

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: Re applicant's response to SoS letter of 2 September 2021
Date: 30 September 2021 15:24:30

We are writing to express our dismay at the lack of intent on the part of Aquind to remove the fibre optic cable (FOC) from the draft consent order as required by the Secretary of State. The adjustments they have made in this latest response are minimal and they are still arguing they need land for ORS, when other interconnectors with FOCs do not have them. This is the second time they have tried to argue that they need to keep infrastructure such as the optical regeneration stations in place, on the grounds that it will be needed at a later date.

This should be a DCO for an interconnector with a FOC cable for monitoring only and not for telecommunication purposes. How can the principle of building future expansion into a project be permissible? If this is the case, what is to stop a company including land that they do not need but might need in the future? There have to be strict parameters otherwise it makes a mockery of the planning application process.

The FOC with additional capacity for third parties should be treated as a separate project. If Aquind feel they must keep this infrastructure in the current DCO then they should ask for an extension while they seek planning permission for the telecommunications component through the correct channels. There should be proper consultation and consideration by all interested parties as to whether the telecommunications cable is the right project to be owned and run by Aquind.

All through the planning process, Aquind have shown nothing but contempt for the wishes of interested parties and arrogance in their reluctance to be held to account. There is no community trust in this company and trust in the decision-making of government is being seriously eroded.

Yours sincerely

Ian and June Hunter