

I object to the proposed use of the former hoverport and the construction methods described for Pegwell Bay. The scheme would irreversibly damage a treasured local amenity and a nationally important wildlife site designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The saltmarsh and associated intertidal habitats have been naturally recolonised and are irreplaceable at local and UK scale. The applicant has provided no credible evidence that these habitats would recover; experience from comparable projects suggests the opposite. Beyond ecological loss, prolonged heavy works threaten residents' wellbeing, businesses, and property values. I urge the Examining Authority to reject this element of the project or, at minimum, require materially different, less damaging alternatives with robust, independently verified safeguards.

1) Loss of a valuable local amenity and community wellbeing

Pegwell Bay is one of the very few places in Thanet where the public can easily experience thriving saltmarsh, waders, and wildfowl at close quarters. I visit regularly for respite; it is essential to my mental wellbeing and to many others in our community. Turning this area into a long term construction site will remove that. Please consider whether there is anywhere else in Thanet that offers comparable access to wildlife—there is not.

2) Irreplaceable wildlife habitat at national importance

The saltmarsh and intertidal mosaic here are rare in Thanet and unusual in the UK. Nature has beautifully reclaimed the old hoverport, creating a continuous habitat used by birds, invertebrates, and specialised plants. The Construction Method Technical Note anticipates extensive use of large machinery, temporary compounds, haul routes, and repeated ground disturbance. This will fragment, compact, and contaminate the saltmarsh, alter hydrology, increase turbidity/siltation, and introduce harmful noise, vibration, and lighting.

Crucially, there is no evidence in the documents that these habitats will recover; on the contrary, comparable coastal works often show long term or permanent degradation of saltmarsh structure and function. lighting impacts

The note underestimates the effects of piling, compaction, vehicle movements, species. Disturbance will displace feeding and roosting birds and harm flora and fauna. Impacts are not "temporary inconveniences"—they can cause breeding failure, recruitment failure, and abandonment of the site.

4) Socio economic impacts on residents and businesses

Prolonged construction directly next to homes and small businesses will cause noise, dust, traffic disruption, and visual blight. For those considering selling, the stigma and uncertainty surrounding a major building site will likely depress property values for the duration and possibly beyond. The applicant has not provided a convincing assessment or mitigation package for these real world effects.

5) Evidence gaps and failure to justify the chosen method

The Construction Method Technical Note does not demonstrate that using the hoverport is the only way to build the new runway. It reads as a choice of convenience rather than necessity. Where are the fully considered options? What about minimising saltmarsh disturbance (e.g., revised logistics routes, different temporary works designs, offshore or upland staging, smaller plant, or modularised approaches)? Absent this, the proposal fails the basic test of minimising harm to a designated site and its users. Where is the Restoration and Aftercare Plan with clear milestones, monitoring and a restoration bond sufficient to fund remediation if targets are missed?

What I ask the Examining Authority to do

Primary request:

Do not approve the use of the former hoverport and associated methods that involve works across or adjacent to the saltmarsh and intertidal habitats.

National Grid is a large multinational, publicly listed utility. Whatever the corporate rationale, the UK public interest here is the protection of a unique, much loved natural place and the wellbeing of the local community. Ethically and practically, this proposal cannot proceed as set out in the Construction Method Technical Note.

Thank you for considering my representation.