

**28/04/23 Kirsten McFarlane ref: AQUI-013 Interested Party.**

**Response to The Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero's letter of 03 March 2023: Request for information from AQUIND and any interested party.**

**by Kirsten McFarlane**

1. This request for any new information since the examination closed march 2021 is for affected parties but primarily for AQUIND to submit their new assessments, reports, conclusions to outstanding requirements for any new documentation.

These new documents won't be posted until after the 28th April 2023 to <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/aquind-interconnector>. Therefore the public/interested parties havent been able to access this new information

Surely any further decisions cannot be made about the project until all parties can review and respond to the new information/reports submitted? These will include changes to the plan since the examination closed, and it is unfair for interested parties to not be able to see these changes prior to the decision made by The Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero. Surely we need to reopen the examination process for this to be completed fairly?

2. Lets stop AQUIND Facebook group have shared their submissions with group members. I would like you to count the group's submission as speaking for me. I agree with everything in their document submitted to you, so please view it as speaking for all the thousands of members, including myself: **Lets Stop Aquind response to SofS DESNZ Grant Shapps 28.4.23.pdf**

3. I am concerned that businesses, residents, and services that have moved into affective areas since 2020, have not been informed or consulted about this project by AQUIND, and therefore have not been offered the opportunity to submit their responses. This may be thousands of additional people.

I myself only became aware of the project In 2020/ jan 2021, and subsequently I was added as an interested party; affected person - after the diligent work of Let's Stop AQUIND group to inform residents of what was happening to them.

AQUIND failed to engage with the public thoroughly or fairly, and it seems they are failing to engage with, respect and digest all interested party's input again.

4. The 1000's of documents may show that AQUIND have submitted their required planning assessments. **The key thing that rings true about the AQUIND methodology for assessing feasibility of the project, is that they consistently denied and rejected interested parties objections, they refused to accept 'no'.**

## **28/04/23 Kirsten McFarlane ref: AQUI-013 Interested Party.**

This stand off of both parties saying 'no' and there being no agreement, is like a terrible divorce court case; were the judge has to decide the result for both sides. I saw this technique in the treatment of the farmers who AQUIND want to take their land, permanently. The farmers said no you can't have our land. and aquind said no we do not accept that. Listening this arrogant 'denying' behaviour by AQUIND in the hearings was especially chilling.

It has been their technique to deny there are major issues with their plans all along; deny that there is anything stopping them, deny that they cannot mitigate their way around critical issues. Deny that critical issues exist.

Issues which are destructive to fundamental health of the local residents, properties, the local economy, access for businesses, schools, mental and physical well being, a densely populated island city's infrastructure, and critical emergency services.

It beggars belief that AQUIND can say 'no, it isn't problem' to block access through the 2nd of only 3 roads onto the island of portsmouth.

### **AQUIND Denying reality doesnt make what they say the truth of the matter.**

Only the northerly section of Eastern road (A2030) is a dual carriageway. Access to the city's major industrial parks, supermarkets, the city's College. The speed limit is 40-50 mph dropping to 30mph as it comes into the residential section. There is a fire station on eastern road which needs to have use of this important road without months and years of closure/reduced lanes. The hospital is off island and this is the only exit from the east side of the island to the hospital.

The M275 is the westerly access to the road with 2 lanes both directions, 60 mph. As with the Eastern road, it is extremely busy daily, with standing and slow moving traffic at rush hour in particular. It is the route into the main ferry terminal, freight traffic is heavy, and also the main way to the Navy docks and whale island MOD .

If there is any incident on surrounding roads, including within the city and on the M27, massive disruption happens. The city is a bottle neck and reducing the use of Eastern road use is completely implausible. Indeed, we often see total grid lock for the entire island - from the ferry /gunwharf on the south coast of portsmouth all the way up and around the 3 arteries into the city and across the island which takes hours to clear.

The third and last road into portsmouth, the A3, divides into 3 residential roads running down the centre of the island. It is not capable of taking on further stress of road closures caused by aquind on the Eastern Road - it would be a nightmare on a daily basis.

**28/04/23 Kirsten McFarlane ref: AQUI-013 Interested Party.**

AQUIND doing road works a section at a time doesnt ease these issues, if anything it will compound the traffic issues across the entire city, not just a few streets at a time, but the whole city would die on a daily basis for the entire duration of the works - and then in future maintenance works. So for years and ultimately the full duration of the life of the project. 20-30 yrs?



Imagine city wide traffic problems being 50% worse for years because aquind are digging up sections of road and land through the entire length of the island.

**My own example of access issues:** I have an allotment where AQUIND want to run works through. They want to take over using the only road through the allotment site. Basically hundreds of people will not have access to their allotments for the entire duration of the works. AQUIND brush over and try to explain away how it would work, but it is utter rubbish and not based in reality.

