

Atkins, Caelan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 July 2023 10:56
To: Aquind Interconnector
Subject: Objections to the proposal for the Aquind interconnector to Lovedean
Categories: Consultation Response

I am responding to the SoS' request for further information regarding the publication of PCC.

I believe there are a number of issues which the SoS should take into consideration before making any decision this proposal

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? Have the alternatives been fully explored?

We have not seen the original feasibility study which led to the decision of Lovedean as connection point for the Aquind Interconnector. It seems that no other Interested Party, nor the previous SoS nor the Judge in the Court Hearing has seen this document. Surely it should be available to the SOS?

In NGET/NGESO 's document, Mannington is still considered to be feasible but would require some additional work. Surely this needs exploring and other options need more investigation?

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 find better alternatives for the Aquind Interconnector should this be required. (I do not, in any case believe this Interconnector is needed.)

Aquind published in July 2018 that they would provide energy for 4 million households 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?

The Aquind project will mean severe disruption for people in the Portsmouth area as well as damage to wildlife sites. A series of recent government documents clearly illustrate the dangers of climate change, including sea level rises. Portsmouth, a city clearly threatened by rising sea levels, needs to consider its resilience, reduce the pressure of extra buildings, protect our fragile ecosystems and reduce pollution. Our marine environment is also very much under threat.

What exactly are the benefits?

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.

There are clearly national security Issues (which both our MPs have referred to in the past) and I would much prefer to see investment in renewable energy within the UK for both cost and security issues

There are other matters of concern:

I gather that releases of bentonite and associated lubricants are quite common and could cause harm to the allotments and wildlife areas.

Pollution as well as disruption caused by installing the cables. Air quality in this area is already poor.

Please take these issues, as well as the many other objections raised by residents in Portsmouth and SE Hants into account when making your decisions. This is a deeply iunpopular as well as an unnecessary project.

Yours sincerely,

Sue James

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.