

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: I am sharing "Document (3)" with you
Date: 15 December 2021 21:30:57
Attachments: [Document \(3\).docx](#)

Please find enclosed my objection to the Aquind interconnector planning application.

Thank you.
Ian Daye (Interested party).

Sent from my Galaxy

Secretary of State for BEIS

Sir.

In answer to the Secretary of State's request for further information (01/12/21) for considerations for alternatives ('optioneering' as described by the applicant), the applicant relies on their documents previously submitted to the Examining Authority. This being APP-117 dated 14/11/19 and their supplementary alternative chapter REP 1-152 dated 06/10/20.

The contents of those documents appear to me to contain Feasibility studies conducted by NGET from 2015/2016. Some 6-7 years ago now. A lot has obviously happened since then.

I notice that the SofS has asked NGET, in the same letter for information on another issue concerning the micro siting of the converter Station at Lovedean. Has the SofS considered asking NGET to confirm that this was their opinion in 2015-16 and if that is still their opinion now some 6 or 7 years later.

Personally, when it comes to the applicants optioneering, I have obviously absolutely zero concern and I am deeply uninterested in the cost benefit analysis for the Applicant company, its owners or shareholders. This, particularly when that company are applying to gouge massive scars through my City of Portsmouth causing untold damage to our green spaces, wildlife, infrastructure and way of life for several years to come.

My, maybe, rather simplistic view of this project, is that the people of Portsmouth to Lovedean do not want this project, both city MPs don't want it, all cross party Councillors don't want it. The environment, wildlife, loss of green spaces, recreational, leisure and sporting facilities will be severely adversely affected by it. The traffic chaos will be horrendous with knock affects to air quality. The French public and local government do not want it. Are there any French support or permissions in place for this proposal? I've not seen any.

I have continually reviewed the planning Inspectorate website for submissions. The only people I have ever seen in favour of the project is the applicant, their paid contractors within this application and of course the SofS in his two letter of support for the project, apparently written to a director of the applicant on 03/10/19 and 17/03/20 regarding PCI lists.

The project, in my opinion, started off poorly with the scary letters and questionnaires sent from the applicant to local affected homeowners asking for private information requesting their status and mortgage details. It has now ended up throughout this process with unwarranted delays, continual cross referenced submissions, overly complicated, overly technical legalised documents that the public has absolutely no hope in deciphering. Meaningful communications from the applicant directly to the public have appeared to have halted since the start of the Examination process. Does this bode well for the future IF, regrettably, they are successful in this incredibly damaging application?

Surely, no more delays, no more alternative submissions. All very accommodating but the application must be assessed on what it is. The fact that the SofS has had to ask for yet more additional information (as was also the case in the original decision to grant nationally significant status on 30 July 2018) is telling. Having now gone through a 6 month examination process and further scrutiny by BEIS, surely this is an indication that the proposal does not meet the standards required for approval.

Please reject this ridiculous proposal. Ian Daye..... 15 December 2021.