confirmed that most vessels would be able to

sail through the wind farm providing they avoided the exclusion zones, although discussions with sea users operating large vessels was ongoing. Depending on the turbines selected, there would be between 600m and 1km in between each wind turbine (most likely around 800m) and the turbines are likely to be in a uniform grid of straight lines, making navigation easier. The team also clarified there would be more extensive exclusion zones in the area during construction, but that only parts of the site would be constructed at any one time.

One representative suggested buoys could be placed strategically around the wind farm to warn boats, which could drift towards the turbines. A temporary mooring facility was suggested as another safety measure. Neville said he would look into this issue. The general day-to-day maintenance of the turbines would probably occur on a 24/7 basis, certainly on a 12/7 basis and so the E.ON workboats would be readily available to give assistance to any mariners in distress.

A concern was raised that there is a potential hazard to vessels anchoring in the site, from the cables. The hazard will be mitigated by burying or covering the cable so an anchor or fishing could not reach it. Helicopter access was discussed in terms of rescuing divers in difficulty and Neville confirmed there would be aeronautical exclusions but the details of this had not yet been finalised. He highlighted the possibility of a helicopter route through the wind farm depending on the demand for this, although divers very close to a turbine would probably need to be rescued by boat.

Neville described the directional drilling process for burying the cables underground. Cables will then be pulled offshore through the plastic duct, each cable split into its three phases and separated onshore into four cables laid in a trench. The duration of the construction work in the areas of the shore would be around three months in total.

One representative asked what it would take to stop the project going ahead and the Rampion team responded that it would require, 'a demonstrable case to prevent approval'. It was also asked whether taxpayers are subsidising the project and the team said that E.ON will be investing the capital required to construct the wind farm. However, as development partner, the Crown Estate continue to provide a percentage of the money required to assist development of the site until it is ready for the consent process.

Item 3 - role and purpose of PLGs and representatives

Chris explained that given the scale and diversity of the community they are wishing to engage and consult with, the PLG initiative was designed to help reach out to a broader network of organisations and individuals across a range of interest areas. The Rampion team identified the organisations to be represented on the PLGs from their stakeholder list of 2000+ local organisations who are well networked and represent particular interest groups. Chris highlighted that local authorities, county councils and Natural PR had all helped contribute to the identification of those best networked organisations. The objective and role of the PLG representatives is to provide a two-way information dissemination process, to filter project information back to their peers, as well as feedback comments and ideas from their interest groups back to E.ON. Through this process, E.ON is aiming to raise awareness of the offshore wind farm and the consultation process throughout Sussex.

The chair asked if the group was happy to continue attending the PLG meetings (the next one of five in total will be recorded as part of the consultation document) and invited feedback. Most of the group were happy to continue being involved and attending future meetings. The RNLI organisations said their main concern was the search and rescue function and would look into providing an overall contact for future information / attendance as it was probably not necessary for all three representatives to attend.

Representatives asked for evidence of influence from PLGs that E.ON had put together for previous projects. Chris said this was an entirely new format for them. Previously, E.ON had formed one single community group but because of the size and diversity of the community that could have a real interest in this project (East Sussex, West Sussex and Brighton & Hove), they had chosen to create six PLGs covering a number of different interest areas. It was asked what exactly the group could influence and the Rampion team gave examples, including the scheduling and accessibility during construction. Chris noted there would be certain things they could not change, especially technological issues and engineering constraints, but during the consultation process where requests for change could not be accommodated, explanations would be provided in response.

Bringing local knowledge to the discussion is also important to the PLG process. The BIZAK representative noted they would appreciate access to the turbines as they will inevitably attract marine life and could provide a diving site.

It was suggested that the Rampion team could email PLGs to notify them of significant developments between meetings. Chris agreed to look into this.

Item 4 - Terms of Reference

Broad principles of openness, transparency and representatives having a fair chance to have their say during meetings were noted as important for the Terms of Reference.

Action: Rampion team and Natural PR have put together Terms of Reference (find attached to comment), which must be agreed by the group.

