

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: Responses to the request by(LSA SoS deadline 18.11.2021
Date: 11 November 2021 18:09:32

Can you please confirm you received my email?

Response to the request by the SoS for additional clarification

I note you have multiple concerns about the application for DCO by Aquind. I have countless much more important concerns than you mentioned in your request to the applicant for additional information. I am bewildered that you should ask such trivial questions when there are huge nationally significant matters put at risk by this project. But I concern myself here with your latest requests.

Mannington?

Any cursory glance shows that connection to the grid at this substation would be as damaging and harmful as at Lovedean. You surely are grasping at straws if you think Aquind will consider this route. What exactly are you trying to achieve here? You refer to an alternative connection point which was rejected back in 2015. Why are you not investigating the possibility of connection at Ninfield? A shorter, less damaging route, not through a densely populated city like Portsmouth or Bournemouth. I fail to understand what you are seeking to do by this diversion from the real reasons to refuse this application for a DCO by Aquind. Because you are suggesting Mannington as an alternative to Lovedean, can I assume then that you have rejected the proposed route through Portsmouth up to Lovedean?

Just as a reminder for you: both MPs, all councillors and a huge number of residents are totally opposed to this destructive unneeded project. Our MPs feel strongly that National Security is threatened by this project.

Were you satisfied with Aquind's response to your concerns regarding the telecommunication system they planned? It seems to me they have ignored the need to remove the excess data capacity. It is not appropriate to take land for an unnecessary ORS building to operate the interconnector. Have you clear evidence that signal enhancement is needed for control and monitoring of the interconnector? My research shows it to be excessive. Evidence supporting my claims have already been sent to you. May I presume you will not allow any telecommunication system to be built as part of this destructive project?

Considering the Climate Emergency we are facing it cannot be right to cause huge environmental damage to our city, already highly polluted. Imagine the additional pollution of months, years of construction work using machinery emitting masses of exhaust. On top of this traffic congestion multiplied by roads being blocked and diversions and delays.

Are you asking us to accept this disastrous project? We shall not accept it should you dare to approve it.

Flood risk and coastal defence scheme

While I applaud your concern for any possible damage done to our flood defences done by this project, again I have to ask why are you highlighting this issue now – this late in the decision making process? Do you need more reasons not to grant this application?

I refer you to all objections from all parties who have substantial evidence to support your decision should you turn this application down.

Cooperation agreement with PCC

As for the cooperation agreement between Aquind and PCC, PCC has expressed repeatedly its rejection of the project. But as this project is an NSIP (Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project), PCC is forced to cooperate with Aquind. The message from PCC is very clear. This

project would cause chaos, damage to the environment and disruption of a densely populated city. Can it get any clearer?

Finally, how can you, Mr Kwarteng, still be involved with the decision of the Aquind Interconnector. You have shown bias in favour of the applicant on more than one occasion. Your failure to be decisive at an earlier date, twice asking for delay, shows you are not able to be dispassionate about this project and rule it out. We demand you rule it out. Stop Aquind!

Viola Langley
Let's Stop Aquind

