

[REDACTED]

South East Anglia Link

Save Minster Marshes

[?]

[REDACTED]

Interested Party Reference number: [REDACTED]

I should like to respond to certain paragraphs as follows:

3. It's essential that mitigation for damage is in place before the damage takes place, and it must be monitored afterwards.

4. Nemo Link has already caused extensive damage, and this is continuing so there is good reason to be concerned about National Grid's approach to preventing harm, and the cumulative impact on the SSSI, in addition NG want to bring a third cable in through Pegwell Bay.

5. NG agrees that the chalk is irreplaceable. That something is irreplaceable is sufficient reason to request that the Minister expressly applies the wholly-exceptional-reasons and compensation test in her decision-making.

6 - 7. There needs to be a worst case assessment of the impact on wildlife (including the seal population) and advance notification for KWT of use of the hovercraft and ongoing monitoring.

16. This is an SSSI, a protected site, and in spring is full of breeding birds. NG must commit to no working from March to September at the SSSI to avoid disturbance. The words 'after a nest check' should be removed. NG has already put up a site office next

to a barn owl box on Minster Marshes that is known to have been used by barn owls.

19. There have already been many collisions of birds with the existing power lines so diverters need to be fitted to power lines from the start, not after more collisions have happened. Five years of monitoring are a minimum, not the two that NG are suggesting.

21 - 22. Further surveys are needed.

26 and 33. NG has failed to respond to Natural England's point that intertidal detonation of UXOs may need habitat restoration. This must be included in their commitments

28. All access routes (locations and widths) need to be agreed before consent is granted, not afterwards.

32. NG's statement that this only applies 'below mean high water springs' means that works at Pegwell Bay, including near the hoverport, could still go ahead in winter. There must be no winter working at all at Pegwell (November - February) to protect the migratory overwintering bird population.

44. NG has failed to carry out any proper assessment of the impact on tourism and the compensation they have offered our community is derisory. They have said that Thanet's tourism industry won't be impacted, a totally unjustifiable statement

55. I support KWT's call for monitoring and mitigation if noise limits are breached.

Yours sincerely

Mary Golder-Hayes