RNLI to propose a single contact for future attendance.

Item 6 - the PLGs going forward

The group agreed the time and day of the meeting was suitable and the project contacts were clarified (see below).

Action: PLG representatives to use Kat Ratcliffe (kat@naturalpr.biz) as the main contact for details on PLG meetings/agenda/minutes and Chris Tomlinson (chris.tomlinson@eon.com) as the main contact for project-related enquiries. Kat to send out lists of all the PLG representatives with the minutes.

Item 7 - review representation on PLG

Chris showed the initial invitation list to the group and highlighted the fact that groups who had not been able to attend the inaugural meeting may wish to attend the next one. If this occurred there was concern that the group numbers could easily exceed 20, beyond which meetings become

unmanageable. It was agreed that the most sensible thing to do would be to combine representation so that interest subsets, such as yacht clubs, sailing clubs, deep sea divers etc, who have several representatives on the PLG list, could discuss and agree between themselves, which one or two should represent them. The selected representative(s) would then have a duty to feed back to those who could not attend and vice versa.

Action: Chris/Kat to check Southern Coastguard is included in stakeholder list to receive information and newsletters and consult if appropriate.

Kat to keep under review attendance for future meetings and if oversubscribed, to speak to subset interest groups and seek a reduced representation for the said meeting.

Item 8 - review consultation event venues

The group considered the venue suggestions and put forward ideas, such as Sussex Yacht Club on Shoreham High Street, which is accessible from the town centre (contact Lawrence Woodhams). For Newhaven, either the Enterprise Centre or Hillcrest Centre were suggested, and the Royal Oak was suggested as the closest meeting place for Wineham and Bolney.

Actions: Rampion team to consider suggestions and practicalities of venue options.

Item 9 - dates and times for future meeting

The Rampion team suggested March would be most suitable date for the second meeting. This gives everyone time to absorb the information during the consultation period, as well as listen to feedback from others which can then be brought to the group. The group supported this suggestion.

Item 10 - agenda for next meeting

Agenda items should be sent to Kat in advance of the meeting. The meeting date will be notified in January.

The next meeting was clarified as being part of the formal process whereby all comments will be recorded and documented. Individuals can also feedback via phone, email, letter, and official Rampion questionnaire.

Item 11 - AOB

Chris will visit as many organisations as possible between January and March – contact him if you would like him to present to your group / organisation.

The met mast construction target date was clarified as April 2012. It was asked on a normal day how many boats would be operating for the wind farm which the Rampion team could not confirm as they do not yet know how many turbines there will be, but highlighted there are two boats per day at their 60 turbine Robin Rigg project in the Solway Firth; every turbine needs servicing once a year.

Representatives suggested posting notices of the consultation events on Shoreham, Southwick and Hove Lagoon Watersports' notice boards to raise awareness.

Action: Kat to include the Lagoon Watersports' notice boards on the list for posters, profiling the consultation events. Chris to upload FAQs on website – <http://www.eon-uk.com/rampion>.

Minutes: Sea Users Project Liaison Group (PLG), 19th April 2012

1. Introductions – attendance:

Chair – Sue Trimingham – Natural PR
Secretary – Kat Ratcliffe – Natural PR

Chris Tomlinson – Rampion
Development Manager, E.ON
Neville Houghton – Senior Offshore
Project Developer, E.ON

Ian Lambert (Jim Skinner substitute) – Newhaven & Seaford
Sailing Club
Nigel Cooper - Newhaven Yacht club
Lawrence Woodhams – Sussex Yacht Club
Nigel Haines (Bob Jaroc substitute) – Brighton British Sub-
Aqua Club 007
David Robertson – Newhaven & Seaford Sailing Club
Noel West – Brighton Marina Boatman's Association
Jim Prior – Worthing Divers

Apologies:

Chris Lane – Adur Centre Sailing Club
Mike Croker – Lancing Sailing Club
Jim Gates – Shoreham Sailing Club
Roger Cohen – RNLI Brighton
Mike Tubb – RNLI Newhaven
Keith Phelps – RNLI Shoreham
John Stirling – Newhaven Marina Limited
Alan Brothers – Southern Division
National Federation of Sea Anglers

***Individuals names are written as their initials e.g. Chris Tomlinson = CT**

2. Approval of minutes

The minutes from 16th November were approved by the group.

