

Written submission following my Open Floor Hearing statement:

I am extremely concerned about National Grid's proposal for SeaLink. I am very much in favour of Green Energy but paying the price for this by losing an extremely biodiverse habitat is not 'green'!

As a member of the local RSPB group, I am extremely concerned about the 36 IUCN red-listed species which either breed in or regularly use this area: turtle doves, nightingales, yellow hammers, golden plovers, marsh harriers, European eels, water voles, to name just a few. This area is vital for them.

This area is a lifeline for migrating birds, for whom this is often a life-saver stop off. Losing this food source and resting area, as well as having to navigate an increase in pylons, at varying heights, will be a big loss for these birds. There are well accounted incidents following the last pylon installation in the area. We already have swans dying from river pollution, avian flu and trying to cross the many busy roads which cut up their habitat now.

We all know that light pollution plays a significant part in the decrease of our wildlife, particularly impacting migrating birds. There is a huge amount of research on this. What would be done to limit this impact?

Moreover, increasing noise pollution in an already industrialised area, would negatively impact birds such as nightingales, already struggling to find a mate with the increasing noise. There have been a number of studies on the impact of noise pollution on bird populations. I didn't feel that NG have done anywhere near enough surveying in the local area to have a good understanding of the impacts on the many different birds using this area throughout the year. They must survey throughout the year to get a true picture of the migratory patterns.

Please consider the cumulative impact of placing this proposed converter station adjacent to a SSSI, which has already been negatively impacted by battery storage, sewage works and solar farms in the immediate vicinity. One small field for golden plovers stuck between all of these industrial sites cannot be considered appropriate mitigation.

Also, how will the sewage works expand to serve the significantly increased housing in this area? If National Grid uses this site there will be no room for any expansion.

The huge increase of hard surface proposed for this converter station would significantly increase the flood risk in an area which is already projected to be under water by 2030. As marshland it is, of course, regularly flooded. The runoff from these hard surfaces, which will be polluted from contaminated hard core rubble, as it flows

directly into the Stour river and our marine conservation area in Pegwell bay will be devastating.

I would like to know what the carbon footprint for this project is. I have not seen any estimated carbon impact in the hundreds of documents that have been sent by National Grid, although I must confess that I have not read every word! I was under the impression that the government are trying to reduce the carbon being produced and, particularly adding in the many truck loads of rubble to make a 2m deep platform under the converter station and the carbon which will be released from the marshland, plus the carbon sequestration ability which will be lost from the marsh.

Following the Open Floor hearing I would like to emphasise the point about the quality of the earth in this area: the fact that the Rich borough Power Station started sinking into the marshes and that a WW11 airplane vanished into the marshland when it crashes should be thoroughly investigated by the Examining Authority. Do you really want the government to be involved in a sinking electrical converter on the coast? We would be ridiculed for building on marshland in the first place. Consider the costs of this, as well as the bad press!

Furthermore, please consider the impact of a huge and unattractive converter station, visible for many surrounding miles, on this holiday area; tourism is a vital employer in this deprived area. Surely the building can be made more attractive? Can it not have a sloped roof with a green roof or solar panels?

Moreover, the significant loss of valuable farmland must be considered. With an increasing population, and many fields already covered in housing, the 'garden of England' will be closed. We are becoming more reliant upon imported food and if we continue to build on our farmland then this puts England in a very vulnerable position.

I therefore implore the Examining Authority to request that National Grid go back to their initial list of potential sites and find where there would be a smaller negative impact on our natural world and a site which will not become a laughing stock and an expensive millstone around the necks of this government.

On behalf of all of the wildlife that will be slaughtered or made homeless by this proposal, I beg you to Rethink Sealink!