

I am an interested party within this proposal. I have previously submitted several objections to this proposal throughout the Planning Inspectorate examination and to the Secretary of State's (SofS) request for further information to the applicant.

I have continually pointed out various aspects of the proposal and as to the havoc and carnage that this proposal will cause and as to the adverse affects on people's lives, our environment, wildlife, green and recreational spaces, traffic congestion and as to the publics health and wellbeing.

I was absolutely dismayed at the basic standard of yet another request for further information required by the SofS in order to make a decision. The questions could have been asked at an earlier stage in the process and saved even further delay.

Does the SofS actually believe that this further information request warrants yet another 3 month delay in his decision making?

The DCO application before him surely stands or falls on its own. Why is there so much tinkering around with the DCO application. All very accommodating, but it doesn't get the decision made.

Does the SofS envisage any further delay in tinkering around with the application or can the public expect a decision any time soon.

With regards to the lack of communications between the applicant and Portsmouth City Council. I can probably answer that one. Whilst PCC will no doubt carry out their statutory professional duty if this ludicrous proposal is approved. Can I remind the SofS that both Portsmouth City MP's and all City Councillors, cross party, object to this proposal.

Could the SofS clarify his position on his previous support for the applicants proposal?

In his interview with BBC's Andrew Marr on the 10 October 21 the SofS stated ' I have never commented on this specific project'

I have seen 2 letters from the SofS to Mr Temerko, apparently an individual associated to the application. The first is dated 03 October 19 regarding the PCI list. In it, is written 'we have written to the commission to reiterate our support for a number of projects including, of course, the Aquind project.

The second letter is dated 17 March 20 again from the SofS to Mr Temerko, this regarding PCI issues and Ofgems position. In it, It is written ' However, I do not think there is much doubt that the UK Government and Ofgem support the project'. It goes on further to say, 'my department actively support the Aquind project for inclusion in the 4th PCI list

I believe these documents were obtained by an FOI request by investigative journalists received in a redacted format. I have copies of both letters if required or disputed.

At what stage was the SofS aware of the proposed route of the cables through Portsmouth and beyond to Lovedean, a distance of some 13 miles of carnage through green spaces and arterial main roads feeding an Island City.

The SofS should have been aware of the proposed route, as it was in November 2019 the applicant submitted their application for a DCO to the Planning Inspectorate, which was accepted by them in December 2019, this, is according to the applicants 'milestone' timeline on their website.

Did the SofS actually care on the adverse affects it would cause to Portsmouth, its land or to its affected public?

I am also aware that MP's have had to recuse themselves within this process. It has been widely reported by investigative journalists that 30 plus MPs have received absolutely lawful political donations from the applicant or individuals associated with them.

Could the SofS, in the interests of transparency, ensure the public affected in this proposal in Portsmouth, that no other MP (that has received a political donation) has in anyway been involved in the Examination or decision making in this proposal?

I still object to this proposal.

Thank you

Ian Daye.