

Additional Comments with regards to responses and previous submissions by the Applicant, Public and Statutory Authorities in the Aquind interconnector proposal.

I am an Interested Party in this proposal. In addition to my previous representation I have since read many of the various documents placed onto the Planning Inspectorate website by the Applicant Aquind Ltd, various Statutory Authorities and the public's responses to the proposal. I have also watched a good proportion of the various virtual hearings held by the Planning Inspectorate.

I would now like to add a further submission to this project. I very much remain strongly objecting to this project. Not only for the previous reasons in my first submission but for the many unresolved issues and concerns that have been raised as a result of the Examination process to date.

Some of those concerns are as follows:-

Book of Reference.

It is clear that the Book of Reference (BOR) is an important and integral document within the dDCO and needs to be accurate and definitive if it is asking the relevant Secretary of State to override the Human Rights of the Public and in particular with regards to Protocol 1 Article 1 of the HRA 1998.

On the current version of the BOR tables throughout the entire route with regards to privately owned dwellings only details of 'Owners or Reputed Owners' are listed in the BOR tables.

What enquiries have been made by the applicant with the private Owners to ascertain who the actual owners are?

Why are these tables empty with regards to details of Occupants, Tenants and Lessees of these private dwelling houses?

What diligent enquiries have been made by the applicant to engage with all these groups of people?

On some occasions within the BOR tables it simply has written 'The owner of ...' and does not name them. Does the Examining Authority find this as an acceptable level of diligent enquiries in order that the owner / occupiers have their interests protected? Or is this a straight copy and paste from various Land Registry records?

The applicant has had a significant amount of time since the project commenced to engage with and obtain details of all affected people with an interest in the land. This can be equated to the decision by the Examining Authority with regards to the Milton allotment scenario where the tenants were given affected person status.

I am aware this would be a large task for the Applicant but they, the Applicant are seeking massive disruption for house owners / occupiers and road users over the entire route. It is therefore surely only proportionate and justifiably required.

I also note that the Owners or Reputed Owners of Dunlin Close in Milton are still contained within the BOR tables. If it is the case that the Applicant has removed the Furze lane option from their proposal why are they seeking rights to this land.

I also note that the owners or reputed owners of the private dwelling houses in Locksway Rd (in between the service road to the Milton and Eastney Allotments and the shops) are also included in the BOR tables. If the intended cable route is by HDD from Kingsley Rd Green to the Thatched House car park, why does this still remain the case? Again where the Furze lane option has been removed from the proposal?

As there are currently 3 options of the cable route over or around Milton Common (a matter I will also refer to again later). Why is it that the owners of Eastern Avenue, which is one of the proposed cable route options, are not included in the BOR tables whereas the Owners of Moorings Way dwellings are currently are included.

Milton Allotments.

I understand that the proposal is that the cable route is to be completed by HDD. What Health and Safety risk assessments have been carried out by the Applicant for people working on these allotments whilst this drilling operation is carried out?

I am not an allotment holder, but I have noticed and common sense suggests, that several tenants use their private vehicles to enter these allotments and drive to the proximity of their plots. I have also seen larger transit van type enter the allotments and use the internal pathways. What Risk Assessments have been carried out for vehicular access over the drilling route? Will there be any restriction on vehicles entering and driving through the allotments during this whole drilling process? I understand from the hearings that the drilling process is to take 3 months to complete. I also understand that no Contractor has yet been appointed to give an accurate estimate as to what is technically and operationally feasible at this stage. What is Plan B in this proposal if the drilling operation under the allotments and Milton Nature reserve fails for whatever reason? Can restrictions be placed into the dDCO regarding no open trenching?

Milton Nature Reserve

I also understand that the HDD drilling proposal will be brought out into the car park of the Thatched House Public house. There are in effect 3 separate car parks contained within this area. One is an initial car park with access from Locksway Rd, the actual car park to the public house which is closest to the Nature Reserve and the other an extended public car park situated in between and following the coastal path and Milton Locks.

