

Dear Inspectors,

I would be grateful if you would please take the following comments and points into consideration when examining the National Grid's Sea Link project.

These are in addition to my previous written objections and verbal submission of 24 March 2026.

I feel it is worth pointing out that writing submissions and speaking at the various hearings takes a great deal of nervous energy and causes untold amounts of stress.

National Grid have whole departments of experts to handle their applications whereas normal untrained individuals such as myself have an uphill struggle trying to make their viewpoints known and put forward their objections within the time frames and regulations laid down. I do hope the inspectors will understand this and take this into account when reading my comments.

COMPULSORY PURCHASE OF THE HOVERPORT AND ACCESS TRACK

I am extremely concerned about the way National Grid [NG] has proceeded with this part of its application.

It has been suggested that its last minute inclusion of the Hoverport within their plans is a mere minor amendment. This is completely misleading. It is also disrespectful to the planning process.

It is a major change, which will have a vast far-reaching impact on many levels including on the environment and local communities.

However in addition to this, I have one major concern regarding NG's proposed amendment.

NG seem to be suggesting that use of the Hoverport is actually essential to their plans. If this is the case, then it is a great worry that they were unable to foresee this at the initial planning stages.

To discover that their plans require such major change at this late stage in the planning process suggests at best supreme [REDACTED] and a lack of due diligence, which is a great worry if they are to be trusted to manage a project of such magnitude and importance going forward.

Indeed, if their initial planning abilities are this flawed, one wonders whether they are even suitably equipped to carry out such an important construction project.

A more cynical viewpoint is that this last minute amendment has been introduced to allow it to slip through with only minimal opportunities for it to be fully examined and the devastating consequences taken into account. This is a form of creeping development often seen in large projects and must not be permitted. This is underhand and one has to question the integrity of an organisation who works in this way, if this is the case.

So the question is: is it gross [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] practices?

In either case, then surely such a nationally important project should not be overseen by an organisation who behaves in such a way.

As can be seen, the research to justify the use of the hoverport is at best sketchy.

It is very apparent that there have been little or no proper surveys done regarding the suitability of this site for its proposed use. It is not clear whether this is again because of a lack of due diligence and foresight or specifically planned in order to avoid discovering the major hindrances and blocks to using the site.

Whatever the reason, the use of the hoverport cannot be fully considered until a full and comprehensive examination and surveys at all levels have been carried out.

Then comprehensive mitigation plans need to be drawn up and submitted for inspection, investigation and approval or dismissal.

However, there are no such comprehensive mitigation plans. And I suspect the reason for this lack of suitable mitigation planning is because it is impossible to mitigate the permanent damage which will be caused to such a unique environmental site by the proposed works.

The old hoverport is precious and should be protected at all costs.

Due to its re-wilding over the last 30 plus years it offers a unique habitat and supports rare orchids and reptiles as well as many birds. It is extremely rare for such a site to exist and its destruction is not to be undertaken lightly. And its destruction is assured if NG are allowed to proceed with their plans.

The Hoverport's foundational structure is fundamentally unsuitable for the works proposed, and will almost certainly fail in the long term causing yet more destruction. This is an environmental disaster waiting to happen.

The ground is not stable. It mainly comprises large portions of broken and deteriorating concrete on an unstable base. It also has underground tunnels and waterways.

It was built over 30 years ago specifically for hovercraft not HGV lorries carrying very heavy loads of aggregate.

The site was constructed by the National Coal Board and Cementation with 300,000 tons of 'NCB colliery spoil heap shale' being used as a base which was then covered by concrete slabs. The surface construction was never designed to withstand the extreme loads of heavy plant such as piling rigs, excavators and frequent passages of heavily laden aggregate lorries.

Colliery spoil typically contains pollutant such heavy metals including arsenic, lead and copper. If [when] the surface breaks up these will leach into the salt marsh and Pegwell Bay causing devastating and irreparable damage.

The hoverport foundations will simply not support such heavy ['both in terms of load and frequency] traffic.

In addition, pollutants from the vast amounts of aggregates that NG wish to store on the land will also inevitably leach into the salt marsh and Pegwell Bay.

Why have NG not yet conducted a full survey of the area and then presented plans to mitigate any such outcomes? This must be done before their plans can even be considered. Yet again their application is incomplete.

Within a short period of time after works begin, the unsuitability of this site will become apparent and then massively expensive repairs will be needed. By which time the devastating impact on this incredibly rare and precious wildlife site will have been permanently destroyed, which is both heartbreaking and impossible to justify. It is a classic case of destroying the environment to allegedly save the environment [but at the same time create some huge profits for some individuals].

Also the access track leading to the hoverport is narrow and I suspect will need to be strengthened, supported and possibly widened in parts.

It is frequently used at the moment to give access for wheelchair users, cyclists, families with prams and baby buggies. I assume this will be closed off, perhaps permanently, shutting out a community of users from a precious and unique space

which supports the well being and mental health of very many people. I was shocked that NG have tried to suggest the hoverport is barely used!

I am fortunate enough to live opposite the hoverport and see how many people use the hoverport on a regular basis. It supports so many and it seems grossly unfair that it should suddenly be arbitrarily taken away without any consideration by NG or an in depth consultation, rather than a rushed last minute poorly publicised addendum to a plan. Many people are still unaware this is even happening.

GENERAL POINTS:

As has been asserted by a great many others, this whole site is fundamentally unsuitable for such as project. To build on marsh land which is shifting and subject to tidal changes and ongoing increased risk of flooding seems unbelievably short sighted.

Recent weather reports assert that more and more flooding is likely throughout the world. It seems short sighted [insane?] to permanently damage and reduce an area which currently helps mitigate flooding to farmland and housing communities in the way currently served by the Minster Marshes.

Initially this site may seem the cheapest option, which is clearly a major factor for a company that seems to put profitability above all else. But it may well turn to to be far more expensive when continued ongoing mitigation is required to hold back the tide of increased flooding and an unstable environment.

In light of recent political events, including the revelation of a nearby Russian submarine cruising our waters, I would question whether enough consideration has been given to the national security of this site. It would seem to present a very easy target for any hostile force, should they wish to harm our energy / communication system. I wonder if sufficient thought has been put into this aspect of the site.

Finally, of course we all support working towards a more environmentally friendly world but when we destroy the environment in order to save the environment then one has to wonder where is the common sense.

This might be the right project but it is without doubt in the wrong place.

Thank you for reading this.