

Atkins, Caelan

From: Pete Fincham <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 24 July 2023 21:48
To: Aquind Interconnector
Subject: Aquind consideration

Categories: Consultation Response

Responding to the SoS' request for further information regarding the publication of PCC ' I would like to highlight the following issues the SoS should take into consideration for further investigation:

1. 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?

2. In NGET/NGESO 's document Mannington is still considered to be feasible but would require some additional work.

3. We were told that Lovedean is the best option but as stated by NGET/NGESO all other possible substations would require upgrading anyway. So, why was Lovedean chosen?

4. 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 (I have explained in my earlier submissions that this Interconnector is not needed.) 5. Other alternatives need more investigation, especially as times have changed compared to when this project was first thought of.

6. 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?

7. What exactly is the benefit for the UK resident who will pay in the long term for this project anyway?

8. Do the harms of interruption of over half a million people' s lives and damage to the environment are not outweighing "benefits"?

9. 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.

10. 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.

2 / 2

11. I need to highlight again the National Security Issue both our MPs have referred to in the past.

12. Bentonite and associated lubricants, in my opinion, 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 are, of course, far more concerns. This ongoing process is tiresome and exhausting. Please bring this to an end.

Kind Regards

Pete