

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: Objection to Aquind
Date: 12 December 2021 16:20:07

As a regular contributor (objector) to this drawn-out DCO process, I am pleased to note that FINALLY, my repeated suggestion that Ninfield substation be considered as an alternative connection point into the 400kva grid, has moved up the agenda and been deemed worthy of a response. Recognition of this now requires the SoS to do due diligence on this issue. He cannot take, as evidence to dismiss this alternative, the assurance given to him by the Applicant in their most recent submission. He must look further.*

In the submission by Aquind of 8th December 2021, relating to Ninfield, it is stated that “substations to the East of Bolney substation, including Ninfield substation, would not have delivered a realistic prospect of delivering the same infrastructure capacity”. Aquind simply write Ninfield out of their story.

* The SoS will note that this assessment and decision was done using data from 2014. At this time it appears that Lovedean also fell largely into the category of a substation needing substantial upgrading to accommodate extra capacity ie Interconnection. Indeed 2024 would appear to be the year by which the entire Southern 400kva is due major attention. Ninfield should be reconsidered as the preferred connection point using current data and reconfiguring due in the near future. The SoS has a duty to approach NGET to obtain up-to-date data and investigate the possibility of this alternative connection point.*

To this end I have attempted to engage with management at NGET, to ascertain the feasibility of connection at Ninfield. The director of the operations, James Greenhalgh,

is spending a “sabbatical” at BEIS. He did not engage. The stand-in replacement for James Greenhalgh, Greg Hunt, has not responded to my enquiry. How simple then to take the necessary steps to question the Applicant’s dismissal of Ninfield. How simple to go down the corridor in the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy to James Greenhalgh’s office and to ask the relevant questions. I am powerless in this matter- the SoS has the power. This must be done. There is a duty to act. He must look further.

* What I am insisting upon is that due diligence be done on this matter. The Applicant should be directed to engage with NGET to investigate connection at Ninfield. The SoS clearly has a duty to follow this course of action, ie direct Aquind to engage with NGET to consider Ninfield as the preferred connection point.*

*In previous submissions to the Planning Inspectorate I highlighted shared concerns -the construction of the Interconnector scheme would be dangerous. It should not be approved on so many grounds. I will not repeat those concerns here. *

Suffice to say that, should approval be given by the SoS for Aquind to begin work, allotment users will hold to account the individuals who will be responsible should harm be done to themselves or their plots. So too those residents who will have to live alongside a 2,000,000 watt current passing close in front of their home: Likewise the thousands of people who will be negatively affected by months of polluting activity: Let’s not forget the damage done to our environment, intrinsic to a destructive construction project which we do not even need: What of the hundreds of people deprived of access to sporting activities? The list goes on and on.

Finally the Telecommunications system that Aquind have been told to remove from the project; Aquind are still seeking the right to build an infrastructure (2x ORS) which could retrospectively be upgraded to its original capacity thus circumventing the instruction by the SoS to remove extra capacity from the FOC. Build only what is required for controlling and monitoring of the electrical cables.

** I draw the SoS' attention to the document furnished by Aquind where they are applying for exemption. They clearly state that their data system does not require "subsea amplification". At this time they clearly presume they can build on-shore amplification ie Optical Regeneration Stations (ORS). Surely, implicit in this statement is the fact that subsea amplification is an alternative to on-shore amplification in the form of 2x ORS buildings. Anyone can see the advantage to the applicant of having buildings constructed which, at a later date, could accommodate an enhanced, enlarged data system denied at original DCO approval (should it be inappropriately granted). The SoS should insist the ORS buildings are not built. Subsea amplification is available and should be utilised. Future use of "hidden" potential ORS buildings should be forbidden. No need then for the compulsory purchase of Fort Cumberland Carp