

# CAH 2 Submission

## SEAL-AAP009

We would ask the Planning Inspector note that this Submission has been made without the benefit of a meeting with the Applicant and SPR as, despite a request to do so, they were unable to meet with us before the current deadline.

We will look to submit an updated Submission after the current deadline but before the close of the Examination on the 5<sup>th</sup> of May, so long as the Applicant offers us the opportunity to meet with them to discuss the points below.

## 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 beneath the existing 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 plot was to be left in the agreement with SPR to facilitate access between the two retained fields. The current explanation for the requirement to purchase the land remains ambiguous.

We don't understand the necessity for Powers in relation to this Plot, 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 road on to the site. The land required by SPR has already been purchased, ready to facilitate implementation.

The Planning Inspectorate has already approved SPR's access plans and we therefore do not believe that the Applicant requires further Powers over any additional land to construct the service road proposed 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. This would be compounded with the adverse effects of shading and moisture competition that woodland/hedge land planting creates and the ongoing maintenance issues for us as the landowner and occupier.

The Applicant has failed to justify why any additional areas are required in addition to the proposed road to be built by SPR. We feel that any areas beyond the existing SPR design are not required by the Applicant in order to implement the Project and have an unnecessary long term adverse impact on ourselves and our family business.

## 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 1<sup>st</sup> April 2026 between Sea Link and SPR, which will then enable us to withdraw our Objection.

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

We are yet to have our follow up meeting with the Applicant in regard to the outcome of their meeting on the 1<sup>st</sup> of April.

## 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.

The level of woodland planting in the SPR plans, in front of the converter station, should be acceptable to facilitate screening of the development. We therefore believe that these plots are not required by the Applicant in order to deliver the Project.

## Plot 2/11 and 2/11 A

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

At a previous meeting, in early 2025, with National Grid representatives it was suggested to them that an alternative access, over the existing drive leading Fristonmoor Barn and High House Farm, would have provided them with access to within a much shorter distance of the same location.

We do not understand why this alternative option was not explored, rather than impact a productive arable field. In the event that access over the existing tracks cannot be established then, at the very least, the right of way should run beside the PROW (a footpath) constructed by SPR to minimise impact on the cultivation and cropping of the field. This would also allow for easier travel to the inspection bay.

The current proposal would likely be impassable during the winter months, choosing the wettest and most heavy (due to clay soils) parts of the field. We believe our alternative proposals would benefit the Applicant in the long term and minimise disturbance to the occupiers' of the land.

We feel that the current proposal appears to maximise, rather than minimise, disturbance to our farming activities within the field, as well as causing ongoing issues into the future.

Surveys have already been carried out on land for both alternative access routes proposed. The Applicant has already had engagement with all relevant Landowners, with regard to the proposed alternative access.

It has been frustrating that no other routes have been considered despite numerous requests or at least evidence that they looked at other routes.

### 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. We seek for this area to mirror SPR plans.

### 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. In turn we will remove our objection.

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?

We believe any area outside of the plans of SPR within these plots to be unnecessary for the delivery of this project.

### 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/removes it.

The road, due to its low-lying position, forms ice and frost in the winter period. The addition of a hedge at this location will increase the risk to road users.

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.

In Document: 6.3.2.1.D Part 2 Suffolk, Page 12, Table 1.5 'Assessment of effects on Representative Viewpoint 5', as can be seen from the projected image, the buildings will stand out against the skyline, when viewed from various directions. The proposed planting of a hedge alongside the road will do little to mitigate the views of the buildings and, taken in the round, add little to the existing landscape, given the existing presence of the Christmas trees.

In addition, the planting of the hedge will cause damage to the adjacent Christmas tree plantation through shading, moisture retention and nutrient competition. This can stretch to 24m out in to the field away from the planting. The Christmas tree's are ever more becoming an important source of income for the Family, with the external pressures on traditional forms of farming. We have a small and finite amount of land on the farm that is suitable for this practice, proximity to customers and the brand that has been built over 30 years. We are already having a large area of this production land being sterilised for this practice due to the cable route. We feel strongly that the acquisition of these Plots unnecessarily increase this damage.

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.

We believe the Project can be built without the use of this land and in our opinion it causes unnecessary impact on our Family business.