

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: Response to AQUIND's response to SoS consultation 13 July
Date: 10 August 2021 00:13:24

To Whom it May Concern

Please find below my responses to the Applicant's Response to SOS's request for further Information. PINS Ref: EN020022

2. Mitigation for recreational facilities

I do not believe that £100,00 mitigation is enough to compensate for loss of recreational space. The mitigation has only included sports clubs with set fixtures within set seasons. But it is not just sports clubs that use these facilities, people use these spaces throughout the year to walk dogs, to jog, do keep-fit classes, play football. These are community-owned spaces that form a vital link to health and well-being and community cohesion.

2.58 At Bransbury Park there is also the Skatepark, which is one of the few spaces for young people and is used throughout the year. It will be massively affected. There is no mention of compensation for that or the car park that will be used by the Applicant, depriving people who use the park for recreational facilities of somewhere to park.

2.87 **Victorious.** It is unreasonable to state that because they have been unable to contact the organisers then they cannot speculate on the impact. They should have a plan for contacting the organisers. There has been the Covid epidemic since the original consultation and many businesses have not known until recently if they will be viable in the future.

2.112 There is no mention of the viability of the festival due to traffic congestion. The Applicant is only concerned with camping. The festival will be held when trenches are dug along the Eastern Road resulting in traffic chaos, lengthy tail backs, increasing air pollution all of which will put people off attending. People already know to avoid the area if they are not attending the festival due to traffic.

3. Fibre optic surplus capacity

This section is difficult for non-planners and ordinary residents. But as I understand it, the Applicant is reluctant to remove the fibre optic cable from the DCO and feels that the space allocated for the infrastructure should remain in the draft DCO should the SoS be swayed. Seems an absurd argument; he wasn't swayed the first time round or he wouldn't ask to have it removed, or do they intend to shovel some more donations his way? I don't think residents would agree that it is in their benefit that this cable, with such huge spare capacity, should be allowed to go ahead. It is a security risk to have this communication cable embedded within important energy infrastructure by a company that has ex-Russian owners hiding in offshore shell companies. There hasn't been proper community consultation on what this entails and therefore it should be removed from this planning application and another consultation held if the Applicant wishes to still go ahead. If not, then all reference to its commercial use should be removed, its description amended to make clear that its capacity is enough to monitor the interconnector and no more.

5. Protective provisions

It is shocking that at this stage so many utility companies have not yet entered into an arrangement with the Applicant (5.4. No agreement 5.7 No agreement 5.8 No agreement 5.10 No agreement 5.11 No agreement 5.12 No agreement 5.13 No agreement 5.14 No agreement 5.15 No agreement). Clearly they cannot provide the further information the SoS requested and the decision on this application should be deferred until they can.

Yours sincerely

June and Ian Hunter

