

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: Objection to Aquind Interconnector Planning Application & Request to Speak at the Hearing
Date: 04 October 2020 21:58:10

Hello,

I would like to make the following objection to the proposal by Aquind to land an interconnector cable at Eastney, in the ward of Portsmouth I represent on the City Council, run it through the eastern part of my ward and more broadly to it going ahead at all through the most densely populated urban area on the south coast of England.

It's that latter point I will address first. This proposal should never have even got to this stage. It is perverse that the chosen landing point of Portsmouth is even being considered in the first place, to cause such huge disruption to the maximum amount of people for, from what it says in the documentation accompanying the application, the convenience of the private company National Grid. I fail to understand the logic of this at all, Portsmouth is nowhere near the closest point of entry on the south coast to where the cable leaves France, indeed the whole of the Sussex coast is closer and much of that has considerably less people if it was landed at a place without settlement or with little inhabitation. The onus surely should be on National Grid and Aquind to invest in upgrading a substation and the electricity network somewhere along that stretch, which would reduce the size and cost of the cable and also cause minimal disruption compared to the absolute maximum disruption the current plan would cause. If there was any actual ongoing, tangible benefit for the community of Portsmouth, Havant, East Hampshire and Winchester council areas to this cable disrupting the lives of everyone on the route of the cable and people in the surrounding area there might be a case, but with ongoing maintenance needs over the years, all it will bring is further unnecessary disruption. Added to that, this is a cable that is landing, not on the mainland, but on an island and part of the plan is to tunnel under the sea once again to get to the mainland when it gets to the top of Portsea Island, under a very scientifically and ecologically important harbour at that. That is probably the most astonishingly bizarre aspect of the entire concept.

Let me be clear, I recognise that for the future energy security of both ourselves and our European friends and neighbours we need to have interconnector cables but surely the schemes should be designed with public and social value in mind in their implementation and installation, not just relying on the fact that it's good for energy security as an abstract.

I will now move onto the specific objections to do with my ward.

Firstly, the landing site at Eastney. The route will take it directly next to nationally listed tank defences left over from the Second World War, and tunnel across an SSSI before the connecting station between the undersea cables and the landside cables at Fort Cumberland Road car park. The area to the east of the landing point, the SSSI & the car park is, planning permission depending, due to be being developed at the same time as the work for the interconnector cable is planned to take place. With the proposal of Aquind to take over around half of a city council

owned car park as a equipment store and access to the landside and sea cables for a proposed 66 weeks this will cause huge disruption for people wanting to use the beach in that part of Eastney, to access the neighbouring heathland and to the wildlife of the SSSI. Even more concerning is the fact that the plans include permanently having two structures of three metre height in the car park therefore reducing car parking availability (there is no ability to extend the car park due to the roads and protected green space around it) and also introducing incongruous structures for which there is no precedent landside of the heathland and Fort Cumberland that would encroach on the amenity of residents who live in Fort Cumberland Road and the roads off it

Secondly, the disruption caused by digging up Fort Cumberland and Henderson Roads as far as Bransbury Park. The junction at Fort Cumberland and Henderson Road is the only access for the whole of the Lumsden Road estate to the rest of the city via car and is a bus route yet this will be disrupted for weeks while the cable is laid. It is also a major cycle route as it leads to the link of Hayling Ferry with cyclists coming from all over the city to use that mode of transport as well as those who drive and get the bus down there too. This is the only part of the entire proposed route of the cable where the only access to and from a community will be completely disrupted. This is unacceptable to the residents of the area and to me as their representative. This will also have an impact on a much wider group of people as their will be necessary diversions and disruptions alongside the disruption that would happen for local residents adjacent to the car park where the lost space will lead to people visiting to park dangerously as is already seen when that car park gets full already.

Thirdly, the proposal to lay the cable through Bransbury Park. To start with this will disrupt yet another car park as that will have to be dug up during the period when the cable is laid, but more importantly, I do not see anything in the proposals from Aquind about whether they are planning to dig up the park itself or whether they are going to dig up the shared use path across the park. I suspect the latter from their lack of mitigation explained, but in itself that causes huge disruption for another main cycle and walking route for people getting from one side of the park to the other without having to go on main roads which would particularly impact more inexperienced and vulnerable cyclists and older and disabled people.

In all cases of mitigation what I have seen from Aquind and from the government, who of course have made the appalling and rather concerning, in context, decision to take the say over this scheme from affected local authorities and give it to itself via the planning inspectorate, developer contribution money has been mentioned but no actual concrete mitigation plans at all that I've been able to see in their proposals. No amount of money will pay for the disruption caused by this scheme nor will it mitigate for the permanent loss of amenity for the people of Eastney and people who visit that part of the city. I find the consideration that money will make objections go away frankly rather concerning and it is insulting to the people of my ward who will be adversely affected if this scheme goes ahead.

In conclusion, this scheme should have been thrown out before ever getting to this stage, the route is all for the convenience of large corporations rather than any benefit to the people who live along the route of the proposed cable, lacking completely in social value, and it is unnecessarily disruptive to residents along its

entire route who will receive no material benefit at all for it being put in place and in fact will in some cases have only a negative permanent impact.

So I ask you to refuse this application for the Aquind Interconnector Cable to be routed through Portsmouth, Waterlooville, Horndean and Lovedean and suggest to Aquind that if they are committed to an interconnector cable scheme across the Channel that they land it and route it in an area of the south coast that has minimal population and would cause minimal disruption.

I also wish to speak at the examination open floor hearings and the issue specific hearings in December.

Regards,

Matthew

Cllr Matthew Winnington
Liberal Democrat
Eastney and Craneswater
Cabinet Member for Health, Wellbeing & Social Care
Portsmouth City Council
Working Hard All Year Round



Matthew Winnington and/or the Portsmouth Liberal Democrats and its elected representatives may contact you using the address, phone number/s and email address details given - some of these contacts may be automated. If you would prefer not to be contacted, please contact me.