

## Atkins, Caelan

---

**From:** Pete Fincham <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 22 April 2023 16:23  
**To:** Aquind Interconnector  
**Subject:** Objection

**Categories:** Consultation Response

To Mr Shapps

I want to once again register my opposition to the appalling proposition to destroy large areas of Portsmouth for questionable benefit.

Let's leave aside the people involved and their contributions to the Conservative Party. That is well documented elsewhere and presents a very difficult conflict of interest to navigate which others, far more eloquent than I, can deal with.

But as a resident for the last 25 years in this wonderful seaside city, I cannot impress upon you enough how much serious, potentially irrecoverable damage these plans will cause.

If the plans to disturb decades of toxic waste are not concerning enough, the traffic impacts (albeit short term for between 5-7 years) will generate enough pollution that it's a certainty there will be lasting effects on our growing population. Portsmouth already sees a significantly higher volume of children impacted by exhaust pollution, than both the national average or what most reasonable people would regard as acceptable. This will just add to it.

There are national security concerns, no guarantee for energy security from the French nuclear estate and it remains unclear what the purpose is (import or export). But most crucially, the question remains unanswered as to "why Portsmouth". Flick Drummond MP has openly requested clarification to this question when more suitable sites, with far less environmental and community damage, identified in East Sussex. You know this is a really bad idea when both Conservative and Labour MPs come together with a Liberal Democratic lead council.... In fact, the idea is so bad you've managed to create something quite unique!

I welcome your response, but would settle for you to support the demands of our local community which are simple. Stop Aquind.

Regards

Peter Fincham (LL.B)