

Considering the site/s identified for the National Grid project in Kent, I cannot find any viable reason for them to be identified as the most suitable for the project, and can only think that the financial burden is less than an alternative solution. The inland area is largely marsh land and we already see the difficulties of building on this land by the rapid degeneration of the main access road to Thanet A299, which has been on a 50mph reduced speed for years (since regeneration of the road), because of the underlying marsh land.

The cable laying to reach the Minster Marsh building site doubles the negative impact of the overall project, by almost completely devastating the SSI area of Pegwell Bay. The SSI is awarded after hundreds of years of ecological development. The impact of the cable laying will devastate this and take lifetimes to be mitigated but that regeneration is doubly-threatened by our climate's change, further increasing the impact on this supreme natural environment.

There are many areas around the south east coast which have open land without the achievement of SSI status. Why is Minster Marshes the only site that can be used? Is it's proximity, it's being almost the closest distance between Suffolk and Kent, a very key factor in the decision? Finance over the world's ecology? For a (broadly) small project like this, should these factors not be the most important, rather than the financial outlay for the company?