

## Response for deadline 7 – Key Outstanding Matters

Planning Inspectorate ref: EN020026 [REDACTED]

As outlined in previous submissions, the Applicant has made many errors and omissions in their submission and many of those are yet to be addressed. For Deadline 7, I have submitted further representations:

Response for deadline 7 to Applicants answer to AP10 from ISH3.

Response for deadline 7 – Lighting at the Hoverport.

Response for deadline 7 – Cumulative Effects.

Response for deadline 7 - Approach to Adopting DESNZ Requirement Discharge Unit for Sea Link.

Each of these submissions contain concerns that I feel need addressing but there are, what I consider, key outstanding matters.

### **1) The estimated cost of the project as of now**

The Applicant is still referring to the cost based on 2018/2019 figures but that is a gross underestimation. If this project is given permission to proceed then it will be UK billpayers / taxpayers who will ultimately fund it so surely, we have a right to be told a more realistic figure.

SEAS in REP6-256A and in my REP6-142 gave clear reasons why this figure is wholly inaccurate but more importantly gave detailed, costed viable alternatives to Sea Link. Even at £1.1 billion it would represent a significant saving to the UK billpayers but with the likely cost being in excess of £2 billion (with some estimating it to be nearer to £3 billion), the Applicant cannot argue that Sea Link represents an efficient and economical solution.

### **2) Construction method for stabilising the ground at the Minster Converter Station**

In REP6-279 I outlined in detail the two possible methods mentioned by the Applicant in their documentation (AS-093 and APP-171). Both require significant HGV movements but with Hydrovac there is the additional issue of disposing of large quantities of material with very high sulphate content. With the destination unknown or unspecified at present it is difficult to know if this has been included in the traffic modelling.

If the Controlled Modulus Column method is used it will require large quantities of concrete with the most logical source being Bretts on Ramsgate Port. This will also have implications for Traffic Modelling.

### **3) The remaining deficit for SC2**

SEAS in REP6-256A and my REP6-142 pointed out that even if Sea Link were given permission to proceed, there would still an unsatisfied deficit of 4,516.2 MVA. At no stage has the Applicant indicated how this deficit will be addressed but it will require as yet unspecified additional infrastructure to be built within SC2 at additional cost to the UK billpayer.

The Applicant cannot argue that Sea Link represents an efficient and economical solution when it is much more expensive than the alternative and still requires additional infrastructure to be built to solve the deficit.

David Stevens.