
Response to Action Point 27 - Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2(CAH2)

From [REDACTED] >
Date Thu 2026-04-23 14:41
To South East Anglia Link <SouthEastAngliaLink@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: Response to Action Point 27 - Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2(CAH2)

Deadline 6 Submission

Response to Action Point 27 - Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2(CAH2)

Paul Smith and Andrea Robinson-Smith (Affected Party Ref: [REDACTED])

I apologies for the late submission of this document [REDACTED].

Both Myself and my wife (Andrea Robinson-Smith) are Affected Persons for the purposes of the Planning Act 2008, We are 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 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 our home and the converter station is located approximately 500 meters east of our home.) The inclusion of this land within the Scheme Order Limits places our residential amenity, setting, and enjoyment of my property directly at risk.

Our objections remains for the following reasons:

Firstly, the proposed compulsory acquisition represents a significant and unjustified interference with our rights to private and family life and to the peaceful enjoyment of our property.

Secondly, the Scheme would result in a material degradation of the setting and character of our 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 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.

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. ion for compulsory acquisition.

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

Kind regards,

Paul Smith and Andrea Robinson-Smith

[REDACTED]