

Summary of Land Parcels and Rationale for Objection

As requested by the Planning Inspector at the Public Inquiry on 25th March 2026, we set out below a summary of the individual Land Parcels in question and the rationale for our objection to their inclusion within the Compulsory Acquisition powers.

We will prepare a detailed submission ahead of 'Deadline 6' of any remaining Objections, after a meeting with Sea Link, as listed in the action points.

Sea Link are clearly aware of the existing SPR Option Area, as the boundaries were included within the plan of the area, in the response to the first CAH on the 27th January, Page 75 of EN020026-002931-9.121 Applicant's Comments on Other Submissions Received at Deadline 4.

Plot 2/20D

The area was left to facilitate access between two fields created by SPR's purchase of the adjoining land.

We understand the need for access for National Grid to the pylons, as stated by James Buckley, but not the need for them to acquire this land.

Any ecological mitigation or landscaping will not be able to be undertaken so close to pylon structures. The applicant has already stated their willingness to grant us access over the area and hence it leads us to believe the plot will not be used for anything beyond this use. The current explanation for requirement to purchase land remains ambiguous.

We don't understand the necessity for powers other than access rights in this area for the applicant to deliver the Project.

Plot 2/20 F + B

No further justification has been provided for the additional land required over and above what SPR have already acquired to facilitate the same access.

The Planning Inspectorate has already approved the SPR's access plans and therefore we do not believe that Sea Link requires further powers over any additional land to construct the proposed service road necessitated to deliver the Project.

If additional land is taken the field size and shape left will be unviable with modern farming practices and the required efficiencies.

Land Parcel 2.20 C

We wish for this plot to reflect SPR's landscaping proposals.

We hope this will be corrected following the meeting on 1st April 2026 between Sea Link and SPR, which will enable us to withdraw our objection.

Our aim is to ensure that no unnecessary land parcels are acquired by Sea Link.

Plots 2/38, 2/39 and 2/99

There is an existing hedgerow on the roadside.

The effect of the acquisition of rights over this land will be to narrow the field entrance at the same time as impacting on the visibility splays which are required when moving large machinery in and out the field.

What Sea Link are seeking to impose on us would not be acceptable within their own policies for visibility and movement of large machinery and equipment.

Plot 2/11 and 2/11 A

Sea Link have repeatedly advised that they do not wish to look at alternative access routes.

There are existing tracks which could bring them to within 30 metres of the proposed inspection bay. Sea Link have been aware of this for a considerable period (1 year) and it has been brought to their attention on multiple occasions.

In the event that access over the existing tracks cannot be established then, at the very least, the right of way could run beside the PROW (a footpath) constructed by SPR to minimise impact on the cultivation and cropping of the field.

We feel that the current proposals appear to maximise, rather than minimise, disturbance to our farming activities within the field.

We believe that surveys have been carried out on land for both alternative access routes are situated.

Land Parcels 2/17 and 2/18

The current landscape plans do not allow for maintenance of the ditch, into which drainage from the field discharges. We will require access to maintain the ditch to ensure the free movement of water down the ditch line from the land.

Land Parcels 2/5, 2/7 and 2/7b

We wish for this area to mirror that of the SPR plans for access/service road.

The requirement / necessity for Plot 2/7b has not been explained.

If for visibility why, as detailed above, (reference Plots 2/38, 2/39 and 2/99), are Sea Link appearing to wish to restrict our own visibility, whilst at the same time purchasing our land to remove hedging and trees?

Land Parcels 1/93, 1/94, 1/99 and 1/100

Our feedback to Sea Link throughout the consultation process has been to exclude these land parcels. To say that, at our request, area required should be widened, is factually incorrect.

At no point during the discussions between Sea Link, Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council, were we, the Landowners, consulted as to our views, comments or suggestions.

We do not believe that a new hedge at this location integrates the into the existing surrounding landscape but, rather, detracts from it.

There is no evidence of historic planting alongside the road. As a Family, we have been at the property since the 1960's. The wood to the east of the land parcels was only planted in the 1960's and, before that, was part of the adjoining arable field.

Secondary hedging already exists on the brow of the hill and the area in question is in the lowest part the surrounding landscape. We do not believe that the establishment of a hedge at this location will aid in screening the development being undertaken by National Grid.

The planting of the hedge will cause damage to the adjacent Christmas tree plantation through shading, moisture retention and nutrient competition.

Sea Link have yet to explain why it is not possible for the proposed ecological mitigation to be located elsewhere away from the edge of the road.

The project can be built and exist without the use of this land and in our opinion it causes unnecessary impact on our family business.