

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: Re: REPEAT AGAIN: NO TO THIS "PLAN", The suggested other variations, suggestions or implicated options. No to AQUIND refusing to compromise. no to AQUIND denying landowners rights. no to aquind saying " we do not agree" to the thousands of objections t...
Date: 18 November 2021 21:51:38

Hello, apologies, i would like to resubmit this as i have been so battered by classifications/ill reckoning of decision makers these years that i sheepishly classed this a 'plan'. it is not. it is a proposal. please accept my updated rejection:

I REPEAT AGAIN:

NO TO THIS 'PLAN' .

NO TO this pretence of a plan.

No to this PROPOSAL

- it is not a plan it is JUST A PROPOSAL, IDEA, SUGGESTION,

This boresome nightmare that has lasted way too many years but as with any nightmare, it shall dissolve into nothing.

A PROPOSAL THAT HAS GOT WAY OUT OF HAND, subjective idea, financially gainful; pet project??

The proposed route (that will literally kill portsmouth and everything through entire route): or no, the 5th reiteration, or is it first/eight concept draft? - none of them are even fundamentally ok.

what's happening? after years of proposals and you, the one human on earth gets to choose - its like a divorce. he (AQUIND) says yes - 'and i cannot be flexible there is no compromise') and SHE (mother earth, the population including humans) say NO. It is not acceptable. non of the proposed routes are acceptable.

... and all we have is bullying, illogical conclusions, total stalemates, fear, denial and risk??

Do you really, sir, want to allow some company to install such a nightmare to the central infrastructure for our country?

I sincerely hope you do not. Please do not let us down in such critical times. Please dont paint brush your decision with manipulation and distortion of the truth. please face reality and look to a better future.

The suggested other variations, suggestions or implicated options, there is nothing realistic or fair about them.

NO to AQUIND refusing to compromise.

NO to AQUIND denying landowners rights.

NO to aquind saying ' we do not agree, and agree to disagree and no compromise (in the hearings).

' NO' to the thousands of objections that they have had from interested

parties these past years.

AQUIND needs to learn what NO means.

It seems currently that you sir, and the government in general need to also ponder on the meaning of NO.

STOP.

What level of abuse of the country and its people, and yes the world, are you willing to neglect exactly?

(none i hope) I dont believe you have any footing in making a 'win' decision for aquind here. all you will do is let the world know that you and the uk government are indeed totally putrid.

Do not let this hideousness kill our nation. as in poison to the world, deadly to our planet and humanity.

yes, it is that bad.

and you cant brush over this with your skilful manipulative wording, nor can aquind. the public are not blind, and this will not be allowed.

yours sincerely kirsten mcfarlane.

I reiterate what you probably ignored/havent seen of the millions of documents submitted to you:

Kirsten McFarlane: Deadline 8 Submission. Reference: AQUI-AFP1348, AQUI-013. 01/03/2021

EN020022: AQUIND Interconnector

Deadline 8 Submission:

Written summary of oral submission at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 3 (CAH3)

by

Kirsten McFarlane.

Represented by Jonathan Walker on 19 February 2021. Reference: AQUI-AFP1348, AQUI-013.

1. Post Hearing notes:

1.1. I am an Interested Party & 'affected person'.

1.2. I am a Council Allotment Plot tenant at Milton Piece, Plot 99A (since 01/07/20). I was on the waiting list for an allotment for 6 years.

1.3. I am a member of the allotment association for July to December 2020 membership, and for the calender year 2021 membership.

1.4. Represented by Jonathan Walker at the hearing due to chronic

medical health conditions – both physical and mental, and including severe, medicated, depression and anxiety.

Dear Inspectorate and all parties,
I am an allotment tenant at Milton Piece, an Affected Person and an Interested Party.

1. After observing the Hearings this week, and in order to minimise repetition of statements already made, my deadline 8 document will provide details and further evidence for this speech and for my 7a submission.
2. I concur with the members of the public and professionals who have spoken at the hearings this week, and i confirm here that:**I reject the applicants change request 2 proposals, methodology, and documentation, and do not agree that they are adequate, constructive, fair or accurate.**

The issues relating to the compulsory acquisition of rights and temporary possession of the land I have an interest in, have not been addressed or consulted upon properly, satisfactory, or fairly. This includes but is not limited to; the applicants plans for 'the surface', 'under' the surface, above the surface, all the access lanes within the Allotment site, and all the access streets across the city that will be impacted by this project, and affect my ability to access my allotment.

