

Final submission to the Planning Inspectorate

Dear Planning Inspectors,

I am writing again to plead the case for the refusal of National Grid's proposed Sealink project.

The sad fact is that England is one of the most nature-depleted countries in the world! Proposed projects, such as Sealink, will only add to this very poor state! I have recently learned that Natural England has stopped designating special wildlife and nature-rich environments as SSSI sites! This was reported upon in the Guardian, 21/04/2026, by Patrick Barkham) And their last SSSI-designated area was back in 2023! Surely, with this information, it would go without saying that we MUST PROTECT AND CHERISH the very special few SSSI sites that we presently have and not allow large private companies to trench right through one of our very special SSSI sites, which is also a RAMSAR, SPA, SPC, and NATIONAL NATURE RESERVE! The one that Sir David Attenborough opened back in 1999. That being Pegwell Bay in Kent.

If National Grid is allowed to go ahead with its proposed plans, it will cause so much disturbance and have such an ongoing, devastating, and detrimental effect on our nature and wildlife that it will really be a disaster!

Recently, on Sunday, 19th April 2026, a fire broke out in the SSSI at Pegwell Bay National Nature Reserve. This caused mass devastation with an area of approximately 300 metres being burnt, with devastating results for the ground-nesting birds that were in the area, their eggs and chicks! This fire was believed to have been the result of an Arson attack. (Another example of humans destroying nature). This area, if allowed, will recover, but this year's potential chicks will have been destroyed. However, this fire also demonstrates how quickly our wildlife and natural habitats can be destroyed, and that we need to care deeply and protect the ones we have, and not let private large companies use them for their own gains when

there are many less environmentally damaging alternatives!

The Needs case for the whole Sealink project needs to be reviewed. Since it was first proposed, this Sealink project has changed very significantly! Which I am sure you will be aware of. Massive changes have been incurred since it was submitted for your consideration, and these must surely lead you to question why it was not fully researched and priced before being presented to you.

A few examples of this include having to place the Converter/Substation on a 2-metre-thick platform on the marsh with poles driven into the marshland to stand it on wasn't originally realised, as National Grid did not know what the land was like. The extra costs and lorry movements, noise, pollution, and environmental damage are all very significant factors. Realising also at a very late stage that the Salt marsh does move, and then wanting to take over the old rewilded hoverport site as a result, also demonstrates National Grid's lack of understanding about the precious environments that they will be destroying, damaging, and impacting upon. The old rewilded hoverport site has been enjoyed by the public for over the past 20 years, and the public should have the right to continue to use it, not to have this treasured area taken away from them and be made to suffer because National Grid now wants it for their own usage, which will destroy the tranquility of the area for the public and severely impact badly on the nearby businesses as well as our wildlife and natural world.

The Need for the Sealink project is flawed. It is not essential for our country to have this proposed project granted.

Upgrading and restringing the power lines would be what is needed! and maybe if necessary, a couple small projects, not the oversized, environmentally damaging Sealink project! The need for Sealink is flawed!

Since the idea of Sealink, the energy landscape has changed dramatically. Several of the offshore wind developments originally used to justify Sea Link are no longer proceeding. At the same time, new interconnectors have been approved and are already underway. These developments materially alter the need case. Yet the project continues to advance as though none of these changes have occurred. The result is a scheme that is oversized, outdated, and increasingly misaligned with current energy realities.

The Save Minster marshes group and the Suffolk campaigners, I'm sure, will be evidencing this. Unfortunately, I am not technically minded enough to do so properly. We should be looking after our Natural assets, not destroying them for the advantage of a private profit-driven foreign company!

It has also been brought to my attention the applicant's proposal AS-167. This would allow a future, hypothetical DESNZ unit - which does not yet exist and has no defined powers or procedures - to take over the discharge of DCO requirements. I am urging you, Examiners, to reject AS-167 in full, as it represents a material and unjustified unacceptable late change to the Examination. It is an example of NGET using stealth to avoid negotiating fair, locally accountable requirements with our local councils.

At the end of the day, our utmost priority is for our Natural environmental assets to be protected, kept safe and respected, not to be trashed and irreversibly ruined in the rush to meet Net Zero targets! Damaging sites with our highest designations of protection on them, as well as highly proven valuable wildlife habitat areas, just goes totally against the idea of Net Zero and must not be allowed!

Please Examiners reject the Sea Link proposal!

I apologise if some of these comments are in the wrong section, I just have found the whole process very confusing, but please take them all into your careful consideration,