

AQUIND PROPOSAL- OBJECTION SUBMISSION 01ST OCTOBER 2021

Secretary of State for BEIS.

Rt Hon Kwasi Kwarteng.

Dear Sir.

I notice in your last request for additional information from the Applicant that they have responded with documents entitled 'Alternative' they are not entitled "updated or revised". Alternative is defined as 'available as another possibility or choice'.

It is unfortunate that the Examining Authority recommendations are not currently available to the public until the SofS decision has been made. I assume the Examining Authority have already commented as to the lawfulness on the SofS powers to make a decision on the commercial spare capacity of the fibre optic cables. There appears to be a disagreement between the legal teams of various parties with regards to the lawfulness of the commercial spare fibre optic cables inclusion into the draft DCO. Will you be seeking your own Departments legal advice on this subject and indeed full due diligence of the whole proposal. The applicant appears to be giving the SofS a choice between their two options of their initial draft DCO application and their newly requested update by the SofS of the draft DCO. That to me appears to be a bit dismissive.

Of course, there is also a preferred more justifiable option in rejecting this proposal in its entirety and save the Portsmouth public and land, years of upheaval, havoc and stress.

I'm my last submission to you I made you aware of the Applicants advertising that it would save households £3.15 a year. That is 0.86 of a single penny a day. (I put the decimal point in the wrong place in my last submission). Not a massive incentive with the current increase in energy prices. They also advertise it would be a boost to the local economy. I guess that means that the workers will be buying their lunch in local retail outlets.....whilst of course ripping up the roads outside the shops so that no one can park outside them or their homes. Again not a massive incentive.

Some questions for your consideration, if I may:

Are you as current SofS content with the original approval by the then SofS (2018) with the decision to grant this proposal National Infrastructure Project status?

Will you be replying to the questions asked by the BEIS committee in their recent letter to you and prior to you making your decision?

Are you satisfied that adequate consultation and communication has been made between the Applicant and home owners, occupants and other affected people along the entire route from Eastney to Lovedean?

Are you concerned with the level of mitigation offered for the loss of playing fields for such a protracted period of time?

Is the loss of our green spaces, trees, disruption to wildlife and traffic chaos justified for such a poorly conceived scheme through what is a Major Island City?

Were all other less impactful routes considered by the Applicant?

Local French government appear to be still objecting to this scheme. Does this come into your consideration?

Will the recommendations from the Examining Authority be released un-redacted to the public alongside your decision?

You also asked the question to the applicant regarding the Inspection by the public of the certified documents. The applicant replied:

4.3 The Applicant does not currently retain an office premises in the vicinity of the location of the Proposed Development and has therefore sought to discuss and agree with the host planning authorities the most appropriate location for the documents to be available for inspection. In this regard the Applicant has held discussions with Hampshire County Council, Havant Borough Council, Winchester City Council and East Hampshire District Council. The Applicant has not sought to discuss this matter with Portsmouth City Council in light of the continued difficulties of progressing matters relevant to the DCO with them.

Does it concern the SofS that this being so far into a DCO application, that there appears to be communication difficulties between the Applicant and the host City area. The disruption to the confines of the Portsmouth City area must be approximately half the length of the entire UK land route in this proposal. Do you agree that this is hardly an ideal situation for an alleged National Infrastructure Project?

What does "therefore sought to agree" actually mean. Have they an agreement with other local authorities or not. Clearly not with the Portsmouth City Council.

Or, is this an example of the applicants communications, consultations and engagement with the public of Portsmouth?

Please listen to all the objections from the public, local Portsmouth MP's and the Portsmouth City Council and reject this proposal.

Thank you.

Ian Daye.