

From: [Sanders, Darren \(Cllr\)](#)
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Cc: [Oliver, Leonie \(Cllr\)](#); [Kadir, Abdul \(Cllr\)](#); [Vernon-Jackson, Gerald \(Cllr\)](#); [Pitt, Steve \(Cllr\)](#); [Barrett, Kimberly \(Cllr\)](#); [Martin Silman](#)
Subject: Aquind interconnector - interested party response
Date: 19 June 2023 10:12:31

To whom it may concern,

I am one of the interested parties, most recently supporting the views of the Milton Neighbourhood Forum on 30 March 2023. This email follows the Applicant's response of 28 April 2023.

As one of the councillors for the Eastern Road and Milton Common - where a significant amount of work will be done should this be approved - I have seen nothing in the response to overturn my principled objection to this scheme.

There are easier alternative landing points - indeed, these have been raised with Aquind and rejected. The Milton Forum has noted Ninfield in East Sussex as a shorter - and so less costly - alternative. I share its desire to see the 2014 NGET appraisal published. I note Justice Lieven asked to see it; it is not clear whether that happened.

It is not as if we do not have evidence of the potential disruption. The works to boost our sea defences in this area has cut residents from the footpath between Great Salterns Quay to Kendalls Wharf for just under two years. The impact on the roads, green spaces and wider environment in my ward by things like HDD is much greater and unacceptable.

I also worry that it is based on incorrect information. For instance, Justice Lieven's said landfall in France would be at Le Havre. That is not correct; it will be at Hautot St Mer, about 90km east. The nearest British landfall from there are in East Sussex, not Portsmouth. Inaccurate information carries severe punishments in our courts; I am sad that has not applied here and may have affected the judgement.

The second reason is that this is not needed. A scheme like this needs to start somewhere. The Feb 2023 rejection of AQUIND as a "Project of Common Interest" (PC1) through the dismissal by General Court of the CJEU (Second Chamber) of its desire to be included in the new list of PCIs (Case T-295/20) cannot be dismissed. That means we have a project without a departure point.

The Blake Morgan submission on behalf of the Carpenters showed the Sec of State was advised that Aquind was the most uncertain of the four interconnectors being considered and that, because of over-capacity, four interconnectors would be unnecessary. The 2020 Energy White Paper supports this. Page 80 says:

"We will work with Ofgem, developers and our European partners to realise at least 18GW of interconnector capacity by 2030."

Two things flow from this policy. The first is what happens when our "European partners" reject the most uncertain option, as with Aquind? The White Paper is clear it cannot. The second is that, as planned and more certain projects - schemes like XLinks - will generate 19.5GW in this period anyway, the most uncertain option is redundant.

So, we have a scheme that:

- is the least certain interconnector project around;
- has been rejected by its country of departure;
- will harm its arrival point;
- has presented British justices with inaccurate information on where it arrives, and;
- is surplus to our country's future energy capacity

Aquind has always been an answer searching for a question. The only question now is how fast we can put it out of its misery. I hope that will be soon.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Yours faithfully,

Cllr Darren Sanders

Lib Dem, Baffins, north Milton and south Copnor

This email is for the intended recipient(s) only.

If you have received this email due to an error in addressing, transmission or for any other reason, please reply to it and let the author know. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not use, disclose, distribute, copy or print it.

This email may be monitored, read, recorded and/or kept by Portsmouth City Council. Email monitoring and blocking software may be used.
