

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: Response to the request from Sos 1.December
Date: 02 December 2021 18:13:10

Reponse to the request by the SoS on 1st December 2021 for more information

I would like to take the opportunity to respond to the latest request from the SoS for more information and raise further issues which seem to have been ignored.

The SoS requests that Portsmouth City Council and Coastal Partners provide their comments on the information submitted by the Applicant ..., including their views on the proposed Co-operation Agreement.

Perhaps the SoS would like to recognise that PCC does not feel inclined to sign the proposed agreement. PCC has expressed over the last year repeatedly that this proposed development is destructive and damaging to the city of Portsmouth and its residents. Surely, the SoS must have noticed that there is universal opposition to this project, both MP ,Labour and Conservative have raised this issue in Parliament and in local and national media. PCC unanimously agreed to oppose this project for a number of very relevant reasons.

Did the SoS notice that a meeting took place on the 28th October 2021 in which the applicant, coastal partners and PCC took part. This document has not been signed.

Though the government is forcing PCC to “co-operate” with the applicant there is resistance.

How can a responsible council, with, at its heart the well- being of its residents, support such a project?

Portsmouth takes its environmental matters very seriously- it is not prepared to agree with a project which would create chaos, environmental harm and have damaging implications for its residents.

The SoS has not commented on the Pandora Papers, not commented on funding and donations of this project.

How can you, SoS, make an unbiased decision when you openly in 2 letters promoted this project?

There are questions which need to be answered. You have the duty and responsibility to do so.

We live in a democratic country. The information revealed regarding this project alone should be enough to Stop it now – once and for all.

SoS, you have duly asked for an alternative route to be explored. Mannington is no alternative. You ignored a very relevant proposal- Ninfield. Never looked at, never explored.

It seems that only documents from the Applicant deserve your attention.

What about the number of individuals who have again and again challenged the applicant’s documents?

I have seen one document in which the applicant referred to our concerns during the examination process. Yet since September no comment, no serious investigation from yourself.

This is no longer just a Planning Issue. This is about our democracy, our exposure of

cronyism, about (as quoted from news papers) "corruption".

How can these issues not be more important for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project?

Looking back to July 2018, when this project was granted NSIP status, even at this time opaque decisions were made. Documents not revealed, meetings on terraces took place. But since then, revelation after revelation and you, SoS, still have questions? At the time the Examination was finished, political issues had been raised but nothing like the Pandora Papers.

At least 2 ministers had to recuse themselves from the project, 34 MPs received donations. Does this not sound dubious?

And yet we are talking about Planning Issues!

Dear SoS, France does not want this project. At local and national level it has been rejected. Why do you still consider this project for a DCO?

If environmental reasons and the threat of Climate Change are not good enough reasons for you to dismiss this project, consider the financial and political implications.

This project should not have been given a NSIP status and should certainly now after all the evidence exposed be thrown out. You have the power to do this NOW -Stop Aquind.

Viola Langley

