

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: Formal Objection to Aquind Interconnector Proposal in Portsmouth
Date: 12 August 2021 13:38:38

Sirs,

Please accept this email as a formal objection to the Aquind Interconnector Proposal for Portsmouth (France to Lovedean).

This project is non-advantageous in numerous ways. Subjectively, I feel it economically and politically links us to France when there is no need for such blurring of lines. There needs to be no deliberate dependency upon another country for power. The concept of sharing resources with France opens us up to various stages of political manipulation.

Quite clearly the Aquind "consultation" process has been flawed. I have owned a property on [REDACTED] since September 2020 and we've had no documentation regarding the proposal. The pipeline is proposed to pass immediately outside our property. Meanwhile, the previous owners have received letters addressed to them by name from Aquind to this address. I know this because we are in communication and have discussed the ridiculousness situation we are now in. This situation being that the previous owner has contacted Aquind to advise them that the property has changed ownership and Aquind respond that the new owner/s would need to "make contact with us [Aquind] directly to advise them of the change". How non sensical. How devious a process. How can a new owner or tenant know to make speculative contact with Aquind? They shouldn't have to. It's an appalling and underhanded attempt to formally "consult". How many other householders have they deliberately avoided?

The area of Portsmouth through to Lovedean is a densely populated area with few community green spaces. None of these can afford to be lost. The chaos of the installation will simply not be worth the benefit to the local community. No green space should be sacrificed for the benefit of private enterprise.

I know personally of no local resident who can see the proposal positively. At best, people feel in ignorance of why the Interconnector is apparently necessitated. Typically they feel vulnerable by the process of installation by a cloak and dagger firm with no transparency. Where is the clarity regarding why this route has been chosen as most viable? Where is the courtesy of communication from Aquind? There is nothing or nobody who has made themselves answerable. There is no clarity in the process this far at all and the proposal's formal process thus far has treated our community contemptibly.

I object wholeheartedly to the Aquind proposal.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Regards,

Mrs Jennifer Jackson

[REDACTED]

