

From: [patricia.mooney](#)
To: [Aquind Interconnector](#)
Subject: Proposed AQUIND INTERCONNECTOR
Date: 08 March 2024 23:07:45

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

Dear Secretary Of State,

I write to object to Aquind's plans (because they would adversely affect Portsmouth as the second most densely populated city in England), and adversely affect the UK as a nation, (because Portsmouth is a city of great strategic importance as it is the home of the Royal Navy).

Here's some questions that I believe have not necessarily been adequately addressed, by your Ministerial predecessors and civil service advisors. Has the Secretary of State considered the following list of unresolved or disputed issues?

My questions can be classified as based on NUMEROUS, parallel, concerns:

A. ENVIRONMENTAL

- (a) Does it even make sense to cut 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?
- (b) Recent closure of the Eastern road bridge, (1 of only 3 roads in and out of Portsmouth) for emergency repairs, has caused massive-scale journey delays and near-gridlock. How can Aquind guarantee that this chaos would not be repeated, ON A DAILY BASIS, FOR THE DURATION OF THE BUILDING WORKS, if building the Interconnector landfall site was to be allowed in the Portsmouth area?
- (c). Please consider/reconsider Ninfield and other substations to the East be brought into consideration? Is it not clear that Ninfield/others located to the East of Portsmouth would be a less environmentally-damaging landfall site - if one is even needed (see question B (b) below)?

B POLITICAL

- (a) Is this project not a National Security risk, (as has been repeatedly highlighted by Portsmouth city MPs)?
- (b) the project has been comprehensively rejected by the French local government - so isn't planning the UK end of an internationally non-viable project a total waste of time?
- (c) HAS THE SECRETARY OF STATE NOT CONSIDERED THAT THE EMBEDDED COMMERCIAL TELE-COMMUNICATION PART OF THE F O C (FIBRE OPTIC CABLE) IS AN UNNECESSARY RISK TO NATIONAL SECURITY?

(C) COMMERCIAL

- (a) How does this Interconnector cable, equally likely to export UK energy as to import European energy, add to our national energy resilience? (I am not convinced that it would, at all)
- (b) 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?
- (c) Can we rely on the company, Aquind, with no proven record of delivery of any similar project in the sector?

(D) PROCEDURAL

- (a) Has the impact of the possibly misleading evidence presented by the applicant in support of the project been thoroughly considered?
- (b) 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?
- (c) 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 the fact that most government policies will have changed (or at least seriously modified - e.g. HS2) during this time period?

Yours

Patricia Ann MOONEY

Portsmouth resident