

As a Portsmouth resident I am, once again, writing to raise my objections to the proposed route of the Aquind Interconnector. I am resending all my previous points as I feel that they are still valid; however, I would wish to add four more observations/questions:

- Has the feasibility study requested by Justice Lieven in the high court appeal case, to which I referred in July 2023, now been found and made public?
- Has the rejection of this project by the local government in France been taken into consideration?
- Should this project still be designated as an NSIP, as it actually involves a means of transporting energy, as opposed to a way of producing energy i.e. it cannot therefore be compared to something like a power station.
- Aquind has provided no evidence of successful delivery within the energy sector. Can we therefore rely on them to do so if successful with this appeal?

Previous points sent in July 2023 that I feel are still valid:

- I understand the original feasibility study, considering other options for connection points such as Mannington, has not yet been seen by the SOS. Surely these other possibilities need further investigation as, linked to a point in my previous objection, landfall location in France has totally changed.
- Originally Aquind stated that 4million homes in the UK could be served by this interconnector but now, according to the Portsmouth News, it seems that 1.4 million is a more accurate figure –a somewhat different estimate! Another example of misinformation at macro level?

Previous points sent in June 2023 that I feel are still valid:

Portsmouth is incredibly crowded – a high density city, second only to London. It seems therefore inconceivable that the planned route should still involve the city considering that the landfall position in France has now changed from the one that was originally proposed. The shortest route, and presumably the cheapest and safest to lay and maintain, should involve landfall much further east, in East Sussex. This would then pass through areas of lower population density, leading to less disruption.

Portsmouth island and has only three land exit points and Aquind intend to cut off one, not only to lay the cable but also to be able to do so whenever changes/ repairs need to be made. When all three exit points are open, they can still become completely congested during busy periods- with Eastern Road closed it's easy to imagine how the city could become completely grid- locked.

The proposed route would also cut into areas containing dangerous materials – former naval dumping grounds containing a variety of hazardous materials such as asbestos. I understand that these are now contained underneath a secure membrane which will be damaged – surely sheer madness with little concern for the potential release of hazardous materials.

The route also proposes drilling under marine environments, parks and allotments. I attended a meeting of allotment holders and felt that we were totally misinformed by the Aquind representative as to what this might involve. I now understand that the material to be used to assist the drilling is potentially hazardous and that this could be released to the surface- surely dangerous for those growing their own food.

This misinformation has also surely been replicated at a macro level – first the cable was only carrying electricity and as a result any planning decision was taken out of the hands of local decision makers. It then was proposed to add a telecommunication cable. This did not seem like an open and honest way for the company to behave. I also understand that the viability of Aquind has been questioned based upon its links to two companies that went into liquidation and of course there is the vast amounts of money Aquind has donated to a variety of Conservative MPs. Added to this is the secrecy regarding at least one of the owners of the company. Even the leader of the House of Commons has referred to the project as a threat to our National Security.

In conclusion I would ask the Secretary of State to reject this proposed route on environmental, ethical, security and common sense grounds.

Christine Elmer



8/3/2024