**Please also review previous submissions and hearing speeches made by interested parties including mine:**

-----

**28/04/23 Kirsten McFarlane ref: AQUI-013 Interested Party.**

**Kirsten McFarlane: Deadline 8 Submission.** Reference: AQUI-AFP1348, AQUI-013. 01/03/2021

**EN020022: AQUIND Interconnector**

**Deadline 8 Submission:**

**Written summary of oral submission at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 3 (CAH3)**

**by**

**Kirsten McFarlane.**

Represented by Jonathan Walker on 19 February 2021. Reference: AQUI-AFP1348, AQUI-013.

**1. Post Hearing notes:**

**1.1. I am an Interested Party & 'affected person'.**

**1.2. I am a Council Allotment Plot tenant at Milton Piece, Plot 99A (since 01/07/20).** I was on the waiting list for an allotment for 6 years.

**1.3. I am a member of the allotment association for July to December 2020 membership, and for the calendar year 2021 membership.**

**1.4. Represented by Jonathan Walker at the hearing due to chronic medical health conditions – both physical and mental, and including severe, medicated, depression and anxiety.**

Dear Inspectorate and all parties,

I am an allotment tenant at Milton Piece, an Affected Person and an Interested Party.

1. After observing the Hearings this week, and in order to minimise repetition of statements already made, my deadline 8 document will provide details and further evidence for this speech and for my 7a submission.

2. I concur with the members of the public and professionals who have spoken at the hearings this week, and i confirm here that:

**1. I reject the applicants change request 2 proposals, methodology, and documentation, and do not agree that they are adequate, constructive, fair or accurate.**

**2. The issues relating to the compulsory acquisition of rights and temporary possession of the land I have an interest in, have not been addressed or consulted upon properly, satisfactory, or fairly. This includes but is not limited to; the applicants plans for 'the surface', 'under' the surface, above the surface, all the**

**28/04/23 Kirsten McFarlane ref: AQUI-013 Interested Party.**

**access lanes within the Allotment site, and all the access streets across the city that will be impacted by this project, and affect my ability to access my allotment.**

3. The **volume of paperwork** detailing the proposals, the subsequent revisions and updates are immense. The quantity of documents doesn't cover up poor content quality.
4. The general (affected) public **do not have the resources nor technical capabilities to understand the nature of these documents, nor the impact it will have on them.**
5. Many allotment holders, along with interested parties, land owners and affected people along the entire route **do not have access to the documents in the inspectorate document library online.** For example, because:
  1. **They do not have mobile phones, they do not have computers.**
  2. **They can't go to the public library to use a computer there, because of the Pandemic lockdowns.**
  3. They have **mental and physical conditions** which limit their ability to digest and respond to this proposal.
  4. They have too many **other stress factors**, including the Pandemic, to be able to respond to the threat of yet another development planning application happening in their lives.
  5. **English is not their first language** which intensifies the difficulty for the lay person to understand the documents.
  6. One example is a fellow allotment tenant who came to me last week saying she received a letter from AQUIND but does not understand it what, or what she's supposed to do, or what it means for the future of her allotment. She is **intimidated by the applicant**, but has no recourse - **she has no mobile phone, no computer, and certainly no consultation from the applicant.**
6. The documents are written in language that may be appropriate for the project but not for the lay person. **The inaccessibility of the exam process and documents is used by the applicant to the detriment of the affected.**
7. The applicant is **eroding the opposition down** through process.
8. **A plain English, final document** would be transparent to clarify the objectives of the proposal.

**28/04/23 Kirsten McFarlane ref: AQUI-013 Interested Party.**

**9.** The complex nature of the process **undermines public understanding, to the point of submission, through mental fatigue and anguish.**

**10. The blight that will be caused by this project is much greater than the applicant will admit.** I think all residents and businesses along the planned route, 2 of 3

**11. Kirsten McFarlane: Deadline 8 Submission. Reference: AQUI-AFP1348, AQUI-013. 01/03/2021**

including all of the City of Portsmouth, should be considered as 'affected persons' for the life of the project (40-60 years).

Nothing that has been said so far can **justify people being told they are 'too late' to take part in the examination process** during deadlines 6 to 8.

1. What has the applicant done to consult people that have moved to the affected areas in the past years?
2. What of people who have only recently taken on an Allotment?
3. It seems grossly unfair to me for new comers not to have a say about what happens to their land, and their lives.
4. The project was years in the making and only came to public knowledge in its nature last year. The impact detracts a significant area of Portsmouth directly, with substantial knock on effects to the rest of the city.

**Thank you.**

-----

**My last examination submission:**

**<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/aquind-interconnector/?ipcsection=relreps&relrep=42166>**

Received **29 January 2021**

From **Kirsten McFarlane**

*Representation*

Deadline 7a Submission - In relation to the Applicant's Change Request 2 EN020022: AQUIND Interconnector Deadline 7a: 28/01/21 Kirsten McFarlane ref: AQUI-013 Interested Party status, Nov 2020. 'affected person'.