Kirsten McFarlane: Deadline 8 Submission. Reference: AQUI-AFP1348, AQUI-013. 01/03/2021

3. The **volume of paperwork** detailing the proposals, the subsequent revisions and updates are immense. The quantity of documents doesn't cover up poor content quality.
4. The general (affected) public **do not have the resources nor technical capabilities to understand the nature of these documents, nor the impact it will have on them.**
5. Many allotment holders, along with interested parties, land owners and affected people along the entire route **do not have access to the documents in the inspectorate document library online.** For example, because:
 1. **They do not have mobile phones, they do not have computers.**
 2. **They can't go to the public library to use a computer there, because of the Pandemic lockdowns.**
 3. They have **mental and physical conditions** which limit their ability to digest and respond to this proposal.
 4. They have too many **other stress factors**, including the Pandemic, to be able to respond to the threat of yet another development planning application happening in their lives.
 5. **English is not their first language** which intensifies the difficulty for the lay person to understand the documents.

6. One example is a fellow allotment tenant who came to me last week saying she received a letter from AQUIND but does not understand it what, or what she's supposed to do, or what it means for the future of her allotment. She is **intimidated by the applicant**, but has no recourse - **she has no mobile phone, no computer, and certainly no consultation from the applicant.**
6. The documents are written in language that may be appropriate for the project but not for the lay person. **The inaccessibility of the exam process and documents is used by the applicant to the detriment of the affected.**
7. The applicant is **eroding the opposition down** through process.
8. **A plain English, final document** would be transparent to clarify the objectives of the proposal.
9. The complex nature of the process **undermines public understanding, to the point of submission, through mental fatigue and anguish.**
10. **The blight that will be caused by this project is much greater than the applicant will admit.** I think all residents and businesses along the planned route, 2 of 3

11.

Kirsten McFarlane: Deadline 8 Submission. Reference: AQUI-AFP1348, AQUI-013. 01/03/2021

including all of the City of Portsmouth, should be considered as 'affected persons' for the life of the project (40-60 years).

Nothing that has been said so far can **justify people being told they are 'too late' to take part in the examination process** during deadlines 6 to 8.

1. What has the applicant done to consult people that have moved to the affected areas in the past years?
2. What of people who have only recently taken on an Allotment?
3. It seems grossly unfair to me for new comers not to have a say about what happens to their land, and their lives.
4. The project was years in the making and only came to public knowledge in its nature last year. The impact detracts a significant area of Portsmouth directly, with substantial knock on effects to the rest of the city.

Thank you.

On 18 Nov 2021, at 21:26, Kirsten Mcfarlane [REDACTED] wrote:

I REPEAT AGAIN:

NO TO THIS 'PLAN', subjective idea, proposed route (that will literally kill portsmouth and everyone through entire route): or no, the 5th reiteration, or is it third/eight concept draft? - none of them are even fundamentally ok.

what's happening? after years of proposals and you, the one human on earth gets to choose - its like a divorce. he (AQUIND) says yes - 'and i cannot be flexible there is no compromise' and SHE (mother earth, the population including humans) say NO. It is not acceptable. non of the proposed routes are acceptable.

... and all we have is bullying, illogical conclusions, total stalemates, fear, denial and risk??

Do you really, sir, want to allow some company to install such a nightmare to the central infrastructure for our country?

I sincerely hope you do not. Please do not let us down in such critical times. Please dont paint brush your decision with manipulation and distortion of the truth. please face reality and look to a better future.

The suggested other variations, suggestions or implicated options, there is nothing realistic or fair about them.

NO to AQUIND refusing to compromise.

NO to AQUIND denying landowners rights.

NO to aquind saying ' we do not agree, and agree to disagree and no compromise (in the hearings).

' NO' to the thousands of objections that they have had from interested parties these past years.

AQUIND needs to learn what NO means.

It seems currently that you sir, and the government in general need to also ponder on the meaning of NO.
STOP.

What level of abuse of the country and its people, and yes the world, are you willing to neglect exactly?

(none i hope) I dont believe you have any footing in making a 'win' decision

for aquind here. all you will do is let the world know that you and the uk government are indeed totally putrid.

Do not let this hideousness kill our nation. as in poison to the world, deadly to our planet and humanity.

yes, it is that bad.

and you cant brush over this with your skilful manipulative wording, nor can aquind. the public are not blind, and this will not be allowed.

yours sincerely kirsten mcfarlane.

