

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Aquind Interconnector](#)  
**Subject:** Response to BEIS request to Applicant for further information.  
**Date:** 17 November 2021 18:39:47

---

I am not surprised to see that the SoS at the BEIS requires clarification on a number of matters relating to this crazy scheme. There are many issues which need to be examined objectively which, if ignored, will allow the construction of a very dangerous project. I use the word "dangerous" deliberately as the harm to the physical and mental health of Portsmouth residents will be considerable. Pollution caused by the trenching through the city will do untold harm. In addition to the harm to humans there are the incalculable impacts on the wildlife habitats, the green spaces affected and the environment in general. So it might seem reasonable to suggest Mannington could be an alternative connection point to the grid for the cables at the UK end of this cross-channel Interconnector. However it seems highly unlikely that the Applicant would give a second glance at this suggestion. Any route from a landfall near to Mannington would result in similar destructive construction. It's a non-starter.

However there is an alternative connection point- Ninfield, a substation 4.3 miles from a potential landfall location West of Bexhill-on Sea. Anyone with a basic grasp of geography would be amazed that this option was never considered in the optioneering process carried out by the applicant. It shortens the cross-channel submarine element of the project and offers connection into the grid without major harm and disruption. What's not to like? I can only think that the applicant has other reasons for adding extra miles to this scheme both sub-sea and overland. I trust the SoS will want to ask for more information about this so far ignored alternative.

"Dangerous" would appear to be appropriate description of an endeavour which would see the UK dependent on another connection to a European country which could, if pressed, switch off the supply. Far better to continue toward home-grown sustainable sources of energy.

Reflecting on the earlier request by the SoS regarding the inclusion of huge capacity fibre optic cables (a telecommunications system by any other name), I note the applicant has largely ignored the SoS's demand to remove the excess FOC capacity. Aquind still insist that buildings to accommodate Optical Regeneration systems will be required. Connection to Ninfield would certainly obviate the need for signal regeneration. I understand that there is no need for signal regeneration for control and monitoring purposes in the current scheme. It means, in my opinion, the applicant wants to preserve the possibility for future upgrading of the FOC system should the project get the go-ahead. The SoS must realise the way in which the applicant is treating this application- there is no respect shown toward us, the people who would bear the brunt of this nonsense, nor towards you, Mr Kwarteng. The applicant is simply motivated by money which brings me to my final point.

I am sure you are fully aware of the murky nature of Aquind. You have been drawn into this difficult situation by the need for your predecessor to recuse himself from the decision process. Indeed there are aspects of this Interconnector which, under close scrutiny, would lead me, if in your place, to distance myself from it and its owners.

I trust you will take time to consider your position and not make a decision which will lead to huge repercussions for all concerned.

Stop Aquind