3. Presentation on draft proposal and community consultation

CT reminded the group of the Rampion Offshore Wind Farm project and updated representatives on the community consultation so far. Over 4500 people had attended the 12 public exhibition events and over 1000 questionnaires received back to date.

4. Feedback from PLG representatives – on community consultation proposal, the consultation process and opinion of peers

i. General awareness

CT asked the group for feedback on the general awareness of the Rampion project amongst the representatives' circle of friends and colleagues. A lack of awareness amongst colleagues and peers was agreed by a couple of representatives. For example, the Brighton Marina Boatman's Association informed the group that the majority of attendees at a recent Newhaven planning meeting in Piddinghoe were not aware of the proposed wind farm. Despite this, the general consensus of the group was that awareness of the project had dramatically increased in recent weeks in comparison to earlier this year (January 2012). The Sussex Yacht Club representative confirmed that it was now a 'hot topic' in Shoreham-by-Sea and that he had been receiving a high number of enquiries.

It was suggested that a lack of engagement within some groups could be linked to the fact that the completion date seemed relatively far off (2017) and therefore interest could well pick up over the next few months / years. A general sense of apathy was noted by the group, with the majority of concerns so far relating to the sea view and visual aspects of the wind farm.

ii. Exclusion zones during and post construction

CT clarified that there will be a permanent 50m exclusion zone around each turbine. This was a concern for the diving representatives as the base of the turbine is likely to be the most exciting spot for divers. The Rampion team confirmed that from a safety perspective E.ON had to be responsible, but they were not ruling out discussions with local diving clubs. They assured the group that they were aware it is a very active area of sea in comparison to existing UK offshore wind farms. It was clarified that monopole turbine structures have a less hazardous base.

Post meeting note - At this stage in the development process, E.ON has not determined the turbine model or foundation designs across the site. Therefore, it is too early to say whether any advisory 50m exclusion zones will be sought around any of the turbine structures and to which vessels this may apply. E.ON will keep the PLG informed of progress in this regard as the wind turbine and foundation designs are selected. Should E.ON wish to seek an exclusion zone for any turbine on safety grounds, they would need to apply to DECC under Section 95 of the Energy Act.

iii. Electromagnetic field

The issue of whether the electromagnetic field from the cables could affect diving equipment was raised. The Rampion team were able to confirm this would not have an effect on sailing equipment and that the cables were to be buried. However, they could not confirm the specific impact on diving equipment and agreed this needed to be investigated.

Action: Neville to take up diving enquiry with E.ON engineers and report back to the group.

iv. Ongoing impacts

a. Charter boat owners

The issue of ongoing impacts was raised and the Brighton Marina Boatman's Association informed the group that they had submitted feedback arguing there were far more impacts on this particular group of stakeholders than specified in the community consultation document. Specifically:

- Seascape greatly changed – potential impact on customers – psychological link with openness of the Sea
- Major area for operating boats which take divers out to ship wrecks

NW from BMBA noted that the chartered boat owners ought to be treated in a similar way to the commercial fisherman. CT and NH clarified that they had met with this stakeholder group back in March 2011 and there had been minimal interest / concern. This was followed up by a presentation by CT to the Brighton Marina Users Association AGM in February 2012. However, CT and NH appreciated that there was a lot more detail on the project now being published and interest is therefore likely to have increased so interaction with this group should be stepped up. The Rampion team clarified that it was important for stakeholders to inform them of any potential impacts so that these could be mitigated.

It was decided that on a practical level, it would not be suitable for the charter boat owners to join with the commercial fisherman in the same meetings as they have different interests.

