

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [South East Anglia Link](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Additional subwmission following CAH hearing today  
**Date:** 27 January 2026 14:32:52

---

Dear Ms Homes and ExA Panel members,

We apologise for yet another submission - but have found today's process difficult with which to engage and apologise if any of the following is incorrect.

In respect of the CAH today, we would have liked to say the following given the opportunity.

Despite trying very hard to read all the documents in respect of land rights, we are still confused about Category 1 and Category 2 on the Land Rights Tracker and how this relates to Class5 land for Work No 14, which includes a bigger land grab of Open Space at Pegwell Bay.

We are concerned with plots 3/111, 3/112 , 3/99 and 3/97a concerning the Hoverport and open space access to it. Please note:-

- The LATEST land rights tracker REP3-059 was only delivered in January 26 after the closure of the consultation on CR1, and this was following two previous changes to the document - this has made it impossible for us to make sense of attending the CAH to make our case, representing users of the Hoverport Open Space land.
- REP3-059 shows the Hoverport land at 3/111 and 3/112 as Category 2 land and in the change sheet shows it as Category 1 - so either the category is wrong or the applicant is seeking to make this Category 2. **Can you ask the applicant to clarify please and explain the difference as we cannot find it in any of the documentation supplied? Thankyou.**
- REP3-059 shows 3/111 and 3/112 as owned by Thanet OFT Ltd and mentions a restrictive covenant concerning cabling underneath the plot owned by Thanet OFT Ltd. We believe these plots are owned by Thanet District Council and were not subject to intrusive underground cabling for the WindFarm or for NEMO. **Can you please ask the applicant to clarify ownership for negotiation and why the covenant appears to mention cabling that is not there? REP3-016 appears to show ownership at TDC so this is inconsistent.**
- The applicant has not mentioned Hoverport, but Hovercraft Port in the land rights tracker. **We think this is deliberate obfuscation and they should put this right. Members of the public looking for Hoverport detail will not find it.**

- REP3-016 does not appear to include 3/97a, which is shown as one of the new plots. We may be wrong of course but **would welcome clarification.**

Although we understand the sensitivities surrounding DH Clifton's farm and the difference between ownership and tenant concerns, we would like to advise you that plots 2/123 and 2/133 (owned by Struan Robertson (AP494) (as shown by yourselves on the work plans today), were the plots that were extensively underwater in the video that we sent you. We would have like an opportunity for you to show this to the Applicant so that we can hear what they say. **If that opportunity is tomorrow please let us know.**

**We have not yet received details of how to attend tomorrow.**

Kind regards

Karen McKenzie for SMM