

Response to deadline 09/12/25

Name: Nigel Hodgkins

Project: Sea Link EN20026

Deadline 2 – 9th December 2025

RE: Response to Applicant's Document 9.34.6 Applicant's Thematic Responses to Relevant Representations

As a local resident at the East Kent end of this proposal, I would like to rebut several of National Grid (NG)'s claims:

The Applicant shrugs off concerns raised, shows little or no evidence for its repeated assertions, and provides no details of its claims of the supposed benefits of this project.

It is impossible not to have 'significant impacts' on narrow, often single-lane roads around Cliffsend and Minster. Thanet has very few access routes on/off the island. Residents frequently have older properties with no opportunity for offroad parking. People travel to and from work and school, often in and out of the area, thus free access is vital to locals.

Comments by NG about ravens foraging in towns do not have any factual basis locally.

NG admits that survey results 'were not available during statutory consultation'. Surely this was a legal requirement. This points to a rushed, inadequate short-term survey (if any). Their 'significant benefit to ornithology' claim is frankly astounding; the significant benefit would come from leaving the area well alone.

NG admits 'significant adverse effects' on bird populations. Over four years, the bird populations would have no alternative habitat and would not survive this catastrophic disruption. Pretty language used by NG e.g. 'no loss of peregrine foraging habitat' is illogical and nonsensical. Flight routes would become dangerous, especially in the dark.

Light, noise and other pollution severely affects birds and animals. Noise travels many miles - not just up to 1km, as quoted by NG with regard to seal populations of Pegwell Bay - especially across water; and would therefore impact upon local wildlife populations. They could not survive this level of disruption and destruction.

Public Rights of Way: NG uses terms such as 'considered', plans 'prepared' - this is a thoroughly inadequate response.

'Green energy' is not 'green' if it causes destruction, detriment and harm to the communities, local populations' wellbeing, current and historical environment, farmland and food production, and wildlife populations and their habitat - all of this is unavoidable should the project go ahead. There is no justification for this.

Amenity effects: to say that there would be 'no significant effect on tourism assets' is untrue: access, visual impact, pollution, loss of wildlife attraction would all be significantly impaired.

Mental Health: This proposal is already causing issues, by its very threat. Loss of access and irreparable damage to the NNR, SSSI, and farmland surrounding Minster and Cliffsend can not fail to have an impact. For NG to claim 'no significant adverse effects' is dismissive at best and shows no real understanding of (or consideration for) the problems which beset sufferers.