

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: Secretary of State has invited comments from Interested Parties : Response to the Secretary of State's consultation of 4 November 2021
Date: 14 December 2021 18:34:57

Reference: 20023149 - (Unique Reference AQUI-AFP090 & AQUI-AFP091) – James & Joan Veryard

Further to the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy to Aquind Limited dated 4th November 2021 :-

I welcome the Secretary of State's seeking clarification on "Consideration of Alternatives" substation sites as I consider the cable route (which is capable of carrying 5 % of the united Kingdom's electricity) through Portsmouth to Waterlooville totally irresponsible, especially as it only 8 metres from my home and only 0.9 metre deep (Measured to the concrete surround).

I note that Herbert Smith Freehill's reply on behalf of Aquind states the area in question was "too congested to accommodate the proposed 1800MW or 2000MW connection", which leads me again ⁽¹⁾ to highlight the number of services which are beneath our roads.

Domestic services to be expected – every house/business:- Electric, Gas, Cable – Internet, Foul Water, Surface Water, Water, plus general services which include Telephone cables, Street Lighting, School warning lights , Traffic light sensors and tree roots.

I had a conversation with Councillor Simon Boucher who stated Aquind expect to excavate 10 metres a day (I have not seen the programme of works to verify this), I stated from my experience in laying gas pipelines in Brighton and Croydon this could be about right due to the number of services under our road network. So you can see why there is so much concern regarding inevitable and considerable traffic disruption.

In previous correspondence with Aquind and at the open floor hearing last December (2020) there are questions which I raised still unanswered by Aquind:-

- The effect on property prices ⁽²⁾.
- Cable noise in operation ⁽²⁾.
- Risk of Cancer ⁽²⁾. – Aquind have made reference to a letter from Public Health England that stated they were completely satisfied with the methodology and conclusions of the above report. I have found one letter from Public Health England to confirm this (<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-001256-Public%20Health%20England.pdf>) but would note that the letter also states "the development is unlikely to present a significant risk to public health". How unlikely, how significant is not stated.
- Loss of trees and their replacement (Farlington Avenue) ⁽³⁾.
- Failure to clarify with a medical electronic device manufacturer, whether the cables magnetic field will effect it's function ⁽²⁾.
- Effect on future development/redevelopment ⁽³⁾
- The Width of the lower part of Farlington Avenue and impact on BT & Mercury (Virgin) cables contained within both footpaths.

Planning inspectorate also blanks out relevant and important information from correspondence which makes such correspondence impossible to understand, for instance an NHS information leaflet I enclosed with one of my submissions ⁽⁴⁾.

I have noted over the past few months issues which the Secretary of State needs to take into account

when making his decision.

(1) France has threatened to disrupt power supplies to Channel Islands on numerous occasions, what would stop them in the future disrupting UK power supply via Aquind's proposed cable link – Disrupting 5% of the UK power supply would have significant economic effect.

(2) It looks as if Aquind have been trying to influence the Government – Donating to the Conservative party, yes planning gains are usual with local government planning which benefit the local community, but donating to a party in government (where there is no gain for the communities effected) is totally unacceptable.

(3) Russia has disrupted gas supplies to Europe, thus increasing the wholesale price of Gas & Electricity for the UK's domestic and commercial users – no company should be allowed to build these cables if there is the slightest risk of disruption to our supply.

The UK should be self-sufficient not relying on others – If capitalism is to be a good thing, commercial greed and the economic benefit have to be controlled.

Aquind are proposing to transmit the 5% of Great Britain's Electricity Consumption 8 metres from our home and through the residential streets of Portsmouth, even if commercially acceptable, it is socially irresponsible.

There have not been any reliable studies on the long-term effect of High Voltage Direct Current, only CNIRP 2009 guidelines on which Aquind are relying.

We would suggest that Aquind make its landfall and install their cable corridor well away from residential areas, we know there are far more suitable alternatives.

Thank you.

James Veryard

References

Note: (1) <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-002902-James%20Veryard%20-%202.0%20Representation%20-Scope%20of%20the%20Environment%20Impact%20Assessment.pdf>

Note: (2) <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-001665-James%20Veryard%20-%201.0%20Representation%20-Socio-Economic%20Effects.pdf>

Note: (3) Recording 13:00 -17:45 [https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-003185-Recording%20of%20Open%20Floor%20Hearing%201%20\(Session%202\)%20-%2007%20December%202020.html](https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-003185-Recording%20of%20Open%20Floor%20Hearing%201%20(Session%202)%20-%2007%20December%202020.html)

Note (3) Transcript 13:07-16:21 [https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-003186-Open%20Floor%20Hearing%201%20\(Session%202\)%20-%20Transcript%20-%2007%20December%202020.pdf](https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-003186-Open%20Floor%20Hearing%201%20(Session%202)%20-%20Transcript%20-%2007%20December%202020.pdf)

Note (4) <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020022/EN020022-001666-James%20Veryard%20-%201.1%20Letter%20to%20Aquind%20dated%2021-03-19.pdf>