

Response to the request for Change 1 – Access to the Hoverport, Kent

Planning Inspectorate ref: EN020026

1. I am a frequent user of the naturally rewilded old Hoverport site at Cliffs End for wild foraging. I use seasonally important plants as part of a healthy approach to my diet. In season I collect for my own use, self-seeded goji berries, sea buckthorn berries, (seeded via migratory bird populations), sea samphire, blackberries, sloes and in May elder flowers and in September elder berries. In season, herbs such as fennel and wild thyme are readily available growing in the apron of the Hoverport. Foraging and cooking healthy food gives me an improved sense of wellbeing. It is enhanced by going into and being in, a naturally rewilded environment, such as the Hoverport's land and shoreline.
2. Environmental movements such as the *Global Alliance for the Rights of Nature* <https://www.garn.org> advocates for the rewilding of land, such as the old Hoverport site. GARN is a global movement which is committed to researching, testing and monitoring previously contaminated sites. Instigated by local communities, findings show that when allowed to happen over time, naturally occurring ecologies may stabilise previously contaminated soil.
3. Having stated my premise, I wish to protest that the Rights of Nature and access to this site by members of the public to enjoy this rewilded site, should be valued as much as the business needs of NG.
4. My belief is that the impact of the NG's proposal for the old Hoverport site will be ecocide. My belief is based on the moral, health and wellbeing aspects I outline above.
5. This site is important to me as an individual and to other users of this rewilded site. It is an important community-wide resource. Restricted access, even for a "temporary" amount of time will be felt as highly detrimental.
6. I have deep concerns around the impact on these naturally occurring wild resources if the proposed amended use by NG Sea Link of the Hoverport as "construction, maintenance as well as a construction compound" is permitted.
7. In addition to the above concerns. I also have deep misgivings around the veracity of NG's documentary and working process.

8. I am aware that no systemic environmental survey has been undertaken by NG for the Hoverport site. NG argue that this was due to the change and amended plans of access which was not part of the original timeline.
9. In the '*National Grid's response – Comments about the existing condition of the hoverport etc. – National Grid November 2025 Sea Link pg 25*' The applicant states that: "*Various searches regarding the Hoverport have identified some 'anecdotal' evidence that the Hoverport was constructed on Colliery Spoil*".
10. There **is both historical and written** evidence which contests this 'merely' anecdotal claim. This is documented in the East Kent Times of 25th April 1969 and consists of a report on a presentation given by the National Coal Board (NCB) and Cementation, who constructed the hoverport site. The article states: "*300,000 tons of NCB colliery spoil heap shale*" was used as the base for the construction. This was then covered by concrete slabs.
11. My deep concern is that the impact of heavy tonnage of vehicles during the construction, maintenance and use as a construction compound, will degrade the existing rewilded environment which is stable. This destabilisation may then allow any toxins contained in the colliery shale to leach into the salt marsh, sea, and local water table and make the whole site unsafe to use.

Word count: 593