The initial car park from Locksway Road gives access to their compound for vehicles and boat transport where there are double gates to the Langstone Harbour Fisherman's Association clubhouse, dry boat compound and the wet locks moorings. It also gives access to a pedestrian footpath to the coastal path and a public slipway to Langstone Harbour and the Locks Sailing club.

It is proposed that the cable route will be brought out of the car parks and onto Longshore Way and onwards onto the University of Portsmouth playing fields. In Longshore Way there is an entrance for vehicles to the Locks Sailing Club compound which contains a large amount of small sailing boats etc. This is the only entrance that gives vehicular access to the compound for the removal and placing of the boats.

During this proposed process what will be the effects of people wanting to gain access to use, work on, stow or remove their boats from the compounds contained within the Locks Sailing club and LHFA. Is this Protocol 1 Article 1 compliant?

Milton Common

To the north of the University playing fields the proposed cable route leaves those grounds and enters a large copse containing several trees.

How many of the trees and natural habitat does the Applicant assess would need to be destroyed to accommodate the open trenching? I have not seen that mentioned in the reports to date.

Is the applicant also aware that if it is proposed to bring the cables out from this copse it has to cross a pathway? This pathway was installed a few years ago during the coastal defence upgrade. The pathway is in fact a bund created to form part of the secondary sea defence. Where it is proposed to cross the bund sea defence at the northern end of Milton Common the Applicant intends to use a short length of HDD to overcome the problem. Is this then proposed to be the case at the southern end of the bund sea defence as I have described or to open trench the bund?

There are currently 3 options remaining in place in order for the cable route to cross Milton Common. I heard during the hearing that they would prefer the north to south option adjacent to the Sea Defence bund.

I was bewildered during the hearings to hear that the reason why there are 3 different options still proposed. I understand that they haven't ruled out using 2 of the 3 options ie splitting the cable route into paired circuits.

The reason given was that the Applicant to date has not yet appointed an actual Contractor to establish what is technically or operationally feasible and is unlikely to do so prior to any recommendations by the Examining authority or decision by the Secretary of State.

I find this an unbelievable state of affairs. How can recommendations or decisions be made on a 'What if' or 'Just in case' basis unless a definitive route is proposed? Owners in Moorings Way cannot even tell if the carriageway is intended to be used for the cable laying or the grass area of Milton Common in front of their houses used.

During the Hearings the same rationale was given with regards to the 2 options at Farlington Ave / Everleigh Rd proposed route options and in relation to the cable joint bays along the entire cable route to Lovedean.

I find that incredible for a company's project that requires the disruption of so many lives in order to complete a private project.

An earlier decision by the Applicant as to the 3 options across the Common would have at least alleviated some owner's fears. I believe that is an extraordinary attitude towards someone's rights and wellbeing!

Whilst these 3 options remain some of the owners / occupiers on Moorings Way and Eastern Avenue have been left in a state of worry and distress as to their future are and in the case of Moorings way

worried by letters talking of Compulsory acquisitions. Has this been fair? Has this been in compliance with Protocol 1 Article 1? I believe not, either currently or in the future if this scheme is approved.

Langstone Harbour

The applicant it appears had decided at an earlier stage in this project to discount the option to use the eastern side of the Harbour due to the protected status of it and the problems of HDD platform areas to the south and north of Hayling Island Bridge. Yet the current proposal is to HDD the cable route from north of Kendall's Wharf to Farlington playing fields.

Not that I would wish this project on any other area or people, can the applicant explain what the difference is between the Eastern side and the Western side of that same protected harbour is?

Is there any evidence to show that HDD is a less environmentally impactful method on the Western side of the harbour?

Having listened to the Traffic (and by definition Air Quality) debate during the Hearings, I must add that I thought it was unrealistic and minimized. Anyone who lives, works or travels through the general Portsmouth area knows from experience that any disruption and / or major incident to any of the 3 arterial routes into and out of Portsea Island causes major delays and even gridlock.

I have kept my submission to the geographical area that I know.

Thank you for reading this submission.

Ian Daye

Milton Resident and Interested Party.