

Response to Action Point 27 - Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2(CAH2) by Gordon Young (Affected Party Ref: [REDACTED])

I am an Affected Person for the purposes of the Planning Act 2008, I am listed in the Book of Reference as having Category 2 and Category 3 interests in land within the proposed Scheme Order limits, namely in plots **1/2, 1/ 4, 1/5, 1/7, 1/8, 1/9, 1/10, 1/11**. and have previously set out my objections ([RR-1866](#), [REP1A-106](#), [REP2-081](#), [REP3A-079](#), [REP6-208](#)) to the proposed Sea Link Scheme. I write to confirm that my objection to the compulsory acquisition and/or temporary possession of land and rights remains unchanged.

My interests fall within the Order Limits and relate to plots in close proximity to my home and its immediate surroundings (the land required for the access road is located with 250 meters south of my home and the converter station is located approximately 500 meters east of my home.) The inclusion of this land within the Scheme Order Limits places my residential amenity, setting, and enjoyment of my property directly at risk.

My objection remains for the following reasons:

Firstly, the proposed compulsory acquisition represents a significant and unjustified interference with my rights to private and family life and to the peaceful enjoyment of my property. The scale and proximity of the proposed works, including access routes, construction activity, and associated infrastructure, would result in substantial and prolonged adverse effects, including noise, vibration, dust, traffic, and artificial lighting. These impacts would be experienced over an extended construction period and beyond.

Secondly, the Scheme would result in a material degradation of the setting and character of my home and its surroundings. The introduction of major infrastructure in close proximity to residential properties is wholly inappropriate in this location and would fundamentally alter the rural character and amenity currently enjoyed.

Thirdly, my property would be subject to clear and foreseeable blight. The presence of the Scheme and its associated impacts would adversely affect both the enjoyment and the value of my home, with no adequate mechanism offered by the Applicant to address this harm. The absence of any meaningful discretionary purchase or compensation scheme further exacerbates this position.

Fourthly, the use of compulsory acquisition powers in this instance is neither necessary nor proportionate. The Applicant has failed to demonstrate a compelling case in the public interest, particularly given the ongoing and unresolved concerns regarding the need case for the project and the availability of less harmful alternatives, including offshore coordination solutions and alternative siting strategies.

Fifthly, there has been no meaningful engagement by the Applicant to explore opportunities to avoid, reduce, or mitigate the impacts on my property and surrounding land. This failure undermines the justification for the exercise of compulsory powers.

Finally, the cumulative impacts of this Scheme, when considered alongside other major infrastructure projects affecting the area, significantly intensify the harm experienced by local residents. As set out in previous submissions, including those relating to health and wellbeing, the Environmental Statement fails to adequately assess these cumulative and psychosocial effects, further undermining the justification for compulsory acquisition.

For all of the above reasons, I maintain my objection to the compulsory acquisition and/or temporary possession of land and rights within the Order Limits.

The Examining Authority is therefore respectfully requested to give full weight to the disproportionate and unjustified impacts on affected persons and to conclude that the Applicant has not met the statutory tests required to justify the use of compulsory acquisition powers.