I reiterate what you probably ignored/havent seen of the millions of documents submitted to you:

Kirsten McFarlane: Deadline 8 Submission. Reference: AQUI-AFP1348, AQUI-013. 01/03/2021

EN020022: AQUIND Interconnector

**Deadline 8 Submission:
Written summary of oral submission at the Compulsory
Acquisition Hearing 3 (CAH3)
by
Kirsten McFarlane.**

Represented by Jonathan Walker on 19 February 2021.
Reference: AQUI-AFP1348, AQUI-013.

1. Post Hearing notes:

1.1. I am an Interested Party & 'affected person'.

1.2. I am a Council Allotment Plot tenant at Milton Piece, Plot 99A (since 01/07/20). I was on the waiting list for an allotment for 6 years.

1.3. I am a member of the allotment association for July to December 2020 membership, and for the calender year 2021 membership.

1.4. Represented by Jonathan Walker at the hearing due to chronic medical health conditions – both physical and mental, and including severe, medicated, depression and anxiety.

Dear Inspectorate and all parties,
I am an allotment tenant at Milton Piece, an Affected Person and an Interested Party.

1. After observing the Hearings this week, and in order to minimise repetition of statements already made, my deadline 8 document will provide details and further evidence for this speech and for my 7a submission.

2. I concur with the members of the public and professionals who have spoken at the hearings this week, and I confirm here that: **I reject the applicants change request 2 proposals, methodology, and documentation, and do not agree that they are adequate, constructive, fair or accurate.**

The issues relating to the compulsory acquisition of rights and temporary possession of the land I have an interest in, have not been addressed or consulted upon properly, satisfactory, or fairly. This includes but is not limited to; the applicants plans for 'the surface', 'under' the surface, above the surface, all the access lanes within the Allotment site, and all the access streets across the city that will be impacted by this project, and affect my ability to access my allotment.

Kirsten McFarlane: Deadline 8 Submission. Reference: AQUI-AFP1348, AQUI-013. 01/03/2021

3. The **volume of paperwork** detailing the proposals, the subsequent revisions and updates are immense. The quantity of documents doesn't cover up poor content quality.
4. The general (affected) public **do not have the resources nor technical capabilities to understand the nature of these documents, nor the impact it will have on them.**
5. Many allotment holders, along with interested parties, land owners and affected people along the entire route **do not have access to the documents in the inspectorate document library online.** For example, because:
 1. **They do not have mobile phones, they do not have computers.**
 2. **They can't go to the public library to use a computer there, because of the Pandemic lockdowns.**
 3. They have **mental and physical conditions** which limit their ability to digest and respond to this proposal.
 4. They have too many **other stress factors**, including the Pandemic, to be able to respond to the threat of yet another development planning application happening in their lives.
 5. **English is not their first language** which intensifies the difficulty for the lay person to understand the documents.
 6. One example is a fellow allotment tenant who came to me last week saying she received a letter from AQUIND but does not understand it what, or what she's supposed to do, or what it means for the future of her allotment. She is **intimidated by the applicant**, but has no recourse - **she has no mobile phone, no**

computer, and certainly no consultation from the applicant.

6. The documents are written in language that may be appropriate for the project but not for the lay person. **The inaccessibility of the exam process and documents is used by the applicant to the detriment of the affected.**
7. The applicant is **eroding the opposition down** through process.
8. **A plain English, final document** would be transparent to clarify the objectives of the proposal.
9. The complex nature of the process **undermines public understanding, to the point of submission, through mental fatigue and anguish.**
10. **The blight that will be caused by this project is much greater than the applicant will admit.** I think all residents and businesses along the planned route, 2 of 3

11.

Kirsten McFarlane: Deadline 8 Submission. Reference: AQUI-AFP1348, AQUI-013. 01/03/2021

including all of the City of Portsmouth, should be considered as 'affected persons' for the life of the project (40-60 years).

Nothing that has been said so far can **justify people being told they are 'too late' to take part in the examination process** during deadlines 6 to 8.

1. What has the applicant done to consult people that have moved to the affected areas in the past years?
2. What of people who have only recently taken on an Allotment?
3. It seems grossly unfair to me for new comers not to have a say about what happens to their land, and their lives.
4. The project was years in the making and only came to public knowledge in its nature last year. The impact detracts a significant area of Portsmouth directly, with substantial knock on effects to the rest of the city.

Thank you.