

From: [REDACTED]
To: [NI Enquiries](#)
Subject: Final response to the ExA - Reference [REDACTED] = Manuelo Luigi Lorenzo - Personal objections
Date: 29 April 2026 17:06:31

[REDACTED]

I intended to use your form but I managed to lose what I had typed so I am sending it to you by email.

Like many others, I support the transition to net zero but resent the use of the term NIMBY merely because I have expressed concerns about the way Sea Link and National Grid have gone about the consultation. There must be infrastructure to support net zero but Pegwell Bay and Minster Marshes are not the locations for this scheme

Pegwell Bay and Minster Marshes are locations of such sensitivity (SSSI, NNR, Ramsar site etc.,) that they should have been avoided rather than chosen on the grounds of cost. Having read through the mountain of papers, I am still not convinced that the other options were genuinely assessed whether comparatively or environmentally. Furthermore, I am not convinced that the implications for the designated habitats and species have been sufficiently explored - what will happen to the saltmarsh, the Hoverport access now that the use is to be intensified? Pegwell Bay is far too sensitive a location for the amount of unresolved risk and post-consent flexibility that has been attached to this scheme.

Kent CPRE has repeatedly supported the need for a funded saltmarsh recovery scheme plus continued monitoring for its efficacy. Let's not have another NEMO link disaster. I wholeheartedly support them in this stance.

It struck me as I watched the open hearings and issue specific hearings that the applicant suggested things could be resolved post consent. The ExA could have demanded greater examination but did not, presumably because of the time constraint laid down by the Secretary of State. Is this also why the late proposal to discharge requirements by a future DESNZ unit? Central Government is in the throes of reorganising local authorities with the concept of Unitary Authorities covering all parts of the country. Large planning issues - presumably including NSIPs, will be dealt with by highly trained new Councillors who should be able to deal with the intricacies of NSIPs yet, the proposal, if accepted, would mean the applicant could pick and choose who would be the determining authority on a case-by-case basis. That, surely, flies in the face of the new Unitary Authorities and undermines local democracy. Kent Wildlife Trust have submitted their objections in their response and they want the provisions to be struck out in their entirety. I think that is a sound suggestion and must be acted upon - strike it out.

I am also concerned about the impact on the community - the increased traffic and noise from construction, the proposed working hours and the impression I

got was that the locals would have to endure the noise and disturbance. The distinct impression I got was the peorityple living there (and the wildlife) were secondary to the ultimate objective of getting the job done.

For these and many other reason as spelt out by other such as KWT, Kent CPRE and Save Minster Marshes, the Examination Authority must to the Secretary of State that the DCO must be refused.

Peter Lorenzo