From: [redacted]
To: Aquind Interconnector
Subject: Application for Interconnector - Portsmouth
Date: 05 October 2020 16:43:24

Dear Inspector,

Re: Application for Interconnector - Portsmouth

I have previously written to you asking to speak at the virtual public meeting concerning the above and while I wish to reserve my right to speak I also know how fickle technology can be and so I felt it prudent to also formally lodge my objection to the above.

The nature of my objections are both as a Portsmouth City Councillor representing one of the wards through which the route of the interconnected passes and as a private individual.

Portsmouth is the most densely populated city in the UK outside of central London, and owing to its island geography it is served by only three main roads on and off the island. Channelling through one of the cities 'key-route network' roads for months at a time would cause significant congestion in the city. There is ample evidence from past events that when one of the roads has a blockage, the other two quickly become gridlocked. The consequence being that frequently the traffic will often back up and cause hazard and obstruction on the highway network (the A27 and M27) controlled by Highways England. This is compounded should Portsmouth Football Club, which is at the end of the A2030 (the proposed route), be playing a home match.

The other consequence is the the DfT concerns the improvement of air quality. The city has breached the acceptable levels of Nitrogen Dioxide in the atmosphere for several years. One of the worst breach points in the city is at Velder Avenue - immediately at the southern end of the A2030 and one of the consequence of this proposal is to make it worse at a time the city should be seeking to improve it.

Further, the applicant seeks to make use of the very limited open space in a land starved city. They propose to make use of when of the few areas go playing pitches in a city which is woefully under-provided compared to most, if not any, other town or city. This will have a further detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of the residents of the city. The city planning officer should be able to provide you the current exact figures. I am also concerned at the loss of trees which would be caused by these proposals, contrary to the avowed intentions of the Government. The only reason many of these trees do not have Tree Preservation Orders is that they are on City Council land and in the normal course of events would have not required TPOs to preserve them.

As a ward councillor I have serious concerns that either of the proposed routes in Drayton either go past immediately outside a school or within 150m of the entrance to a school in either part of Solent Road.

Also, as a ward councillor, I have concerns that these works could be taking place when Strawberry Fields, land in an adjacent ward (in a different local authority), could be taking place and Moreland School, the school proposed to serve these large number of new homes is along Farlington Avenue, the route that is proposed for the Intercopnnector.

I have further concerns about the the potential impacts on the Sites of Special Scientific Interest in Langstone Harbour and at Eastney, I realise the applicant has taken steps to mitigate that but my concerns still remain.

I fail to understand why the route of the proposed interconnected must come through one of the most congested cities in the country rather than come through the wind-farm and it's propose extension just off Brighton, I can only speculate that it has more to do with the proposed optic fibre cable which I believe is integral to this application.

In the alternative I see no reason why Aquind could not route the cable under the motorway and along the M3 motorway to reach the new proposed sub-station in Lovedean. This is would have a minimal impact on the lives of those people that live in the area. I am shocked by the proposed route. Clearly Aquind have not prioritised the best way to cause the minimum impact on businesses, public transport and homeowners, but instead I can only assume have gone for the route where the consents due, come from local authorities instead of Highways England and or multiple farmers and landowners.

My final objection, is the application for the CPO of public highway. I can see absolutely no reason why Aquind need to own the land the cable will run through. When you consider the length of the route, and the complexities of creating multiple new titles, (should this application be granted), leases along the public highway would suffice. It will also make it more complicated in terms of on-going road maintenance, public liability and other utilities such as the Gas Networks who are used to working with local authorities in such matters.

Thank you for taking my objections into consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Steve Wemyss
Portsmouth City Councillor for Drayton and Farlington

From: [redacted]
To: Aquind Interconnector
Subject: Fwd: Application for Interconnector - Portsmouth
Date: 05 October 2020 16:49:57

Corrected

Begin forwarded message:

From: Stephen Wemyss [redacted]
Subject: Application for Interconnector - Portsmouth
Date: 5 October 2020 at 16:43:21 BST
To: Aquind Interconnector <aquind@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Dear Inspector,

Re: Application for Interconnector - Portsmouth

I have previously written to you asking to speak at the virtual public meeting concerning the above and while I wish to reserve my right to speak I also know how fickle technology can be and so I felt it prudent to also formally lodge my objection to the above.

The nature of my objections are both as a Portsmouth City Councillor representing one of the wards through which the route of the interconnected passes and as a private individual.

Portsmouth is the most densely populated city in the UK outside of central London, and owing to its island geography it is served by only three main roads on and off the island. Channelling through one of the cities 'key-route network' roads for months at a time would cause significant congestion in the city. There is ample evidence from past events that when one of the roads has a blockage, the other two quickly become gridlocked. The consequence being that frequently the traffic will often back up and cause hazard and obstruction on the highway network (the A27 and M27) controlled by Highways England. This is compounded should Portsmouth Football Club, which is at the end of the A2030 (the proposed route), be playing a home match.

The other consequence is the the DfT concerns the improvement of air quality. The city has breached the acceptable levels of Nitrogen Dioxide in the atmosphere for several years. One of the worst breach points in the city is at Velder Avenue - immediately at the southern end of the A2030 and one of the consequence of this proposal is to make it worse at a time the city should be seeking to improve it.

Further, the applicant seeks to make use of the very limited open space in a land starved city. They propose to make use of one of the few areas of playing pitches in a city which is woefully under-provided compared to most, if not any, other town or city. This will have a further detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of the residents of the city. The city planning officer should be able to provide you the current exact figures. I am also concerned at the loss of trees which would be caused by these proposals, contrary to the avowed intentions of the Government. The only reason many of these trees do

not have Tree Preservation Orders is that they are on City Council land and in the normal course of events would have not required TPOs to preserve them.

As a ward councillor I have serious concerns that either of the proposed routes in Drayton either go past immediately outside a school or within 150m of the entrance to a school in either part of Solent Road.

Also, as a ward councillor, I have concerns that these works could be taking place when Strawberry Fields, land in an adjacent ward (in a different local authority), could be taking place and Moreland School, the school proposed to serve these large number of new homes is along Farlington Avenue, the route that is proposed for the Intercopnnector.

I have further concerns about the the potential impacts on the Sites of Special Scientific Interest in Langstone Harbour and at Eastney, I realise the applicant has taken steps to mitigate that but my concerns still remain.

I fail to understand why the route of the proposed interconnected must come through one of the most congested cities in the country rather than come through the wind-farm and it’s propose extension just off Brighton, I can only speculate that it has more to do with the proposed optic fibre cable which I believe is integral to this application.

In the alternative I see no reason why Aquind could not route the cable under the motorway and along the M3 motorway to reach the new proposed sub-station in Lovedean. This is would have a minimal impact on the lives of those people that live in the area. I am shocked by the proposed route. Clearly Aquind have not prioritised the best way to cause the minimum impact on businesses, public transport and homeowners, but instead I can only assume have gone for the route where the consents due, come from local authorities instead of Highways England and or multiple farmers and landowners.

My final objection, is the application for the CPO of public highway. I can see absolutely no reason why Aquind need to own the land the cable will run through. When you consider the length of the route, and the complexities of creating multiple new titles, (should this application be granted), leases along the public highway would suffice. It will also make it more complicated in terms of on-going road maintenance, public liability and other utilities such as the Gas Networks who are used to working with local authorities in such matters.

Thank you for taking my objections into consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Steve Wemyss
Portsmouth City Councillor for Drayton and Farlington