From: [redacted]
To: Aquind Interconnector
Subject: Fwd: Objection to interconnector construction at Portsmouth, UK
Date: 06 October 2020 21:53:46

Dear Sir/ Madam,

To clarify with regards my objection email below, I am a concerned resident of Baffins, Portsmouth living about 1 mile from the proposed route of the cable to be laid along the Eastern Road.

Yours faithfully

Megan Coventry

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Megan Coventry [redacted]
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2020 11:55 pm
To: aquind@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
Subject: Objection to interconnector construction at Portsmouth, UK

Dear Sir/Madam,

I object to the construction of the Aquind interconnector at the city of Portsmouth in the UK. Whilst I understand the benefits to energy supply security of connecting the UK and Europe with another interconnector, I believe that this is the wrong location to land the interconnector due to the disproportionate negative impacts on the local community of this island city. Other options for locations to land and construct the interconnector must be considered and a full impact assessment and benefits case brought to justify the chosen location. For the following reasons Portsmouth is not a suitable location:

1. Portsmouth is the most densely populated city in Europe. Construction of the interconnecter through this city will cause huge disruption and displacement of many people's homes, workplaces, schools, roads and transport, community facilities, green spaces and heritage locations (Eastney Beam engine house), when the city does not have available space or resource to relocate or rebuild in the wake of their destruction. This will have an extremely negative impact on the city's infrastructure, likely to cause deprivation to many local people's lives and livelihoods, in particular to local children, the elderly and vulnerable.
2. Building the interconnector through Milton common, Farlington Marshes and Langstone Harbour will have an extremely detrimental impact to the local environment, which currently supports a diverse array of wildlife and a unique habitat that draws migrating bird populations such as Canada Brent geese. To remove this natural safe haven for wildlife will cause irreparable damage to the ecosystems of many marine and land animal species and flora & fauna that have existed here and utilised this area for hundreds of years.
3. Portsmouth is an area already suffering from traffic congestion and air pollution, with warnings of breaches of carbon particle levels in the air affecting people's quality of life and resulting in related rises in people, in particular children, developing lifelong lung conditions and breathing difficulties, such as asthma, caused and exacerbated by pollution. Building the interconnector through

Portsmouth would significantly increase pollution during and after construction, permanently damaging local people's quality of life and life expectancy.

In summary, Portsmouth is not an appropriate location to build the proposed interconnector landing point due to the disproportionate negative impact and costs, both financial and non-financial, that would be borne by the city and local residents. These outweigh the benefit to the UK of the interconnector purpose in the long term. I am sure there are more reasons to support the argument against construction of the interconnector in Portsmouth. I would be happy to discuss the above reasons and others with you further.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs Megan Coventry

Get Outlook for iOS