

From: [Graham O'Neil](#)
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: Opposition to the Aquind interconnector
Date: 06 March 2024 08:20:04

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you again to oppose the Aquind interconnector proposal which will cause unbelievable environmental damage to Portsmouth and the surrounding area.

There are so many reasons why this thoroughly ill-conceived plan should be abandoned. At the end of this email I have copied some key points from the Just Stop Aquind Facebook group which I am a member of. I am also a member of Keep Milton Green, Milton being the area of Portsmouth I live in and an area that would be hugely adversely affected by the scheme.

My involvement in this campaign has laid bare the seedy underside of political decision making in the UK. I am appalled at the amount of money that those connected to Aquind have donated to the Conservative Party. I view this as corruption and am furious that elected representatives are so blatantly lobbied with financial sweeteners by the rich and powerful to further their economic interests.

Is this interconnector going to cause environmental chaos? Yes. Portsmouth is a highly densely populated island city with three roads in and out. An accident on any of these causes traffic chaos in the entire city for hours and you will have been presented with clear evidence of this. But it's not just the delays. It's the associated increase of air pollution in a city that already has appalling air quality, as I outlined in a previous objection. The pipeline route on the east side of the city would involve huge disturbance to Milton Common, Bransbury Park and Milton allotments. I don't think it is an exaggeration to say that residents would effectively be trapped in the area, breathing ever more polluted air, with no access to the few, small green spaces that provide respite. And this would go on for months. It is a terrible price to pay for the residents of the whole city as traffic comes grinding to a halt.

The route involves digging up previous landfill sites and other toxic areas. There is an obvious pollution risk here.

Has the case been proven that this project will increase our energy security and decrease bills? You know it hasn't. The French have already rejected the project. The French have also threatened to cut off energy supplies to the Channel Islands in recent years, highlighting how energy supplies can be weaponised for political gain, as if the war in Ukraine had not made that abundantly clear. I believe that we should be funding our own sustainable and green energy solutions rather than this environmentally disastrous scheme that will have a ruinous effect on the health of hundreds of thousands of people. And what are the predictions for how it will reduce the price of our energy bills? So small as to be insignificant.

I'm summarising the arguments because I, like you, have seen the highly detailed objections sent to you by Portsmouth City Council and our two MPs.

So to summarise, and beg, please do not risk the physical and mental health of the residents of Portsmouth for a project that fails to increase energy security, fails to protect

the environment, fails to significantly reduce the price of electricity and will only succeed in adversely affecting the daily lives of the residents of Portsmouth.

Yours faithfully,

Graham O'Neil

Ps - here are the copied objections that I have read and agree with each point.

Let's Stop Aquind sent another document to the Secretary of State at the DESNZ - today, 29. February 2024

Unresolved issues regarding the Aquind Interconnector Has the SoS considered the following list of unresolved or disputed issues? 1. Do the harms of this project not substantially outweigh the benefits? 2. Has the missing NGET feasibility study, requested by Justice Lieven in the High Court Appeal Case and the then Secretary of State, been found, validated and made public? 3. Should not Ninfield and other substations to the East be brought into consideration? 4. Has the impact of the possibly misleading evidence presented by the applicant in support of the project been thoroughly considered? 5. Should the fact that the project has been comprehensively rejected by the French local government not be a decisive factor? 6. Is this project not a National Security risk, as has been repeatedly highlighted by Portsmouth city MPs? 7. How does this Interconnector cable, equally likely to export UK energy as to import European energy, add to our national energy resilience? 8. Is it not appropriate to question the designation of this project as an NSIP? It is a means of transporting energy not a producer of energy. Should it have ever been compared to a power station generating electricity ? Does it not lead to no actual energy gain? 9. Is it a sensible option to slice through the second most densely populated and highly congested city, with dangerous levels of pollution, in the UK when there is a known risk of disturbing toxic waste ? 10. In view of the passage of time, over three years since the original completion date, should the project not be completely re-evaluated in light of the changes in national and international affairs, climate change urgency, national energy demands and of course all government policies which will have changed during this time period? 11. Could the embedded commercial tele-communication part of the FOC (fibre optic cable) be considered a risk to national security? 12. Can we rely on the company, Aquind, with no proven record of delivery in the energy sector, to deliver this project?