From: [redacted]
To: Aquind Interconnector
Date: 06 October 2020 16:42:26

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed route across Eastney/Milton for the Aquind Connector power line.

The attempts at consultation by Aquind have been shamefully inadequate. For instance,
I have been made aware that the rules around who can make representations to the Planning Inspectorate regarding the Aquind project are such that anyone who wanted to give their views should have registered as an interested party in February 2020. However, it is also my understanding that changes were made to the plan after February which should have resulted in an extension to the date by which parties could register, and that has not happened.

Closing part of the Eastern Road for 18 months - one of the three major roads in and out of the city - will be hugely disruptive to local residents. The work will hinder the bus route which will lead to fewer journeys by public transport at a time when we're trying to encourage people out of their cars. In turn, this will have a negative impact on the already poor air quality we have in Portsmouth.

The route poses a huge threat to the last remaining green corner of Portsea Island. The route through Bransbury Park and the allotments will be disruptive and cause irreparable damage to wildlife and green space. I understand that there are rare newts living at the allotments which could be lost for ever should their habitat be disturbed by this plan.

Our natural habitats are already under huge pressure due to climate change. We should be taking every precaution to safeguard our wildlife, and infrastructure projects can no longer be allowed to further jeopardise a very delicate environmental balance.

The outline project case implies environmental benefit, stating the project will "facilitate more efficient dispatch of renewables across Europe" and that "Carbon dioxide emissions are projected to reduce overall with the introduction of AQUIND". However, I have seen no detail or evidence to substantiate these claims, or show how they are to be measured. In fact, the reduction in CO2 emissions is qualified as being "mainly driven by a reduction in more carbon-intensive GB generation". Given the trajectory with the green agenda, there is no alternative but to reduce carbon-intensive energy generation, so I remain unclear as to how the interconnector will directly contribute to any reduction.

For this to be a viable proposition, the environmental benefit has to outweigh any detriment, and the scale is not tipping the right way based on the information I have seen.

I believe this project and its perceived benefits need to be reviewed and further scrutinised.

Yours faithfully,

Emily Prior