

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Aquind Interconnector](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to Aquind  
**Date:** 04 October 2021 20:18:35

---

Dear Sir/Madam

**Re: Formal Objection to the Aquind Development**

I would like to object to the Aquind Project on the following grounds:

- French authorities have refused to hand Aquind an environmental permit and have said they will do all they can to prevent the project.
- France recently flexed its muscles over GB trade deals and said it would consider cutting off the power supply to Jersey. We do not think it is wise or prudent for any power supply to be dependent on UK relations with France.
- National newspapers including the Times, Telegraph and Guardian have questioned the suitability of the Russian Alexander Temerko an alleged former arms dealer and party donor, who has long boasted of his political connections and influence, and who has made considerable donations both personally and through his companies several of which are now insolvent and in some cases owes considerable sums to the public exchequer.
- The ownership and control of his current energy company Aquind, has been taken to an opaque tax jurisdiction raising serious questions and concerns as to where the source of funding for 1.2 billion is coming from. In the last set of company accounts, there was no value showing in the company. This information is all in the public domain.
- The transfer of Aquind as an asset to a connected party was made by OGN Ltd. within 2 years of it becoming insolvent raising questions around financial misfeasance concerning the conduct of the directors.
- OGN has documented form for starting large infrastructure projects and then bailing
- Is it prudent to hand over such an important national infrastructure project (the largest in Europe) to an individual who is subject to an outstanding arrest warrant for fraud in his home country of Russia, and who could be a 'potentially exposed individual'?
- We live less than 100m from the proposed Aquind site. This borders the South Downs National Park and the location has already been overdeveloped because it is owned by two different authorities, each allowing development without taking into account the other's development. In the space of a few years an area which was countryside has seen industrial development on a huge scale as well as various housing development, solar farms and substation has doubled in size. There is now planning for Aquind, as well as planning submitted or about to be submitted for several battery storage facilities further edging into more fields. The countryside area is being overdeveloped. When the substation was recently extended, huge swaths of trees and shrubs were taken down around the perimeter and inside, with the promise to replace them but this never happened. These trees also completely screened the substation, but now it is clearly visible. Even is trees were replanted it would take many years to reach adequate screening height.
- The proposed site borders the South Down National Park. It is an old saxon and bronze age location, with bats, badgers, dormice and a wealth of wildlife flora and fauna. It is also an area of historical interest. It is thought that James II was married to Anne Hyde in Hinton Daubnay, and the Hyde family lived here for many years. Monach Way is close by which follows the route taken by King Charles as he fled to France, and is one of the longest and most well-known English footpaths.
- The fragile infrastructure of the area cannot take such a massive development. The lanes

are single lane tractor lanes, with limited access points, and no pavements. When the substation was expanded, it created a huge amount of mess along the road, traffic disruption, hedgerows were destroyed, and it became a runway for heavy-duty transport which is unsuitable for a quiet countryside area. Roads feeding into the lanes are also residential and were not built for heavy vehicles. At the top of the proposed road is a very dangerous blind bend. There has already been a dramatic increase in traffic due to the housing developments nearby, and these small country lanes just aren't suitable.

- Lanes are narrow with national speed limits – it would not be safe to have entrances off and onto these lanes.
- We work in Portsmouth and our extended family live there. None of us want to see the disruption, noise, congestion and increase in traffic pollution that would occur, along with the loss of allotments and heavy environmental impact.
- There has been a huge public outcry which is being ignored. It is therefore reasonable to expect ongoing mass protests and demonstrations if this project is agreed, which could bring Portsmouth to a standstill as it is an island with only two main routes on and off the island. There are other alternative sites in the region which already have infrastructure in place and are much better suited. These have been identified but have not been explored such as Lee-on-Solent, HMS Daedalus. We would question why this has not been the case. Is this already a 'done deal' and who is this being driven by and for what purposes?
- Despite there being very vocal opposition from tens if not hundreds of thousands of people, and objections from MPs and several local authorities and councils, as well as well documented controversy, negative media coverage on a mass scale and many unanswered questions surrounding the project, the company and the people involved, it is highly concerning that the application is even being considered. It begs the question why this might be the case and what is really going on here.

I honestly don't see how you can justify proceeding with this project given the evidence, and could have devastating consequences if it is allowed to go ahead, and anyone agreeing to this having being presented with the evidence should be held fully accountable.

Yours faithfully

Rachael Ross MBE

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]