

Karen McKenzie participant number [REDACTED]

This is my personal statement delivered to the ExA in person 11th November 2025

We have had to review over 400 complex documents, in which there are inconsistencies and gaps. Subsequently, another 63 documents were added or superseded, so was the applicant ready for this examination after 4 years? Also the additional Hoverport consultation was only launched last month and was not advertised to consultees or residents.

The applicant doesn't follow their own guidelines for site selection even within the flexible "Rochdale Envelope approach", which should develop worst case scenarios. It was always known that this is on a marsh and is not suitable land.

I have found news articles about the Richborough Power Station build. And, as my friend, Pippa has just said, the buildings could not be supported on the unstable ground and 6 years later, CEGB had to underpin it with 2000 concrete pillars. This new project has not learned the lessons of history and has no organisational memory. Don't build on a marsh.

The applicant is retrofitting the site selection decision. And this is in advance of NESO's strategic spatial energy land use framework. It is Cart before the Horse.

The energy market is also changing dramatically. I reference the select committee discussion in parliament of 15 October. Stop this juggernaut project before it becomes a second HS2 fiasco.

The cavalier attitude we have witnessed from the applicant's staff and their agents is shocking. I have just read Emma Tolley's words. I informed her of her rights in the consultation process, not the applicant. Other residents are being badly let down by their land agents, who have not kept them informed of opportunities to engage, preferring instead to deal direct with the applicant and keep them in the dark. Local businesses have been treated with contempt.

Workers engaged to do further investigations into the suitability of the ground have been left with nothing to do because the applicant has not provided work plans. They have collapsed tracks beside the Minster Stream and driven heavy vehicles across crops without mats. They really do not care about the damage they do, or the wasted cost and this is before the project has even started.

The EIAs are deficient in several respects and the environment at the Hoverport has not been assessed even now they are consulting on this change and they no longer have time to do this. It's just not acceptable.

The applicant could reconsider the site selection in Kent to find acceptable locations, either North Kent coast nearer to the Canterbury substation, or through Dover to Sellindge as KCC have proposed.

So I conclude, as many have said, this is not a green energy project if it destroys the environment. It is flawed in the justification, site selection, environmental and geology assessments, consultation process and pitiful mitigation proposed.

Please ask National Grid to reconsider. We must not become a Zone of Sacrifice.

Thank you.