

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am emailing you my comments from the above issue specific hearing 3 regarding the Sealink project proposal.

OPEN FLOOR HEARING 24TH MARCH 2026

THE HOVERPORT

HELLO EVERYONE, AND THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

FIRSTLY, I MUST SAY HOW TIME-CONSUMING, CONFUSING, AND DIFFICULT THIS PROCESS HAS BEEN, AND THE SMALL NUMBER OF PEOPLE PROTESTING AT THESE HEARINGS DOES NOT REFLECT THE STRENGTH OF OPINION AGAINST THIS PROPOSED SEALINK PROJECT!

THE OLD REWILDED HOVERPORT SITE IS LINKED TO PEGWELL BAY NATIONAL NATURE RESERVE AND IS A WILDLIFE HAVEN.

I AM STRONGLY OBJECTING TO NATIONAL GRID COMPULSORY PURCHASING THIS AREA, AS THEY WILL RUIN IT FOR THE WILDLIFE, PLANT LIFE, AND EVERYONE! THIS AREA HAS BEEN LEFT TO NATURE TO RECLAIM, AND IT IS DOING A VERY GOOD JOB OF IT! BIRDS, MAMMALS, AND UNUSUAL PLANTS SUCH AS THE BEE AND LIZARD ORCHIDS HAVE TAKEN UP RESIDENCE THERE. THESE AREAS NEED OUR UPMOST CARE AND PROTECTION.

THE OLD REWILDED HOVERPORT AREA IS EASILY ACCESSIBLE FOR EVERYONE, AND IT IS ONE OF THE FEW PLACES OF REFUGE, LEFT IN THANET, WHERE PEOPLE CAN GO AND SPEND TIME IN NATURE, AND GET AWAY FROM THE STRESSES OF LIFE. IN A RECENT SMALL SURVEY ON FACEBOOK NEARLY 300 PEOPLE SAID THEY USE THE OLD HOVERPORT SITE ONCE A MONTH OR MORE! IN REALITY THIS NUMBER IS MUCH LARGER! NATIONAL GRID COMPULSORY PURCHASING THIS AREA WILL TAKE THIS AWAY FROM THE LOCALS AND TOURISTS TO THANET.

THERE IS ALSO THE THREAT THAT NATIONAL GRID WILL CAUSE EXTENSIVE DAMAGE TO THE VULNERABLE SURFACE OF THE OLD HOVERPORT WITH THEIR HEAVY VEHICLES, MACHINERY, AND EQUIPMENT, ALLOWING POLLUTANTS TO ESCAPE AND POLLUTE THE BAY!

THE NEMO LINK CABLE, WHEN THAT WAS PUT THROUGH PEGWELL BAY, CAUSED IRREVERSIBLE DAMAGE TO THE AREA, WHEN THEY ABANDONED THE HORIZONTAL DRILLING TECHNIQUE FOR OPEN TRENCHING!

(THERE HAS BEEN NO MITIGATION FOR THIS EITHER!)

SINCE NATIONAL GRID CANNOT 100% GUARANTEE THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE INCIDENTS MAY OCCUR, AND THEY WILL NOT WANT TO ABANDON THEIR PROJECT ONCE IT HAS COMMENCED! SEALINK MUST NOT BE GRANTED PERMISSION! THERE IS TOO MUCH AT RISK!

THIS AREA IS TOO PRECIOUS AND VALUABLE TO BE GAMBLER WITH!

THIS WHOLE PROPOSED SEALINK PROJECT WILL BE A MASSIVE NATIONAL SECURITY RISK! WE HAVE SEEN THAT IN THESE RECENT TIMES OF CONFLICT, IT IS THE ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE THAT IS TARGETED AND BOMBED! THE PROPOSED CONVERTER STATION IS TO BE THE LARGEST IN EUROPE, SO THIS WILL BE A PRIME TARGET!

WE SHOULD LEARN FROM WHAT IS GOING ON IN THE WORLD AND NOT ALLOW SUCH BIG PROJECTS TO BE BUILT!

THE QUESTION OF WHETHER WE NEED THIS PROJECT NEEDS TO BE FULLY EXAMINED! I DO NOT THINK THIS IS THE CASE, NOR THE RIGHT WAY OF GOING ABOUT IT!

I AM NO EXPERT, BUT BETTER TECHNOLOGIES ARE BEING DEVELOPED ALL THE TIME! WE CANNOT AFFORD TO MAKE SUCH PLANETARY AND ENVIRONMENTALLY COSTLY MISTAKES AS GRANTING THIS PROPOSAL WOULD CAUSE!

PRESENTLY THIS COUNTRY IS IN A MAD DASH TO REACH NET ZERO! BUT THIS WILL BE AN ABSOLUTE DISASTER IF WE HAVE NO COUNTRYSIDE, NATURE AND WILDLIFE LEFT!

ONE THING WE KNOW FOR CERTAIN IS THAT IF THIS SEALINK PROJECT IS ALLOWED TO GO AHEAD, IT WILL CAUSE MASSIVE AMOUNTS OF DEVASTATION TO OUR MARINE ENVIRONMENTS AND MARINE LIFE, OUR ONSHORE NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS, AND TO OUR ALREADY STRUGGLING WILDLIFE!

PLEASE EXAMINERS CAREFULLY CONSIDER WHETHER SEALINK WILL BE DOING US MORE HARM THAN GOOD!

THEN REJECT IT!

I would also like to further add to my comments that I do not believe that there is an absolute need for this project to go ahead. I believe that the existing cables could be reinforced and upgraded to carry more power. Also, the cumulative different projects that have been developed and recently been completed I believe would be enough without Sealink. National Grid I believe are wanting this infrastructure on their books so to speak to benefit themselves as a company and their shareholders.

I also have seen a very worrying question from the planning inspectorate to National Grid asking about the deposit of plastic and synthetics at sea! (ExQ3: No 28.Other 25 February 2026 30TH1.). If National Grid are planning this, won't this also be damaging to our marine environment?

Question to Applicant Deposit of plastic and synthetics at sea

Part 1(7) (e) of the dDML sets out that plastic and synthetics are authorised for deposit at sea. NPS EN-15.15.11 states that assessment should include other uses of material before disposal to sea.

Applicant:

- . confirm whether this assessment has been carried out or whether it would be secured through a control document.
- . Provide an estimate of quantities and likely locations.

MMO/NE: Comment as to whether this is acceptable.

The Marpol convention Annex V bans the disposal of all plastics and synthetic materials from ships anywhere at sea!

There are so many damaging outcomes that this proposed sealink project will cause from the Suffolk end, right through to the Kent end, and there are so many other less damaging alternatives that I am most strongly urging you examiners, to most strongly reject this proposal.