

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: Submission made in response to the Secretary of State's requests for further information from the Applicant
Date: 18 November 2021 23:37:57

Dear Mr Kwarteng

As Secretary of State for Business and Energy, you have ordered a third delay in your decision to grant or deny Aquind Limited the Development Consent Order it seeks. Many objectors will have taken the opportunity to write to you about the overwhelming environmental case against allowing the DCO. You will also have received responses referring to the numerous routing options that were mysteriously discarded at an early stage of the process, such as Ninfield. It is likely that there will be legal arguments submitted about the inclusion of the fibre-optic communications network that the Applicant still seeks to smuggle into the project. Some will no doubt have written to you about the false claims made by Aquind that the energy they seek to transmit over 150 miles is desperately needed (when the 14 other interconnectors live now or coming online before Aquind will meet our energy needs), will be cheap (when Aquind have been granted an exemption from electricity price regulation), will be clean (when we know the energy sources include aging nuclear power stations) or will be green (when we know the environmental damage caused to marine and shoreline habitats and our precious green spaces by laying the cables will last generations).

There may be references in the responses to the chaos and pollution that will be caused to the city of Portsmouth by this absurd scheme, and perhaps even some consideration of the breadth and depth of the feeling against Aquind within Portsmouth and the South Downs, or reflection on the threadbare "consultation" process carried out by the Applicant and the Examination that followed, thoroughly biased towards the applicant in every respect (my detailed complaint about the conduct of the Examination is still waiting a full response).

However, the one aspect of the project which has not yet been fully expressed at any stage is the moral case against the Aquind Interconnector.

No doubt there is no specific planning regulation to take this into account, yet it looms ever larger over the decision, especially as your government and even perhaps the Prime Minister are finally showing an interest in the moral behaviour of MP's and Ministers.

Can you simply discard the fact that your mind was made up even before the Examination begun? That two letters released under FOI requests show your clear and direct support for Aquind before the duty to take this decision had landed in your lap? Is it not now clear that your role in this decision must end now, before your career is further tainted by your failure to recall this support, given even in your own handwriting? Is not amoral for you to continue in this quasi-judicial role?

And what of your fellow Conservative MP's and your party, who have so widely benefited from the lavish generosity of Aquind Limited and its directors, now these donations can be seen in the same light as those received by your disgraced colleague Owen Patterson who lobbied on behalf of his donors? Is it not now time to call an end to this farce, return the donations and scrap this plan as a thinly disguised attempt to buy the influence of MP's, Ministers and Lords? Does the acceptance of donations from Aquind Limited not now seem to be thoroughly and visibly immoral, now politicians are finally starting to understand the standards that the public expect them to uphold - that you must not be influenced, and you must be seen not to be influenced by strange, and strangely generous donor companies with so much to gain?

And how strange this particular company is, whose directors you are so fond of, and look forward to seeing at party conferences so much. A company that does... precisely nothing, other than rack up debts preparing for a £1.2 billion project that it has no previous experience of delivering, because it has no previous experience of delivering anything at all, apart from delivering financial support to your fellow Conservatives. A company funded and owned largely by a man whose sources of wealth are either tainted by corruption or simply unknowable, because they have been so carefully funnelled offshore, the very darkest of dark money. An owner that has to defend himself from allegations of high-level financial corruption in Russia, which if there is any truth to, would make him an extremely compromised individual whose loyalties may be questioned, when you look at the strategic aspect of the project in terms of UK

infrastructure and communications and its highly unusual siting in the home of the Royal Navy. A company whose donations are not illegal because it is registered in the UK, and whose owners are now British citizens not Russian, so its donations from unknown sources routed through tax havens are technically legal, but only technically, and only for now. Does this blatant threat to national security not register on your moral compass? Are you really preparing to wave it away as "ridiculous" and blandly reassure the voters that there is no possibility of corruption when it is staring us in the face? Do you really need to be reminded that the people of this city and this country expect to be protected from the threat of dark money infiltrating our political system, with the possibility of a hostile power having access to our strategic assets?

Even the Prime Minister, recently wanting Germany to "wean itself off" Russian controlled energy, seems to be grasping the strategic importance of developing homegrown sustainable energy sources, which, you will recall, is government policy. So if you will not recuse yourself from this decision, I'm writing to ask you to do the right thing for the environment, for Portsmouth and for our national interest - make the moral choice for democracy: **stop Aquind.**

Jonathan Walker