CT clarified that a great deal more technical detail will be included in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). It was also clarified that the community consultation deadline was Sunday May 6th, the statutory consultation would follow in early June (*CT to inform all PLG representatives of exact statutory consultation dates very soon), and engagement with sea users would be ongoing.

It was noted that the charter boat owners would prefer to communicate directly with the Rampion team.

Action: Charter boat stakeholders to use Alan Edwards as liaison officer with the Rampion team and if this is not successful, go straight to CT. Ongoing - the Rampion team need to ensure a process is there for charter boat owners to register their feedback and raise concerns.

Action: CT to arrange meeting with charter boat owners early summer 2012.

b. Yacht owners

LW from the Sussex Yacht Club informed the group that 20-30 of their representatives own commercial dive boats. He noted that awareness had been picking up recently and he had received a number of concerns regarding commercial interests.

CT confirmed that they would be reading all comments received and that local knowledge was vital for the success of the project. It was noted that the impacts listed on the presentation slides were just a few examples of the potential onshore and offshore impacts of the project.

Action: SYC representatives can contact David Guy, based in Newhaven. CT to arrange dedicated meeting with the club early summer 2012.

Action: Lawrence Woodhams to take community consultation documents to upcoming Board meeting.

c. Port decision

CT confirmed there had not yet been a decision made on the port, which will be used for the operations and maintenance base. It was noted that E.ON would make a decision if it became apparent that one port was far more suitable.

It was also clarified that the offshore substations would be painted grey to blend in best with the sky, but that they would be visible from the shore, albeit as a small object rather than the detail of the structure.

d. Sediment

A couple of representatives enquired about the possibility of sediment during construction of the wind farm. NH confirmed that this can happen, generally during the cable laying. Studies have shown this is short-lived but exactly how much there will be for this project is not known.

e. Other

CT clarified that the decision on which turbines will be used (larger/smaller etc) will not be made until after consent has been given. They are consulting on the worst case scenarios – the Rochdale

envelope approach – 100 of the largest turbines or the greatest number (195) of the smaller turbines, or somewhere in between, e.g. 140 x 5MW turbines. E.ON is seeking views from the community whose responses will be a contributing factor in finalising the design, so it's important to submit questionnaires.

The consultation report will show the data collected from all the questionnaires and the Rampion team were keen for it to be a transparent process.

5. Met Mast update

CT asked the group if they were happy with the communication they and their peers received regarding the met mast installation. The group agreed they were satisfied with the communication and that each had seen a number of notices announcing the construction work and associated exclusion zone.

6. Outstanding action points

None – the PLG Terms of Reference had been sent to the group; the Rampion team had taken on board venue suggestions for the public exhibitions; CT had uploaded FAQs to the Rampion website and the Lagoon Watersports' notice boards had been included on the list for posters, profiling the consultation events.

7. PLG Terms of Reference – agreement

The Terms of Reference were agreed.

8. Date and time of next meeting

Mid September falls after the summer holidays and is a good milestone given that the application for consent will be submitted either just before or just after a meeting in September. We can also start planning for the future. CT clarified people will be able to comment on the proposal post the May 6th community consultation in relation to the draft Environmental Statement (ES) which will be published on the Rampion website in early June (*CT to inform all PLG representatives of exact statutory consultation dates very soon).

The ES provides a technical assessment of the baseline data and the impacts, mitigations and any residual impacts of our proposal. You will be able to respond to this during the public consultation under Section 48 of the Planning Act and a notice will be placed in local papers advising you of the period during which you can submit your comments. All PLG representatives will be informed of the time period for the statutory consultation very soon.

9. AOB

The Sussex Yacht Club representative discussed his concerns that the yachting stakeholders were not being taken as seriously and raised the issue of the Royal Escape boat race – annual Sussex boat race with 60-80 boats. CT agreed that the Rampion team needed to better understand the need of this group, including this race.

Action: CT to organise meeting with LW to discuss Royal Escape Race and any other issues.

Action: CT double check Solent and Dover coastguard are on the stakeholder list.