

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Aquind Interconnector; enquiries@beis.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@beis.gov.uk)
Subject: David Langley's response to letter of SoS on 13th July. Your ref; EN020022
Date: 11 August 2021 20:39:08

David Langley's response to letter of SoS on 13th July. Your ref; EN020022

The link to pins below refers to the communication between BEIS and Aquind, in the pre-application section of the examination library logged as "correspondence". Aquind has been requested to remove elements of their request for direction in the letter of 28th June 2018 and they presumably did remove these elements in their response of 3rd July. Whatever these elements were (Telecommunications?), this communication contains the phrase "together with any development associated with it" at the bottom of page 1.

This overall phrase allows Aquind to include the elements expressly excluded from the request (Telecommunications, assuming my suspicion is right). I think that the letters referred to in the communication are not part of the examination library. They may (if proposing to build a Telecommunication System) open the way to the conclusion that the project should never have been an NSIP.

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-003961-AQUIND%20-%20Letter%20to%20Request%20Further%20Information%20-%2013%2007%2021.pdf>

The following info relates to the FOC and whether ORS x2 are needed at all. The exchange of mails is in reverse order and my initial enquiry to Gridlink, asking if an ORS had been included in their Interconnector project, has been omitted. It is interesting to note that Gridlink's initial emphatic rejection of the need to have enhancement of the data, for control and monitoring of their energy supply through the electrical cables, is in contrast to their view that "commercial use" of spare FOC capacity might require enhancement. Clearly Aquind have all along presumed they would be allowed to construct then sell-off or rent out this spare capacity- but to whom and for what purpose is anyone's guess. This presumption should not be included in an NSIP which is for energy supply.

The following is communications from Gridlink. It shows that ORS is not needed for Interconnector control and monitoring purposes.

Hi David

Just to clarify, we do not need optical regeneration of the FO cable to compensate for degradation of the signal because our cable route length is about 150km. When the cable route length reaches 230km+ (like AQUIND), then the stations may be necessary so that is the most likely reason why they are included in the AQUIND project. This is especially necessary if the FO cable may be used for commercial data transfer as well.

Regards

David

David Barber



Elan Energy Project Management Ltd is appointed by iCON as the project developer for the GridLink Interconnector
All related correspondence is conducted through this email address

From: David Langley [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 June 2021 10:33
To: David Barber [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: GridLink Interconnector - Contact Form EN - "Fibre Optic cable"

Thank you very much, David. This clears up any confusion at my end.

You may like to know that my city, Portsmouth is under siege from the Aquind Interconnector project. Aquind's owners have pressurised the Planning Inspectorate into including 2x OR Stations in the DCO application. This means the loss of use of 1/3 of a small but popular beach-side carpark to accommodate a stockade housing 2 large structures to enhance the performance of the FOC.

Hopefully the SoS at BEIS will chuck the application out.

Thanks again.

David

On Fri, 11 Jun 2021, 15:43 David Barber, [REDACTED] wrote:

Hello David

Thank you for your inquiry.

A small fibre optic cable is included within the subsea cable bundle to provide monitoring of the cable and help measure performance and detect any potential damage to the cable. The fibre optic cable is installed with the two subsea cables and then connects together with the power cables into a converter station at each end. The converter stations are designed to link the cables to the national grids, and also provide the location for operations and control of the whole system. "Optical regeneration stations to enable sufficient FOC capacity" are NOT required or included in the GridLink project.

I hope that this answers your question.

Best regards

David

It is clear that ORS are required when the focus is on commercial use of spare capacity, not for normal control and monitoring of the Interconnector. The ORS at Fort Cumberland carpark should not be built at all. It must be removed from the Draft DCO.

Continuing with the theme of ORS, I note that in Aquind's responses to SOS's questions of 13/7/21, they (Aquind) have talked about a reduction of size of the ORS compounds, not the removal of them from the scheme. SoS insisted in his demand that Aquind submit a revised DCO with the commercial element of the FOC removed therefrom. Aquind appear to be toying with the idea that commercial use of spare capacity is not permitted under a NSIP project. At no time is there a clear commitment from them to change the capacity of the FOC. The SoS should insist that the ORS be removed from the landfall site and that an FOC of the correct capacity for control and monitoring purposes only should be installed.

There are 3 other matters concerning the Aquind Interconnector

- 1) Ninfield as a more logical landfall
- 2) The ownership of Aquind
- 3) Russian influence in the UK as revealed in Catherine Bolton's "Putin's People"

The selection of Lovedean for connection into the 400kva grid is a nonsense. When the original departure point from France was near to Le Havre, it made sense. However, now that the French have moved the connection point into their Grid further East, to Barnabos near Dieppe, it no longer makes sense. One has only to refer to an Atlas covering the South coast of England and the North coast of France. It is plain to see that the logical route to a connection point into our 400kva grid is for a landfall West of Bexhill on Sea, the shortest distance between Barnabos and a suitable sub-station, Ninfield. Why was this ignored? Ninfield is less than 5 miles from the sea. It would be a local planning issue rather than requiring the Planning Inspectorate's involvement. A shorter distance would be in everyone's interest I would suggest. Can this not be put forward to the applicant?

In short I trust you will find reason enough to throw out this highly damaging proposal.
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows