

I am writing to urge your immediate attention to an issue where your intervention could make a meaningful and time-critical difference.

I understand why the Climate and Nature Bill did not proceed to a second reading: its scope was broad, aspects were unenforceable, and much is already addressed within existing legislation. Nonetheless, its underlying aims clearly have widespread public support. Your department's mission—to make the UK a clean energy superpower through Clean Power by 2030 and Accelerate to Net Zero, while enhancing energy security, protecting billpayers, creating jobs, and cutting emissions—is one I fully support.

What I cannot reconcile is the pursuit of these ambitions without an explicit and robust commitment to protecting nature—particularly where current proposals risk actively damaging it.

In your State of Climate and Nature Statement to the House of Commons on 14 July 2025, you said: “The fight to protect our home is a deeply British cause ... Only by bringing down carbon emissions, protecting nature, and working internationally can we deliver energy security today, and climate security for future generations.” You also stated that this transition would occur “whilst restoring our natural environment and tackling the climate crisis.” (HCWS817)

These commitments are difficult to align with the proposed development at Minster Marshes in Thanet, where over 12 hectares of high-water-table BMV arable land would be permanently lost beneath concrete for National Grid's Sea Link converter station.

This is not degraded land. It is productive farmland that supports red- and amber-listed birds and protected species, including beavers, water voles, grass snakes, slow worms and hares. Once destroyed, this landscape cannot be meaningfully restored.

Of immediate and urgent concern, men in high-visibility jackets have already been observed walking through restricted areas of the nature reserve. This activity is disturbing wildlife at a critical time, compromising their ability to rest, feed, and survive. The situation is already having a tangible impact on a site that is meant to be protected.

The proposal also includes drilling beneath Pegwell Bay—a National Nature Reserve with SSSI, RAMSAR and Special Protection Area designations—established specifically to safeguard it from harm.

I believe the project's Needs Case contains fundamental flaws, and I am confident these can be demonstrated.

Proceeding in its current form risks committing the UK to a course that prioritises returns to large, predominantly overseas institutional investors over genuine environmental protection.

We all want a rapid transition to clean energy. However, that transition will only maintain public trust if it does not undermine the very ecosystems it is intended to protect.

This is now an urgent matter requiring immediate attention.

Thank you for your time and consideration, and for your continued service.

Yours sincerely,

Lynda Hills