

The examining procedures for the proposed Sea Link project I feel are flawed and unfair in the following ways.

The whole process is very orientated towards Internet and computer literature individuals. This immediately rules out a large portion of our local population!

Lack of information displayed about what the public can do and the deadlines. No information in local libraries and public places.

Hardly any Radio and News coverage.

Short deadlines.

Two very significant days have been chosen for the Preliminary meeting and start of the Open Floor meetings in Kent and Suffolk. (5th November = Guy Fawkes, and 11th November = Remembrance Day) this is unfair as many people will be preoccupied with these events. Why were these dates chosen?

A confusing process many people will think that they have already Registered and put in their comments, and not realise that they can comment again if they Register again.

The fact that National Grid does not have to get the public to do anything is weighted on their side to start with! Many people will be horrified by the SeaLink proposals but will still be unaware or not know what they can do and how they can object against them.

Also, by the very fact that it is a National Infrastructure project many people also think that it is a lost battle and therefore don't complain because they think it is a waste of their time as it will already be a done deal.

To be a fairer process the Secretary of State should not be allowed to overrule the Planning inspectorates decision.

To be a fairer process the onus should be on National Grid to get the public on side with them and register to consent and agree to the SeaLink Project. It should not be left to small local groups who often lack the expertise, knowledge, finances and legal representation to try to protect their natural environments and the wildlife! When these large multi million dollar companies main priority is making profits and they do not care or know how valuable these areas are.

The surveys they do are minimal and not comprehensive so do not show the full extent of what damage they will be doing.

Being that it is a long examination process people get tired and think they have done enough with their initial registration. This also benefits National Grid.

National Grid changing the project proposals as and when they want. E. G. Wanting more land when the public have already submitted their comments. Many people will not know/realise they can comment about this change.

National Grid wanting advance funding from Ofgem before consent is given, undermines people's confidence in a fair process.

The process and how to express your views is also very difficult as it requires a certain level of intellectual ability. I. E. with referencing documents etc...

I realise that many of these points are out of the Planning inspectorates hands, but they do highlight that it is like a David and Goliath battle for locals affected by these proposals to try to fight against!