

Atkins, Caelan

From: Martin Grice <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 23 July 2023 15:21
To: Aquind Interconnector
Subject: Aquind interconnector Portsmouth

Categories: Consultation Response

To whom it may concern the following additional criteria needs careful scrutiny along with the plethora of objections already provided by the town council and citizens of Portsmouth .

The UK already has a clean green technology for electricity generation that needs no additional infrastructure much and that is nuclear. There's also Development of hydrogen technology imminent. Why (given the Russian misuse of its gas pipeline to Europe) would the UK possibly depend on a third party to supplier of energy on a for profit basis when the money needed to construct and implement these interconnectors could be better used building our own nuclear power plants? As it is we buy in rather than sell electricity on the existing connectors.

In response to its request for further information the SoS should take into consideration for further investigation the following:

Whilst NGET and NGESO have provided a document explaining the feasibility of Mannington they have failed to provide the original feasibility study which led to the decision of Lovedean as connection point for the Aquind Interconnector. No other Interested Party, nor the previous SoS nor the Judge in the Court Hearing have seen this document. Should the SoS not demand to see this document?

In NGET/NGESO 's document Mannington is still considered to be feasible but would require some additional work. We were told that Lovedean is the best option but as stated by NGET/NGESO all other possible substations would require upgrading anyway. So, it's not evident at all why was Lovedean chosen? Given the extensive infrastructure required to implement it.

NGET has just published that they plan their greatest ever upgrade of the electricity grid. This gives an opportunity to reinforce the electricity grid all around the country and therefore free better alternatives for the Aquind Interconnector should this be required it's not. More self sufficiency is what is required.

Other alternatives need more investigation, especially as times have changed compared to when this project was first thought of. I suggest Nuclear should be our solution it ticks all the boxes.

Aquind published in July 2018 that they would provide energy for 4 million households (July 2018). The BBC (January 2021) published figures around 5 million homes. The latest publication of Portsmouth News (May 2023) reveals that only 1.4 million homes would be supplied with energy. Was the original figure misleading to the public/ the government? Was this figure part of the decision to give Aquind back in 2018 Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project Status? Should this be reviewed?

What exactly is the benefit for the UK resident who will pay in the long term for this project anyway and of course suffer the inflated cost of energy from 3party suppliers when it can generate its own?

It's very clear now thsy the harms of interruption of over half a million people' s lives and damage to the environment are outweighing "benefits"?

The Third National Adaptation Programme (NAP3) and the Fourth Strategy for Climate Adaptation Reporting – the government's latest document clearly highlights the imminent Dangers of Climate change. Portsmouth, a town on the coast, must make sure that it does not have more building interruption than necessary. The effects of these

building works which are not nature-based solutions, are damaging and put even more stress on our fragile ecosystem and infrastructure. In this document, it is admitted "One of the major resilience challenges facing marine ecosystems is from human pressures such as pollution, destruction of habitats through development, and fishing."(page 64) This does not only refer to marine environment but the whole ecosystem.

The Fibre Optic Cable remains controversial. In Aquind's latest document from 14. June, justification for the FOC is overstated. Yet it is not necessary for any interconnector project. Other Interconnectors do not require this inclusion. Aquind seems to be interested in the commercial aspect only. The loss of Fort Cumberland Car Park is therefore not justifiable. Any unsecured foreign data cable connection to the UK's backbone data infrastructure is a security risk. That needs to be struck off the scope of work either way.

It needs to be highlighted again the National Security Issue both our MPs have referred to in the past.

Bentonite and associated lubricants, on the materials list to be used in this project could cause harm to the allotments. Inadvertent releases are quite common. The damage to fruit and vegetable, possibly even people, children being on the allotment whilst a possible breakout occurs, is too high a risk. There is no way this project should bisect any land growing food for human consumption.

There are, of course, far more concerns. The SoS has received many documents beforehand expressing those. The world has changed. The risks of the UK dependent on 3rd party supply are clear. People have become aware of their responsibility for our environment too, you should be and respect the environmental toll caused by the massive scar this will cause through our landscape and the pollution causing disruption it will cause. Please maintain the original decision not to approve the Aquind Interconnector.

Best regards

Martin Grice



Sent from my iPhone